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PREFACE

LOUISIANA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
1914-1986

What conditions brought the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES) into existence? What conditions have sustained it for over 70 years? And finally, what does the future hold for the LCES? It is apropos that these questions are asked during the septuagenarian anniversary decade of the LCES.

The conditions which brought the LCES into existence and sustained it during its first 34 years are reviewed in Chapter III, which is an overview of the establishment of the LCES and its history to 1948. The primary source for this chapter is the seminal work of Frederick W. Williamson entitled Origin and Growth of Agricultural Extension in Louisiana, 1860-1948.

Since Williamson studied the LCES up to 1948, this work will only provide information not covered by him and will deal as well with the subsequent 38 years, 1948-1986. Primary sources will be published materials and personal interviews. The developments which have occurred during the 1948-86 period will be reviewed in Chapters IV through XIII. Chapter XIV will contain the evaluation and conclusions; and Chapter XV, the final chapter, will be devoted to an
analysis of what the future may hold for the LCES—its challenges and its opportunities.

In approaching this study, one must be aware of the larger social context of which the LCES is a part. In this regard, it has been estimated that roughly 40 percent of Russia's population are farmers1 and that approximately 80 percent of China's population are employed as farmers.2 The significance of these figures is apparent when they are contrasted with the 2 percent for the United States' farm population. Additionally, U.S. farms are now the most productive in the world. One farm family now grows enough food to feed 78 people. In Russia, more than half of their personal income goes for food; in the U.S., less than 20 percent of a family's income goes for food even though only 2 percent of the U.S. population are farmers.3

The latter figure was not always the case for the United States. In 1790, 95 percent of the country's population were farmers. In 1986, almost the exact opposite was true, with 2 percent of the total population being farm people. This current high level of American agricultural

1ASCs Notes (Denham Springs, LA: USDA/Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), 25 April 1984, p. 2.


3ASCs Notes
production did not "just happen." Professor Roy V. Scott in his book, The Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914, goes to great lengths to document this fact. He relates that his book "... is a story of the search for a teaching device effective with rural adults. The search was a lengthy one, extending from at least the 1780's to 1914."

Since this major societal change has occurred—fewer farmers with increased productivity—and since the Extension Service is the primary government-sponsored development program designed to introduce technological innovations in agriculture, the major objective of this study will be to chronicle and describe the various extension education philosophies and practices which have been employed by the LCES to bring about these changes in Louisiana.

It is the hope of this writer that this objective can be met; if so, the study will make a contribution by describing the role which the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service has played in Louisiana's recent agricultural history.
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ABSTRACT

This dissertation studies the conditions which brought the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES) into existence in 1914 and which have sustained it for over 70 years.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that 40 percent of Russia's population consists of farmers and that approximately 70 percent of China's population are farmers. The significance of these figures in relation to productivity is apparent when contrasted with the United States farm population of 2 percent. The current high level of production in American agriculture, sustained by such a small percentage of the population, is not an accident, as Professor Roy V. Scott, in The Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914, documents.

In light of this inverse relation of farm population to productivity and of the role of the Extension Service as the primary government-sponsored development program designed to introduce technological innovations in agriculture, the major objective of this study was to chronicle the extension education philosophies and practices employed by the LCES to bring about these changes in Louisiana.

Primary data for the study was obtained through in-depth interviews with past and present employees of the LCES.
and from original documents. Secondary data was acquired from published information such as memoirs.

The last attempt to describe the LCES was made almost 40 years ago by Frederick W. Williamson in Origin and growth of Agricultural Extension in Louisiana, 1860-1948. Since then, no effort has been made to document extensively the involvement of the LCES in agricultural pursuits. This study sought to rectify this situation.

Chapter I contains the introduction with an explanation of the importance of history; Chapter II provides an overview of the social milieu of Louisiana. Chapter III treats the antecedents of the LCES and the LCES itself to 1948. Chapters IV through XV cover the period from 1948 to 1986 and topics such as the Department of Extension and International Education; the Communication Division; Farm Bureau; Agricultural, Home Economics, 4-H and Community Development work; and the Black Experience in the LCES. The evaluation and conclusions are given in Chapter XIV and the future of the LCES in Chapter XV.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The current high level of American agricultural production did not "just happen." Professor Roy V. Scott in his book, *The Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914*, goes to great lengths to document this fact. He relates that his book "... is a story of the search for a teaching device effective with rural adults. The search was a lengthy one, extending from at least the 1780's to 1914."¹ Before outlining the various routes taken by those who sought better ways for teaching improved farming methods, Professor Scott acknowledges, "There can be little doubt that increased agricultural productivity is a necessary prerequisite to industrial growth and a rising standard of living, regardless of time or place. ..."²

Stewart and Glynn have explained the importance of agricultural production in this way: "The production of an agricultural surplus has always been a requirement of city life ... In the preindustrial city, a majority had to till the soil so that a minority could live in the city. Today, a majority live in the city."³ They summarize this trend of urbanization for the U.S. in the following manner.

Even by the time of the Civil War only one-third of the United States had to work the land. By the end of World War II only one person in twelve farmed for a
living. By 1970, the agricultural production of the United States was increasing more rapidly than ever before. This observation takes on special significance when we consider the fact that now only one man in forty-three is occupied with farming!  

Note that the increase in agricultural productivity rapidly accelerated after 1914, the date given by Professor Scott when "a teaching device effective with rural adults" was found.

Most people today recognize the important role which agricultural production has played in providing Americans and others with an ever-increasing standard of living. However, the contribution which Louisiana Cooperative Extension personnel have made to this effort is often less well known. It is the objective of this dissertation to describe the contribution of the Extension Service in this area.

**Subject**

The primary focus of this dissertation will be the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. There is, however, an interrelatedness of personnel among the Extension Service, Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station and various academic departments of Louisiana State University (LSU). Since the total salary of some employees is supplied by payments proportional to the time the employee devotes to the different program areas, this interrelatedness provides the rationale for considering their contributions under the generic title of this work.
Scope

The study will be a descriptive history. It will describe the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service from its inception in 1914 to 1986, according to Extension Education and sociological perspectives.

As indicated by its official name, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, LSU is the beneficiary of the 1862 Morrill Act, which established one "land grant" university in each state.

The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 established the Agricultural Extension Service, which is now known as the Cooperative Extension Service. Act No. 8 of the Louisiana Legislative Session of 1914 authorized the State of Louisiana to participate through LSU in the Extension program created by the Smith-Lever Act.

LSU continues to administer the Smith-Lever Act for Louisiana. The program is, as originally envisioned, a joint endeavor of the federal, state and local governments; hence its present name, the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. The current Extension director is Dr. Denver T. Loupe, who holds the position of Vice Chancellor and Director for Extension in the LSU Agricultural Center.

Significance

It has been estimated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) that roughly 40 percent of Russia's population consists of farmers and that approximately 70
percent of China's population are employed as farmers. The significance of these figures is apparent when they are contrasted with the 2 percent for the United States' farm population. The importance of agriculture is explained by Professors J. Paul Leagans and Charles P. Loomis in their book *Behavioral Change in Agriculture*.

Structuring agriculture so that it feeds a nation and is an instrument of economic growth is a central problem today in a hundred countries around the world. The agricultural portfolio is generally conceded to be one of the most complex in any government. What is the proper arrangement of ends and means? How can it be created? Once created, how can it be made to function effectively on a continuing basis? The answers given by governments to these questions affect two-thirds of the world's population directly, and all of its three and a half billion people indirectly.

Dr. Leagans emphasizes the important role of education in improving agricultural production in the above-mentioned book. Pertinent excerpts follow:

Crucial in the task of proper utilization of modern technology is education of the ultimate utilizers (farmers and leaders at the micro level) and of those who can provide environmental interventions (professional agricultural leaders and macro-level policy makers) which results in environmental variances contributory to modernization goals. In this role, education is a catalytic ingredient that modifies, relates, and activates the other elements essential for agricultural development.

... This fact suggests, universally, that as greater knowledge and precision are required in the use of technology, a comparable educational input is essential. Not to provide it is to invite less than optimum use of science and, indeed, to risk failure. The simple fact is that, for the new technologies to be effective in increasing agricultural production, they must be used by the farmers, and this requires extension of them to the farmers. Hence, to expect, without an effective educational input, an uneducated, tradition-bound farmer to identify and clarify the most
technically sound, economically feasible, politically compatible, and socially desirable goals to pursue; to expect him to assemble and effectively utilize new production technology and related inputs required to achieve modernization; and to expect him to self-generate the motivation necessary to achieve new and complex (to him) behavioral innovations in his long-practiced farming pattern, approaches sheer romanticism.9

The preceding helps to explain why the high level of production in the U.S. did not "just happen" but has been the result of deliberate, persistent and systematic efforts by Extension educators.

Extension education is defined by Professor Leagans as follows:

Extension education may be functionally defined as an applied science consisting of relevant content derived from researches in the physical, biological, and social sciences, and in its own process, synthesized into a body of concepts, principles, and procedures oriented to providing noncredit, out-of-school education largely for adults.10

The societal importance of education is described by Dr. Leagans in the following model:

What is known about why people behave as they do suggests that man is an independent living system surrounded by an environment with which he constantly interrelates: other human beings, physical objects, social and cultural norms, and economic, technological, and political conditions. Studies indicate that cultures tend to institutionalize at least seven primary elements.11

Leagans enumerates these elements in his Figure 1 (a copy of which follows), a circular, donut-shaped diagram with the center (1) Education, or as he specifies, Extension Education, surrounded by the outer whole of the donut segmented into the remaining six elements: (2) Physical, (3)
Social, (4) Economic, (5) Political, (6) Religious and (7) Technological, a recent development.12

Analysis of the role and functional relationships of these elements indicates that in the present context, education tends to be central among societal subsystems, influencing other elements and, in turn, being influenced by them. Empirical evidence suggests that development requires that major societal institutions have quality and continuity, function with inseparable interrelatedness, and operate in reasonable balance. In this context, the central role of an extension education system is to focus on the transaction between man and his environment in ways that improve the quality of the transaction. In this task, its specific role is to "orchestrate" physical, biological, technological, economic, social, and political resources so as to reduce dissonance between the status quo and desirable new economic and social conditions of living and ways of making a living.13

This then serves as the basic premise for Leagans:

...that an effective extension education system is one of the requisites--but only one--of agricultural modernization. The central role of an extension system is to focus on the transactions between man and his environment in ways that improve the quality of these
transactions. In this task, its specific role is to "orchestrate" physical, biological, technological, economic, social, and political resources so as to reduce dissonance between the status quo and desirable new economic and social conditions. . .\textsuperscript{14}

So, the significance of this study will be the description of the impact which the personnel of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service have had on the improvement of agriculture. This will be done by documenting their effort to obtain proper utilization of modern technology through the use of education and by evaluating their success in reducing "dissonance between the status quo and desirable new economic and social conditions of living and ways of making a living.\textsuperscript{15}"

Conceptual Framework Used in the Study

The importance of organizations to modern society have been recognized by a variety of disciplines, including sociology, business management and extension education. This study will be an eclectic, multidisciplinary approach which will utilize concepts from the previously mentioned disciplines to describe and evaluate the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service.

From management, Professor Herbert G. Hicks in the Preface to his book \textit{The Management of Organizations: A Systems and Human Resources Approach} describes the importance of organizations as follows:

Organizations have enabled man to span oceans in hours, to enjoy an unprecedented abundance of material goods and leisure, and to double his span of life. Organizations also have enabled man to go to the moon.
Clearly, organizations are among man's most important creations and servants. Organizations exist because they help man to achieve his objectives.

Dr. Hicks recognizes the evolutionary development of organizations when he stated:

The "organization man" in the gray flannel suit was a product of our own civilization, but he had a host of ancestors. Anthropologists have discovered evidence of organizations in the primitive societies of the earliest known humans. For thousands of years the basic organization was the simple family unit, but other forms gradually developed in answer to the demands of tribal living, religious teaching, and barter and commerce.

Such an evolutionary perspective will be taken with respect to examining the origin and development of the Extension Service in an effort to answer the question of what societal needs it is fulfilling.

Professor Hicks' book will also serve as a reference for management terms and taxonomies. For example, in describing the organizational management structure of Extension such concepts of Professor Hicks' will be used as types of staff: personal, specialized and general.

From sociology, a theoretical as well as a practical sociological organizational perspective is described by Boyd Professor Emeritus Alvin L. Bertrand in his book Social Organization: A General Systems and Role Theory Perspective. The principal concepts which will be used are introduced by Bertrand in the beginning of his book:

... It may be trite to observe that man must organize, that is, learn to act in concert with his fellows, in order to survive. Yet, this fact is so fundamental to an understanding of social organization
that it cannot be overemphasized. Introductory textbooks in sociology underscore this point by noting the long period of dependency of the human infant and man's lack of usable instincts (that is, instincts related to patterns of behavior such as nest-building or migration). Sorokin (as well as others) goes further and notes that group life is essential to the development of the creative potential of human individuals.

Dr. Bertrand continues to develop, as the book's title indicates, a logically consistent general systems and role theory perspective of social organization. He does this by first defining the products of man's organizing efforts—social systems—as "two or more people in interaction directed toward attaining a goal and guided by patterns of structured and shared symbols and expectation." Professor Bertrand next defines the structural elements of social systems: norms, roles, status-positions, situses and stations.

Professor Bertrand then turns his attention to describing role relationships as he states, "The importance of structural elements to the organization and process of social systems cannot be fully grasped until the nature of role relationships is understood." He introduces these concepts, which will be utilized in the study of the Extension Service: reciprocality and conjunctivality. As a final topic, Dr. Bertrand concludes with a description of the various classes of social systems: groups, complex organizations, communities and societies.

The usefulness of these concepts can be seen once it is
recognized that the Extension Service is a complex organization which is linked by numerous reflective reciprocal roles. For example, Professor J. H. Jones, Jr., is employed by the Extension Service in the Division of Program Services as an Extension Research and Program Analyst and he holds academic positions not only in the Department of Agricultural, Extension and International Education but also in the Sociology Department. These various positions which Dr. Jones holds are linked by reflective reciprocality. An example of an interstitial group with which Dr. Jones is frequently involved, often as chairman, is a dissertation committee.

From Extension Education, the concepts and philosophies enunciated by Professor Ralph W. Tyler in his book Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instructions are important. Among these concepts, Tyler suggests that Learners themselves should be studied as a source of educational objectives; contemporary life outside the school should be studied; and the subject specialist should be consulted on suggestions about objectives. He postulates how learning experiences can be selected which are likely to be useful in attaining the adopted objectives, how learning experiences can be organized for effective instruction, and how the effectiveness of learning experiences can be evaluated.

These concepts will serve as reference points, particularly in the chapter on "Evaluation and Conclusions"
Methodological Procedures

Primary data for the study were obtained through in-depth personal interviews with representative past and present employees of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. The initial list of interviewees was developed by working with present knowledgeable administrative officials of the Service. When these interviewees were contacted, they were asked to name other individuals who should be contacted for similar information. This procedure served as both a check on the original list and as generator of additional names.

The interview guide was constructed to emphasize the experience factor because only those who have actual working experience can provide details. Provisions were made to record each interviewee's position held in Extension, years of service with Extension, whether presently employed or retired, age, race, address and phone number. See Appendix A.

Secondary data came from published information on the Extension Service such as annual reports.

Need for Study

The last attempt to describe the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service was made almost 40 years ago by Frederick W. Williamson in his book Origin and Growth of
Agricultural Extension in Louisiana, 1860-1948, 1951. Since then, no effort has been made to systematically document the involvement of the Louisiana Service in agricultural pursuits. This study sought to rectify this situation.

**Review of the Literature**

Professors Leagans' and Loomis' book *Behavioral Change in Agriculture* is an excellent orientation to the societal importance of agriculture and the focal role of education in improving agricultural production. The societal paradigm described by Dr. Leagans in Chapter 5 of his book, with education being central to and integrating all other subsystems, is the conceptual model followed in this study.

A good overview and introduction to societal change is contained in Everett M. Rogers' and Rabel J. Burdge's book titled *Social Change in Rural Societies*. Parenthetically, Rogers and Burdge define a change agent as "a professional who influences innovation decisions in a direction deemed desirable by a change agency." This will be the operational definition for a change agent used here.

Theoretical concepts useful for integrating the topics of this study are described in the book, *People, Groups, and Organizations*, edited by Bernard P. Indik and F. Kenneth Berrien. (Dr. Lynn L. Pesson utilized the conceptual approach described in this book on one of his consulting trips for the Haitian government.)

Evaluation criteria and methodology are discussed in
Organizational Effectiveness and Impact: A Planning Guide, prepared by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, for the USDA Extension Service, Washington, DC, in August 1977. Also, the book by Paul D. Warner and James A. Christenson titled The Cooperative Extension Service: A National Assessment (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984) offers extraordinary insight into the Extension Service. Because of its use of a national random sample of the user public of Extension services who were interviewed by telephone, it will probably become the benchmark paradigm study of Extension in the foreseeable future. (It would be most interesting and valuable to replicate this study here in Louisiana in order to compare the findings.)

General information on the Extension Service is included in Heritage Horizons: Extension's Commitment to People, edited by C. Austin Vines and Marvin A. Anderson and published by the Journal of Extension in 1976.

Specific information and good guidance are offered by these two books on the history of Extension: (1) from a national perspective, Adult and Continuing Education Through the Cooperative Extension Service (Columbia: Extension Division, University of Missouri, 1984) by Warren Prawl, Roger Medlin and John Gross, and (2) from a state view, The Montana Cooperative Extension Service: A History 1893--1974 authored by Merrill G. Burlingame and Edward J. Bell, Jr.,
and published by Montana State University in 1984. Both are well done and helped to crystallize the arrangement of this work.

**History: Its Importance**

The importance of history can be viewed from at least these three perspectives (1) its colloquial effects, (2) its practical benefits, and (3) its theoretical treatment. In viewing the colloquial effects, one is reminded of the common proverb, "If you don't know where you have been, how do you know where you're going?" or, as was expressed by William Faulkner, "The past is never dead, it's not even past." The former connotes the old adage that if one does not know history, one is doomed to make the same mistakes again. Faulkner's remark emphasizes that the past can be perceived all around us if we are sensitive to it. For example, the LSU area abounds with names of great agriculturists from the past--Knapp Hall, Dodson Auditorium and Dalrymple Drive--if we are aware that they are named for the Father of Extension Education, Seaman A. Knapp; the first Dean of the LSU Agriculture College, Director of the Louisiana Experiment Station, and first Director of the Agricultural Extension Service, W. R. Dodson; and the noted veterinary scientist, Dr. W. H. Dalrymple.

The practical benefit of history is best embodied in an article entitled "The Value of Corporate History" by George David Smith and Laurence E. Steadman. For this study,
"corporation" needs to be read as "organization." The utility of their article for this study of the Extension Service can be seen from this excerpt:

Corporations, like individuals, have more than skeletons in their closets. They have accumulated ways of doing things. And, like individuals, corporations may benefit from the old ways of doings things but may also become unable to adapt during periods of change. At these times, managers can look at the history of an organization to find ways it adapted in the past.

A history is also useful as a diagnostic tool and as a way of calling up great moments from the past to motivate employees in the present. A company's history contains its heritage and traditions, which managers need to understand if they are to see the present as part of a process rather than as a collection of accidental happenings. Perceiving a company in this way can enhance a manager's ability to plan for the future. Managers need to learn how to develop historical resources and how to put them to use.16

They posit that studying history entails the ability to:

1. See and explain the flow of events as a process over time, not just a sequence of isolated happenings.

2. Approach the past with a sense of surprise—that is, regard events and decisions as uncertain and thus recapture them unaffected by their real outcomes.

3. Treat any part of the past on its own terms and in ways that would have been comprehensible to people of that period. (Our natural tendency is to distort the past by reading it in light of our own experiences, ideas, and values.)

4. Understand particular historical problems or episodes in their contemporary social, intellectual, political, and economic contexts.17

Using these points to orient our focus during the remainder of this study will increase its meaning.
Third and finally, there is a theoretical consideration. Although history is an important source of data for sociology, the difference between the two must be recognized. Don Martindale in *The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory* states that "the two fundamental ways of dealing with subject matter are by laying down laws (in which case knowledge is nomothetic) or by describing individual facts (in which case knowledge is idiographic). Natural science is a nomothetic type of inquiry; history is idiographic."\(^{18}\) He further clarifies the difference by adding that "like history, sociology aspires to empirical knowledge of social events; unlike history, it aspires to a knowledge of the general rather than the unique, for, when all is said and done, sociology is a scientific organization of knowledge."\(^{19}\) Hence, although numerous historical data will be cited in this dissertation, the objective will be for the development of a general knowledge of the growth of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service rather than for the development of unique knowledge about the Service. That is, this writer considers the "process" of the "growth and change" of the Louisiana Service to be more important than recounting all occurrences associated with any one development once a pattern of change has emerged.

In this introductory chapter, the subject and scope of the study was identified as the history of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service from its inception in 1914 to
1986; the conceptual framework used in the study was outlined; methodological procedures were stated; the need for the study was discussed; previous studies relating to research were reviewed and the importance of history was examined from three perspectives. In Chapter II, the social milieu or setting will be provided by using descriptive information and statistical indicators.
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CHAPTER II
THE SOCIAL MILIEU OF LOUISIANA

Introduction

Before reviewing the agricultural demography peculiar to Louisiana and pertinent to this study, a brief historical overview on Louisiana is in order.

Background


It was not until after 1900 that agriculture and general agricultural production recovered the ground which had been lost during the period from 1860 to 1877. In 1860 the value of farm lands had been approximately $248,000,000; in 1890 their value was only $110,500,000. Farm equipment had declined from over $18,000,000 to about $7,000,000 and the value of livestock from $24,500,000 to $18,000,000.¹

Davis outlines the improvements made in Louisiana agriculture as follows.

The increasing use of scientific agricultural methods gained momentum as the years passed. The World's Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition, which was held in New Orleans in late 1884 and early 1885, greatly stimulated the farmers. The first agricultural experiment station was established at Kenner about the same time and others were soon in operation, all under the directorship of Dr. W. C. Stubbs. . . .²

Director Stubbs is the person for whom Stubbs Hall on the LSU Campus at Baton Rouge is named.

Visual and practical demonstration methods were used
even at this early date, according to Davis.

Demonstrations were given in the terracing of land to prevent erosion, in the use of new farm machinery, and in the treatment of animal and plant disease, but many farmers were slow in adopting the new discoveries and methods. One man refused to admit that farming could be taught by a "college professor," saying: "Why I've worn out two farms; you can't tell me how I ought to farm."³

The importance of the year 1914 to Louisiana agriculture was described by Davis in this manner.

In 1914, 4-H Clubs came into existence, and the next year witnessed the introduction of home-canning clubs and the organization of the Agricultural Extension Service by the State University. Agricultural meetings and conferences, where papers were read and discussions were held on various subjects of interest to farmers, increased in number.⁴

Thus by the year 1914 when the Agricultural Extension Service was established by the U.S. Congress through the Smith-Lever Act, Louisiana was well under way with programs extending scientific knowledge in agriculture and homemaking to the farm family.

**Demography**

**Population Characteristics**

Table 1 shows the rural-urban population of the state from 1900 to 1980. The percentage of the state's population classified as rural has declined consistently from 1900, when the rural population represented 73.5 percent of the total population, to 1980, when the percentage was only 31.4 percent. The urban population increased from 26.5 percent to 68.6 percent of the total population from 1900 to 1980.
TABLE 1
RURAL-URBAN POPULATION OF LOUISIANA
1900-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>RURAL POPULATION</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
<th>URBAN POPULATION</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1,015,337</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>366,288</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1,381,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1,159,872</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>496,516</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1,656,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,170,346</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>628,163</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>1,798,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,268,061</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>833,532</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>2,101,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,383,441</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>980,439</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>2,363,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,211,820</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>1,472,696</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>2,684,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,196,416</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>2,060,606</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>3,257,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,235,156</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>2,406,150</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>3,643,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,318,499</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>2,887,401</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>4,205,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The increasingly urban character of the state can be seen from another measurement—the number of cities with a population of over 5,000. In 1900, the number of cities fitting this category was only six. They were:

- New Orleans 87,104
- Shreveport 16,014
- Baton Rouge 11,269
- Lake Charles 6,680
- Alexandria 5,648
- Monroe 5,428

By 1980, the number of cities in Louisiana having a population over 5,000 had increased to 62.

Farm Characteristics

Table 2 shows the average size of farms, number of...
farms and value of farms in Louisiana from 1900 to 1984. It can be seen that Louisiana is following the national trend of a decreasing number of farms with an increasing average size of farms. In 1910 there were 120,546 farms with an average size of 86.6 acres; by 1985 the number of farms was 35,500 with an average of 285 acres. The value of farm land and buildings per farm increased.

However, the change in agriculture did not occur uniformly throughout the state. For instance, the number of farms in substate District 1, the New Orleans area, dropped from 1,365 in 1959 to 718 in 1969, a decrease of 47.4 percent. The greatest percentage change occurred in Orleans, where 69 farms existed in 1959 and none existed ten years later.

The change in the number of farms from 1959 to 1969 for all of the substate districts is shown in Table 3.

The purpose of this demographic data is to show that changes have taken place in the environment in which the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service functions. The important questions which will be considered in this study are, "Did the Service change over time in anticipation of these historic changes or just in response to them; if it changed, how did it do so and how can one differentiate between anticipatory and responsive changes?"

These selected demographic entries are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to be representative or
# TABLE 2
## TRENDS IN FARM LAND ACREAGE, USE AND VALUE
### LOUISIANA, 1900-1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AVERAGE SIZE OF FARMS IN ACRES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FARMS</th>
<th>VALUE OF FARM LAND BUILDINGS PER FARM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>115,969</td>
<td>$1,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>120,546</td>
<td>1,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>135,463</td>
<td>3,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>161,445</td>
<td>2,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>150,007</td>
<td>2,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>124,181</td>
<td>7,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>74,438</td>
<td>23,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>232.0</td>
<td>42,269</td>
<td>74,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>275.0</td>
<td>33,240</td>
<td>140,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>296.0</td>
<td>31,370</td>
<td>290,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td>31,628</td>
<td>381,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** [1981 Statistical Abstract of Louisiana and 1900 and 1982 Census of Agriculture](#).
exhaustive of all the facets in which Extension is involved. For instance, those involved in 4-H youth work may want data showing the Louisiana population by age cohorts so that a determination could be made for the number eligible to participate in the youth programs. Those involved in Home Economics may want information pertinent to their principal clients—the female portion of the population.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF FARMS BY SUBSTATE DISTRICT IN LOUISIANA WITH PERCENT CHANGE, 1959-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICTS</th>
<th>NO. FARMS 1959</th>
<th>NO. FARMS 1969</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>-47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13,203</td>
<td>6,738</td>
<td>-49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>-37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17,285</td>
<td>10,607</td>
<td>-38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>-17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,812</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>-47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,525</td>
<td>6,206</td>
<td>-50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,243</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>-41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>74,438</td>
<td>42,269</td>
<td>-43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this explanation out of the way, let us take a final example which shows the change in agricultural production in Louisiana. Cotton is no longer king in Louisiana. While production has increased phenomenally from 135 pounds per acre in 1910 to 423 pounds per acre in 1974, the number of acres planted has declined from 930,000 acres to 650,000 acres for the same years, respectively.6

Further evidence of the decline in agricultural importance of "King Cotton" to Louisiana is shown in
Table 4, which ranks commodities by cash receipts from farm marketings for the period 1965-1984. Cotton was last ranked number 1 in the period 1960-64. Other commodities ranked number 1 during the period 1965-84 have included cattle and calves and a newcomer in 1975, soybeans.

TABLE 4
RANK OF FARM COMMODITIES BY CASH RECEIPTS FROM MARKETING
1965-1984
(000 OMITTED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>RANK 1 CASH</th>
<th>RANK 2 CASH</th>
<th>RANK 3 CASH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Cattle $ 91,581</td>
<td>Cotton $ 91,139</td>
<td>Rice $ 82,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Cattle 141,880</td>
<td>Soybeans 102,707</td>
<td>Rice 102,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Soybeans 223,943</td>
<td>Sugarcane 178,624</td>
<td>Rice 172,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Soybeans 557,612</td>
<td>Cotton 231,115</td>
<td>Rice 214,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Soybeans 327,895</td>
<td>Cotton 232,205</td>
<td>Rice 146,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The great diversity in types of farm commodities in Louisiana by 1980 is illustrated by Table 5 which lists the top ten commodities in terms of cash receipts from marketing.

Ideal proof of the responsiveness of Extension to these changes in Louisiana agricultural production would be evidence that Extension anticipated them and allocated personnel and research resources to prepare their farmer clientele for them.
### TABLE 5

**RANK OF TOP TEN LOUISIANA FARM COMMODITIES**  
**BY CASH RECEIPTS FROM MARKETING**  
**1980**  
**(000 OMITTED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>COMMODITY</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td>$557,612</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>231,115</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>214,876</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>162,712</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dairy Products</td>
<td>139,149</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Broilers</td>
<td>109,991</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sugarcane</td>
<td>100,616</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>30,147</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sweet Potatoes</td>
<td>23,098</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Forest Products</td>
<td>12,955</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**


**Summary**

The chapters which follow will track Extension's recognition of the changing composition of the State's agricultural crop commodities and population from rural to urban and its commitment to serve all the people. For example, in 1986 the Service had about ten staff members serving Orleans Parish, a parish which had no farms after 1969. These urban agriculturalists are providing much sought-after services in the areas of small gardens, ornamental horticulture, nutrition, etc. Many urbanologists now concede that urban gardening, whether indoors or out, has therapeutic value.
An example of Extension's response to the changing composition of the State's crop commodities is that Extension has "broken new ground" (which will make this idiom obsolete) in the area of coastal zone management. Warren Mermilliod, who "... calls himself a marine advisory agent" is known by his employer, the LSU Cooperative Extension Service, as "Assistant Area Agent (Fisheries)." In 1979, he was one of six Extension Marine Agents.7

In Chapter III, the salient events in the history of the Louisiana Service from 1914 to 1948 will be summarized.
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CHAPTER III

THE LOUISIANA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE TO 1948

**Introduction**

The words used by former Director Sanders to describe the objectives of his chapter on U.S. Extension history in his book on *The Cooperative Extension Service*, 1966, which has become a *vade mecum*, a valued manual, for students of Extension, are appropriate here.

The understanding of an organization is increased through a knowledge of its history. By knowing the guiding philosophy and practices followed and when, where, and how they succeeded or failed, repetition of failures can be avoided. The Cooperative Extension Service has a colorful, interesting history. . . .

What is not appropriate is to repeat Sanders' coverage; but, it is hoped that a supplementation of his work will be. This will be accomplished by including information specific to the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES), such as its organizational development, as indicated by increased staff and their arrangement, comparisons of funding sources by years and by the administrations of the different Extension directors and program developments.

**National and Louisiana Extension Heritage**

Permit this brief preface and overview of the national Extension heritage of which the LCES both contributed to and
contributed to and benefited from. First, "the Cooperative Extension Service [is] the largest problem-solving educational system in the world." Second, because of this fact, the following occurs:

Each year, representatives from many countries visit the United States to study the Cooperative Extension Service and its relationship to the land-grant system and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The system, including teaching, research, and extension education, has made a major contribution to the well-being of the people in the United States.

The system of teaching, research and extension education is variously described as "The Magic Triangle," or as the "Land-Grant Triad." These components developed nationally as follows:

1862 Morrill Act: Land-Grant Colleges

. . . in 1857, Vermont Congressman Justin Smith Morrill introduced a land-grant college bill. Not until 5 years later, however, did the bill finally win approval when Abraham Lincoln signed it July 2, 1862.

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 [emphasis added].

It provided a number of 30,000-acre land grants to each state equivalent to the number in each state's congressional delegation. The lands were to be sold, 10% of the proceeds used, if necessary, to purchase a college site, including an experimental farm, and the balance was to be permanently invested at 5% interest.

Thus, this act explains the origin of the term, "land-grant," which was a "grant" of Federal "lands" by the national government to the state governments for the
establishment of colleges "... in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." It also provides the explanation for the "A & M" in the official name of LSU--Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Louisiana State University

LSU began its existence as the State Seminary of Learning at Pineville in 1860. In 1859, before the college opened, the State Legislature changed its name to the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy, a name that continued until 1870. Williamson described its first superintendent this way:

The appointment of William Tecumseh Sherman, later to become notorious in the annals of the South as a Union general in the War Between the States, as superintendent of the Seminary, was not the least important incident of the institution's beginning. Whatever place Sherman was to fill in the military history of the nation, he maintained throughout the rest of his life a deep regard for the Seminary he assisted in founding, a sentiment signally evident under various circumstances.

Following the War, an original faculty member, David French Boyd, now Colonel, was named acting superintendent in 1865. In 1870, by legislative act, "... the designation of the Seminary was changed to Louisiana State University, and Colonel Boyd as head of the institution became its first president." Although Louisiana became eligible in 1865 to receive the benefits of the Morrill Act, it was not until 1869 that the legislature accepted the donation. But, it
was not until 1877 that the Agricultural and Mechanical College was made a part of LSU; and, it was 1883 before the first professor of agriculture, General Allen Thomas, was appointed.7

Williamson continues his coverage of LSU by writing sympathetically of the "travail and tribulation" encountered in establishing the first component of the triad, resident instruction, in Louisiana. All Louisianans, particularly LSU graduates, are encouraged to peruse his work on this subject.

The small body of University people led an anxious and financially unprofitable life, frequently despondent and sometimes in actual need. Scarcity of the necessities of life made matters almost unendurable at times. During 1874-75, Colonel Boyd kept a diary relating to the affairs of the University which reveals the whole story of struggle, hardship, and disappointment.

On July 23, 1874, Colonel Boyd wrote: "This day finds our poor school in very bad condition, terribly in debt, ourselves so poor we are in actual want. . . We are nearly out of such common articles as we have; viz., meat peas, rice, coffee, and tea. We are out of sugar and butter; we have had none for many months. . . We have not a dollar in the treasury; and where the money is to come from to pay those who have fed us this month, I do not know." August 15, 1874: "What is to become of us if we stay here much longer, or if I should die, God only knows. I have not a dollar, owe a great deal, and what money is due me from the University I may never get. . . ."8

The preceding should demonstrate that the establishment of the first component of the "Magic Triangle," resident teaching, was not an easy task, at least in Louisiana. Also, the significance of having the Graduate School administrative building named for David F. Boyd should be
more acute.

1890 The Second Morrill Act: Black Land-Grant Colleges

Morrill, it is reported, began to campaign for additional funds for the land-grant colleges soon after the passage of his 1862 Act. However, his wait was long—until 1890—and then a key provision was inserted which required that the institutions be opened to both white and black students or that "separate, but equal" facilities be established.9

Appropriations were to be ". . . applied only to instruction in agriculture, mechanic arts, the English language, and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic sciences, . . . provided that no money shall be paid out under this Act . . . for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students."

Following 1890, the southern states had four alternatives for action to meet the requirements of the law. They could establish new black land-grant colleges under state control, they could designate an existing private college for blacks as the land-grant institution, they could name an already existing state-supported black institution as recipient, or they could take over a private black institution as a state college.

. . . The states that designated the existing state-supported black institution as the land-grant college were Alabama (1875), Arkansas (1872), Florida (1887), Kentucky (1887), Louisiana (1880), and Missouri (1866).10

Southern University

The institution designed by Louisiana to be under the 1890 Morrill Act was Southern University which had been established in 1880. More will be presented on this 1890
Morrill land-grant institution in Chapter XIII which examines the Black experience in the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. Now, the second component, research, will be considered.

1887 Hatch Act: Experiment Stations

Establishment of Agricultural Experiment Stations was another milestone in the developmental process that ultimately led to Extension's emergence. . . .

Legislation was introduced in Congress in 1882 to establish Experiment Stations at 1 land-grant college in each state. But, it was 5 years later—in 1887—before such a bill, sponsored by Missouri Representative William Henry Hatch, was signed by President Grover Cleveland. Research was now firmly established as a recognized function of the land-grant colleges and universities.11

As a historical aside, Seaman A. Knapp, who it shall be shown shortly is the Father of Extension Education, can also be considered one of the "fathers" of the Hatch Act. In Joseph Cannon Bailey's excellent biography of Knapp (1833-1911) entitled Seaman A. Knapp: Schoolmaster of American Agriculture, 1945, he provides the evidence for this statement:

"I found it so hard to get any appropriation from the State," Knapp told the Breeders Association at the close of 1882, "that I thought we would try to get a national appropriation. So we had a bill drawn and introduced into Congress giving to each State that would do this work [research] . . . $15,000 a year.

Four years and two months later, in March, 1887, the bill, which Knapp's push started on its course through Congress, became law. Modified and amended principally as to the provisions bearing on the Federal-state relationships, it was the basis for the since famous Hatch Experiment Station Act.12

Knapp's handling of the bill which was to become the
Hatch Act was a precursor of his perspicacious judgment which he was to exhibit in the founding of the final component of the Land-Grant Triad, extension education. His handling of the bill is described by Bailey as follows:

... Again introduced by Representative Holmes in 1885, after it had been remodeled to make distinct provision that the [experiment] stations should be departments of State colleges and not virtual branches of the United States Department of Agriculture, it was reported favorably back to the House by Mr. Cullen of Illinois for the Committee of Agriculture. (For an interval thereafter it was known as the Cullen Bill.) As chances for its passage mounted, Knapp, and other agricultural educators, in cooperation with Commissioner Coleman of the United States Department of Agriculture, wisely transferred sponsorship of the bill to the Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, William H. Hatch of Missouri. Under his aegis, the measure was passed and in 1887 received the signature of President Cleveland.13

Thus, agricultural development was positioned for its next quest: How to get the research findings from the experiment station scientist to the needed user--the farmer?

A brief outline of the development of the experiment stations in Louisiana follows. In 1884, Dr. W. C. Stubbs of Auburn was elected to fill the post of professor of general and agricultural chemistry. He arrived in Louisiana in 1885 and "... began at once to develop courses in agriculture at the University and to organize experiment stations. ..." Williamson further provides:

The first agricultural experiment station in Louisiana was instituted in 1884 at Kenner as a private undertaking by the Louisiana Scientific and Agricultural Society, which donated $60,000 for the purpose. ... 

Agitation in congress for a nation-wide system of
agricultural experiment stations culminated in 1887 in the adoption of the Hatch Act, which appropriated $15,000 a year to each state to establish in its land grant college a "department to be known and designated as an agricultural experiment station." This act proved to be one of the most important developments up to that time affecting agriculture in Louisiana. Considerable controversy arose over the question of locating the experiment stations in the state, but the final decision was to establish three: one near New Orleans, one at Baton Rouge, and one at Calhoun in Ouachita Parish. The station at New Orleans, first located at Kenner when it was under the joint operation of the Agricultural College and the Sugar Planters association, was later moved to Audubon Park, within the city limits. Coincidentally a sugar school was established at the Audubon Experiment Station for the training of students in the growing of cane and the manufacture of sugar. The sugar school attracted a large number of students from sugar growing Latin-American countries. Aside from a similar school in Trinidad, South America, it was the only one of its kind in the world.14

Williamson concludes his treatment of Louisiana's experiment stations by briefly reviewing a history of the staff and their contributions:

A staff was organized at each station, composed usually of nine members at the Sugar Station, nine at Baton Rouge, and six at Calhoun. In addition to Dr. Stubbs, who remained at the head of the station until January 1, 1905, several other men of noteworthy ability and efficiency were added to the station staff, their work and efforts proving a stimulus to the development of Louisiana agriculture. Foremost among these was Dr. W. H. Dalrymple, who for twenty years worked to better the livestock conditions in the state. A product of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, London, he brought a wealth of scientific knowledge and experience to bear in the solution of livestock problems which left a permanent influence on the farming life of Louisiana. Professor W. W. Clendennin was another leading scientist identified with the experiment stations who made several valuable geological reports and soil surveys. Professor J. G. Lee, Sr., was the first director of the Calhoun station, and later became state commissioner of agriculture.
Professor H. A. Morgan, professor of zoology and entomology, had charge of the Baton Rouge Experiment station. He was a scientist who ranked with Dr. Dalrymple in brilliancy and attainments. He was later to become famous as chairman of the technical board directing the Tennessee Valley Authority at Muscle Shoals. Others with the experiment stations included Professor A. T. Prescott, of the botanical division; R. E. Blouin, later director of a sugar station in the Argentine Republic; and W. R. Dodson, professor of botany, who later succeeded Dr. Stubbs as Experiment station director.\textsuperscript{15}

The contribution of many of the previously named individuals is commemorated on the University grounds by their having buildings and a street named in their honor. For example, there is Dodson Auditorium, Prescott Hall, Stubbs Hall and Dalrymple Drive and Dalrymple Hall. Additionally, many were destined to play pivotal roles in the establishment of the final component of the Magical Triangle, Extension Education.

1880-1915 Farmers' Institutes

In the evolution toward a national agricultural extension service, several intermediate organizations and events occurred and individual leadership appeared. One of the most important organizational developments was that of the Farmers' Institutes. True writes: "Between 1880 and 1890 farmers' institutes or equivalent public meetings were established on a more or less permanent basis in 26 States."\textsuperscript{16} Williamson adds these specifics on Louisiana.

A form of agricultural extension work, designed to carry the findings of the college and the experiment stations to the farmers of the state, was introduced during the last decade of the [19th] century. Professor Dodson was one of the first to organize such
a program [in 1896. . . . (See Williamson, page 324, for this date.)] These gatherings were known as Farmers' Institutes, and usually covered two-and three-day periods. In 1902, forty-five of these institutes were held.

The message of science had a varied response. Dr. Dodson told of a farmer who, having heard him lecture on the value of soybeans in restoring worn-out land, returned six years later to express his thanks for the information which he had practiced throughout the intervening period. Another farmer, however, scornfully rejected the idea that farming could be taught by a college professor. Said he: "Why, I've worn out two farms; you can't tell me how I ought to farm." [Emphasis added.]

In an introductory address at the different meetings of that first Farmers' Institute under state sponsorship [1897, p. 324], Commissioner [of the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Immigration, J. G.] Lee [Sr.] made it clear that he entertained high hopes that the movement would become an educational instrument in stimulating the betterment of Louisiana farms and farm homes. . . . It is a gathering essentially educational, intended to impart knowledge and suggest thought that seeks to make the farmer a better farmer, the citizen a better citizen."17

1904 The Mexican Boll Weevil

The event which was to change American agriculture forever and which was to serve as the needed stimulus for the enactment of a Federal act creating a national Extension Service was the invasion of Texas and Louisiana cotton fields by the Mexican boll weevil. Williamson provides the setting:

It was 1904, when the Farmers' Institutes were at the peak of their activities, that a disruption in normal agricultural development occurred which diverted attention from the intellectual and ethical phases of farm teaching. A new menace appeared on the agricultural horizon, the Mexican boll weevil. When the boll weevil began its destructive march through the cotton fields of Texas and of Louisiana, consternation overcame the planters. They saw their patrimony wither
and fade before their eyes. Broad acres, the source of the South's livelihood, were laid waste by the devouring horde. There was no staying the march of destruction. No weapons were available to attack the devastating pest, whose path was marked by ruin. It was not alone the cotton planter who was the sufferer of the scourge. Bankers, merchants, business men, commercial and industrial enterprises, whole communities dependent on the cotton crop as the fundamental source of the region's livelihood, were engulfed in the disaster that followed in the wake of the boll weevil.

The situation was appalling but not entirely hopeless. As events proved, the boll weevil became a more potent school master in teaching the farmer the folly of pinning his faith on the "single-crop system" than all the theorists who had yet inveighed against the practice. (In Enterprise, Alabama, stands a monument erected by citizens grateful to the boll weevil as an instrument for teaching the economic unsoundness of the single-crop system.) Out of confusion and disaster emerged a prophet of hope who was to infuse a new sense of stability and confidence, not alone in the cotton industry, but into the whole scheme of agricultural life. It was his mission to lift the science of husbandry to a higher plane and to bring about a new understanding between the technician trained in proven agricultural practices and the man who cultivated the soil for uses of mankind. That prophet was Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, the story of whose work and the influence it exerted in creating a richer and more satisfying life for the farming population furnishes one of the most inspirational chapters in the history of American agriculture.18

Seaman Asahel Knapp (1833-1911):
A Man With A Mission

Because of the important position Dr. Seaman A. Knapp occupies in agricultural history as the "Father of Teaching by Demonstration," the philosophical base on which Cooperative Extension Education is founded, it is desirable to document the development of this concept thoroughly. Hence, the following excellent summary excerpts are taken from True. (The most informative and detailed biography on
all aspects of Dr. Knapp's careers, with which this writer
is familiar, is by Joseph Cannon Bailey, Seaman A. Knapp:
Schoolmaster of American Agriculture, 1945.)

The originator and leader of this movement
[farmers' cooperative demonstration work] was Seaman
Asahel Knapp . . . . He was the son of a physician at
Schroon, Essex County, N.Y. He was prepared for
college at the Troy Conference Academy, at Poultney,
Vt., and graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y.,
in 1856, having gained membership in the Phi Beta Kappa
Society. In college he came under the influence of
President Eliphalet Nott, one of the great liberal
educators of that time, who even introduced in his
institution courses in gardening and agriculture. In
August, 1856, Mr. Knapp was married, and with his wife
taught for several years in the Collegiate Institute at
Fort Edward, N.Y., and then was associated for a time
in the management of the Ripley Female College, at
Poultney, Vt. Crippled by an accident, which seriously
impaired his health, he moved to Iowa in 1866 and
settled on a farm at Big Grove, Benton County, near
Vinton, the county seat. Continued poor health
compelled his removal to Vinton, where in 1869 he was
elected superintendent of the State college for the
blind.19

Since the previous paragraph is an example of the type
of biographical information contained in True's book on
Dr. Knapp, the remainder of True's coverage of his early
careers will be summarized. In 1874, Dr. Knapp resigned his
superintendency to farm; this led him to become a member of
the first Iowa Fine Stock Breeders Association and a little
later he established The Western Stock Journal and Farmer,
through which he advocated a diversified agriculture. About
this time he became acquainted with James Wilson, afterwards
Secretary of Agriculture, who was then a farmer in Tama
County. He became professor of agriculture at the Iowa
State Agricultural College, at Ames in 1879. In 1884,
Dr. Knapp began a short term as president of that institution. He was instrumental in establishing there a more systematic course in agriculture, from which during his term of office some men were graduated who became prominent in agricultural affairs.

In 1886, Professor Knapp went to Lake Charles, Louisiana, where he had charge of the agricultural development of a large tract of land in western Louisiana. When it proved difficult to interest the native population in improved methods of agriculture, and farmers coming from the North refused to settle in this region because agricultural conditions seemed so unfavorable, Professor Knapp offered very favorable terms to one settler for each township. These farmers were to come from Iowa and other Northern States and show what could be done by good farming under his general direction. This plan was so successful that, as the result of these demonstrations, thousands of northern farmers settled in this region, and the natives also undertook better farming. Rice growing with modern methods and machinery was a prominent feature of this enterprise, and was so successful that it was extended into Texas and other adjacent States. The Rice Growers Association of America was formed and Professor Knapp was its president several years. He was active also in farmers' institutes, the writing of many agricultural articles, and the organization of associations of farmers.
In 1898, when the development of the rice industry in southern Louisiana and Texas demanded improved varieties, Secretary Wilson sent Professor Knapp to Japan, China, and the Philippines to investigate rice varieties, production, and milling. The result was a great expansion of the rice industry after the introduction of Japanese varieties and when useful changes had been made in growing the crop.

It was about 1901 when Dr. Knapp and B. T. Galloway, Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, established a number of demonstration farms in the Gulf States in an attempt to show how his favorite theory of the advantages of diversified agriculture could be carried out practically in that region by adding other crops to the growing of cotton. However, experience in this undertaking confirmed his belief that farmers generally would not change their practice from observing what could be done on farms operated at public expense. True states Knapp concluded that "There must, therefore, be demonstrations carried on by the farmers themselves on their own farms and under ordinary farm conditions." 20

True provides further information on this epoch-making event in American agriculture:

Professor Knapp took this matter up with business men and farmers at Terrell, Tex. A committee of eight was formed, who provided $1,000 as an indemnity fund to protect against loss farmers who would attempt to grow cotton under his direction. Walter C. Porter volunteered to do this on his own farm and made a success of his demonstration, the object of which was to show what could be done with different varieties,
fertilizers, methods of cultivation, and planting. About 70 acres of land were used, nearly equally divided between cotton and corn. Though there was much damage to the cotton by the bollworm, and to the corn by wind and hail, the crops gave Mr. Porter a profit of $700 more than he probably would have obtained if the methods commonly used in that region had been followed. 21

Walter C. Porter's Community Demonstration Farm
Terrell, Kaufman County, Texas

Bailey elaborates as follows on the significance of this demonstration on the development by Professor Knapp of his unique concept of teaching.

The right psychological key which unlocked the door to the farmer's cooperation had been found. As Dr. Knapp later said, "What a man hears he may doubt, what he sees he may possibly doubt, but what he does himself he cannot doubt." Prior to the Terrell demonstration the Department of Agriculture had been saying, "Come and look at the way we can do things on our model farms. Why don't you try the same thing?" Such farms made virtually no impression on the farmer. It made little difference to him whether the government owned the farm outright (as at experiment stations), had received its free use as a loan from some owner, or rented it for cash or on shares season by season. The government simply wasn't on the same footing he was and it couldn't go broke whatever it did. His inevitable rejoinder under such circumstances was, "If I had somebody back of me too, I could afford to try your scheme." The backing was exactly what had been supplied at Terrell, but by his own neighbors not by a distant government.

The complete elimination of government money and direct control removed the last excuse for the ingrained skepticism and suspicion of the farmer. . . . 22

The stage was now set for the final event, the major agricultural crisis, to catapult the tried and tested demonstration experiments into national prominence. True writes that "The opportunity to show on a broad scale that
this [demonstration farming] was the correct procedure in aiding farmers, especially when they were financially embarrassed and discouraged, came immediately thereafter [Terrell Farm, 1903] as the result of the invasion of the cotton boll weevil in Texas." It had crossed the Mexican border in 1892 and 10 years later was creating such widespread havoc in Texas that southern farmers were thoroughly alarmed regarding the future of the cotton crop. This caused the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry to visit the devastated region and become personally acquainted with the methods and results of the demonstration at Terrell. They recommended that Congress promptly made an emergency appropriation of $250,000 to combat the boll weevil. The Bureau of Entomology and the Bureau of Plant Industry each received half to the appropriation. In the latter bureau $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."23

True continued:

Professor Knapp established headquarters at Houston, Tex., in January, 1904, and took counsel with farmers, bankers, merchants, railroad presidents, and other business men. Contributions of money, railroad trains, passes, and other aids were received. On February 19, 1904, W. D. Bentley was appointed as agent and served on an agricultural train of the Fort Worth & Denver Railroad for two weeks. Meetings were held in towns along the route, and lectures were delivered on cotton, corn fruit, and forage and other crops. At first
farmers were unwilling to agree to undertake demonstrations, but after Mr. Bentley joined the farmers' union he had better success and gave demonstrations in about 10 counties in the northwest part of the cotton section in Texas. W. F. Procter and James A. Evans were appointed February 12, 1904. The latter has remained in the Government service in prominent positions in connection with demonstration and extension work and at present is assistant chief of the Office of Cooperative Extension Work. Over 20 agents were employed in Texas in 1904, 3 in Louisiana, and 1 in Arkansas. That year over 1,000 meetings were held, and 7,000 farmers agreed to demonstrate. In the fall a meeting of agents and more than 200 representatives of farmers was held at Houston. Profits from the demonstrations were reported, and the benefits of pure seed, deep plowing, frequent shallow cultivation, and the growing of home supplies were the chief topics discussed. In general, getting ahead of the weevil with early planting, early-maturing varieties, and treatment of the soil to promote rapid growth was the secret of success.24

1902 General Education Board

According to True, other organizations in addition to the Federal government were interested in Knapp's concept and what it could do to improve the economics of farming. Among these was the General Education Board which 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."25 True describes how the Board documented the disparity in the economics of farming in the South between those of the North and the adverse effect this had on income from taxation to support a public school system. True explains:

... Beginning in the fall of 1902 it [the General Education Board] held conferences and made surveys in the Southern States, collecting a great mass
of information regarding economic and educational conditions there. It found 85 per cent of the population in that region living in rural communities with a low average income for farmers. In some Southern States the average farmer's income was about $150 per annum, as compared with more than $1,000 in Iowa. The officers and members of the board, who were acquainted with the results of this survey and had themselves visited the South, felt that "more favorable economic conditions must be attained before comprehensive school systems could be supported by taxation." It was, therefore, necessary to give the adult farmers of the South such practical education as would enable them to secure larger returns for their labor.

The secretary of the Board visited agricultural schools in the U.S. and Canada in an effort to identify an acceptable practical educational method. He visited the Texas college while Professor Knapp was lecturing there and he was favorably impressed with him and his plan of demonstration work. Therefore, a conference with Professor Knapp and Secretary Wilson was held at Washington. In Knapp's opinion, "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.'"

True goes on to provide the genesis of the funding arrangement which now characterizes Extension as unique and truly "cooperative" among federal, state and local agencies.

Government funds for demonstration work were at that time appropriated for combating the cotton boll weevil and were not available for strictly educational purposes. [Emphasis added.] The board could, therefore, supplement these funds and work on the same plan, in the general field of agricultural education.
This it determined to do, and an agreement for this purpose was signed April 20, 1906, by the secretary of the board and the Secretary of Agriculture. . . . Under this agreement the Government funds were used for demonstration work in weevil-infested States and the board funds were used for similar work in States which the weevil had not yet reached. . . . The money furnished by the board was used in paying the salaries and expenses of agents where adequate funds for these purposes were not available from State and local sources. Agents paid from board funds were given Department of Agriculture commissions as collaborators at salaries of $1 per annum. This gave them official status and enabled them to use the franking privilege for official business.27

1906 First County Agent and Origin of Name

True enlightens his readers on this subject by providing the following information.

On November 12, 1906, the first county agent, W. C. Stallings, was appointed in Smith County, Tex. His appointment resulted from a local demand for more demonstrations and more information than could be given by agents whose territory included several counties. . . . Business men 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. In three counties in Texas and two parishes in Louisiana they offered from $750 to $1,000 to obtain the services of an agent.

. . . in 1908, Professor Knapp said:

"A few demonstration farms scattered throughout the county . . . 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 completion everywhere, and arouse the whole community. To do this requires at least one agent in each county."

With larger funds and greater local support from farmers, bankers, and business men the number of agents increased rapidly. In 1910 the work was in progress in 455 counties in 12 States, and there were 450 agents.
Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work

The growth in the number of agents in Louisiana prior to the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 can be seen from Table 6.

**TABLE 6**

**AGENTS ENGAGED IN FARMERS' COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION WORK**

**LOUISIANA, 1904-1914**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49**</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** *Only estimates for total number of agents are available for 1904-06 since no records are available to show the actual number of agents in each State. The total number for 1904, 05 and 06 were 15, 20 and 25, respectively. **For the years 1911-14, the listed number includes women agents.*


LSU Department of Agricultural Extension

The State of Louisiana through LSU began participating in the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work at an early date as the following excerpts from the LSU Catalogue for 1914 show:

This department of the College of Agriculture was organized September 1, 1909. Its purpose is to convey agricultural information to persons not regularly enrolled as students at the University. In years gone by the chief method of disseminating such information has been through the printed page of the bulletin. The failure of a large per cent of those engaged in agricultural pursuits to avail themselves of the knowledge wrought out by the experiment stations, has led to the establishment of departments of agricultural extension, which seek to carry direct to the farmer...
such information relative to his operations as he may want or need. The various activities of this department of the College of Agriculture will indicate in a more specific manner what its purpose is conceived to be...

Seventeen specific tasks are listed; two examples are: "The organization of boys' agricultural clubs in the public schools of the State. . . ." and "The formation of girls' home economic clubs, with the purpose of training the girls of our public schools in the fundamental principles of home making."28

The staff was composed of:

E. S. Richardson Director
W. H. Balis Assistant Director
Miss Elizabeth Kelly, Organizer of Girls' Clubs
Miss Ola Powell, Asst. Organizer of Girls' Clubs

This staff and the faculty of the College of Agriculture in association with the USDA, experienced farmers and planters presented Farmers' Demonstration Courses and Conferences at LSU. Selected examples of those who delivered special lectures at the winter session of 1914 include:

Luther E. Hall, Governor of Louisiana
M. B. Oates USDA
Charles E. Pabst Pecan Grower and Nurseryman
Ocean Springs, Mississippi
T. S. Granberry Long-Bell Experiment Farm
Bonami, Louisiana
C. N. Brumfield Agricultural Agent
Illinois Central Railway
L. A. Higgins Mississippi Field Agent
Dairy Division, USDA
L. N. Brueggerhoff Secretary, Louisiana State Fair
Shreveport, Louisiana
Mason Snowden State Agent, Farmers' Demonstration Work, USDA
Bradford K. Knapp USDA
The types of courses, lectures and demonstrations given for the years 1910-14 were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck Gardening</td>
<td>Rice Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeds and Feeding</td>
<td>Beef Cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Culture</td>
<td>Soils and Fertilizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Judging</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Farm Machinery</td>
<td>Hogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairying</td>
<td>Plant Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Judging</td>
<td>Crop Pests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forage Crops</td>
<td>Breeds and Breeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budding and Grafting</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Catalogue concludes with this offer: "For further information in regard to the courses to be offered next winter, write to Professor William R. Dodson, College of Agriculture, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana."  

Funding for the farmers' cooperative demonstration work increased nationally from $27,316 from USDA in 1904 to $371,800 in 1914. In 1914, the USDA contribution was matched by $187,500 from the General Education Board and $411,179 from other sources to form a total of $970,479.

Louisiana's receipt from this fund was estimated at $1,000 in 1904 and by 1914 had increased to $45,000. In 1914, when the Smith-Lever Act was passed, Louisiana only received $10,000 from it; and it was 1917 before Smith-Lever exceeded the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration in granting funds to Louisiana. The high year of the latter program was 1918 when the State received $40,000. However, this program continued with gradually decreasing funds until 1938 when Louisiana only received $144. Since the Farmers'
Cooperative Demonstration Program preceded the Smith-Lever Act and actually co-existed with it until 1938, this fact probably explains why there are some apparent discrepancies in the number of Extension Workers in Louisiana— it depended on which program, Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration or Smith-Lever, paid them as to how they were counted.33

Knapp's Oratory

How did Seaman A. Knapp stimulate these agents to accomplish great works? The following example of his oratory should be convincing.

Average men and women are seldom in their lives offered leadership and vision of such range and power. Underpaid teachers in the ramshackle one room schoolhouses of the impoverished Southern countryside and earnest middle-aged farmers recruited from their unstimulating routines to serve as agents were told that "Your mission is to make a great common people and thus readjust the map of the world," and again that

"A few cannot be great when the many are weak; a few cannot be wise and pure when the masses are the reverse. The great question is the education of the masses. No fortress is stronger than its weakest point. What makes a nation firm and great and wise, is to have education percolate all through the people. I want to see education in this grand country correspond to the country."

"A great nation is not the outgrowth of a few men of genius, but the superlative worth of a great common people." And to his listeners, stirred by the possibilities unfolded before them, Dr. Knapp declared that at their hands lay all the opportunity necessary to accomplish the supremely worthy task of "making greatness common. . . ."34

Bradford Knapp

True concludes his coverage of Seaman A. Knapp with the transfer of the demonstration program to his son Bradford.
Seaman A. Knapp died April 1, 1911. He had lived to formulate and direct the development of approximately the whole system of farmers' cooperative demonstration work. Its organization and main lines of work had become fixed and were ready to carry the great expansion of the next three years. Its management passed to his son, Bradford Knapp, who was thoroughly imbued with the principles which had guided his father, had an intimate acquaintance with the general conditions and details of the enterprise, and was possessed of ability to adjust himself to new situations. Under his guidance the work expanded rapidly and was conducted in some respects on a broader basis.35

Thus one era concludes and another begins, the final triad—the beginning of Cooperative Extension Education.

Vines and Anderson state:

1914 Smith-Lever Act: The Cooperative Extension Service

As Extension-type work increased and flourished, it became readily apparent that greater federal support was needed. By 1905, the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations established a standing committee on Extension work. . . . President Theodore Roosevelt's Commission on Country Life a year later added its strong recommendations for "nationwide Extension work."

A bill filed in December, 1909, to finance Extension work by the agricultural colleges was the first of 32 such bills ultimately submitted. South Carolina Congressman A. Frank Lever put his in the hopper on June 2, 1911. An amended version of Lever's bill was introduced in the Senate more than a year later by Georgia's [Senator] Hoke Smith. Nearly two more years elapsed before the Smith-Lever bill—by then even more modified—finally was passed. President Woodrow Wilson signed it May 8, 1914.

The Smith-Lever Act provided for mutual cooperation of USDA and land-grant colleges in conducting agricultural Extension work. It specified that the work

. . . shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home
Economics to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting to such persons information on said subjects through field demonstrations, publications and otherwise. . . .36

Epilogue on Seaman A. Knapp and His Role with the Smith-Lever Act

Bailey provides the best synopsis on Knapp's role with the Smith-Lever Act.

How completely that Act [Smith-Lever], the legal foundation of the Extension Service of the United States. . . .

Almost in no instance, however, has there been a limited recognition of him as a consummate politician—statesman, if preferred—with a genius for public relations and the mobilization of public opinion, which he used to out-maneuver individual opponents and to overcome concerted opposition. Lacking his educational fertility, his inspirational leadership and his administrative competence, his political skill and generalship would have been of small avail in the field of agricultural extension. However, had he lacked the latter—so needful to gain perpetuation for the demonstration work through the Smith-Lever measure—it is a serious question whether traditional educators could not have written their own legislation, and remained at liberty to apply funds for agricultural extension to whatever academic fancy they pleased to give proper label.

Knapp's performance in this role was unsurpassed; so much so that its effortlessness may be the reason why it has been overlooked in the existing brief accounts of his life. . . .37

Bailey ends his treatment of Seaman A. Knapp with this eulogy:

No great Congressional statute comes readily to mind for which one man was more wholly responsible than Knapp was for the Smith-Lever act. He was originator of the idea, organizer of the details of structure and operation, and principal engineer of the forces of opinion and political energy with secured its passage. . . .

Seaman Knapp died April 1, 1911, three years before the
Smith-Lever bill became a law. . . . Coming from a family of octogenarians, Seaman Knapp should have lived to witness Woodrow Wilson sign the measure. But near the end of spring in 1910, his wife, Maria Hotchkiss died. For more than sixty years, ever since they were both sixteen, Maria had been the mainstay of Seaman's life, the comforter and upholder of his active spirit. Her death, to the seventy-seven-year old man, was a deprivation seen by others in his declining health. There were other men, now, who could carry on his work and so, ten months later, he was buried by Maria's side in the College cemetery at Ames.

Iowa was a fitting choice for the location of their graves. It was there the crippled Seaman won his stubborn fight for health, there he first made a name in agricultural education, and there he and Maria reared their family. They lie, in Iowa, near the center of one of the finest blocks of farmland on the globe. All around them, the land's fertility is enhanced and guarded by agricultural agents, whose work continues a pattern Knapp established, and for whose presence in all the states his own life was so much responsible.38

Although Knapp has failed to achieve proper recognition for his contribution to agriculture, according to Bailey, he has received recognition in his adopted state of Louisiana. Bailey writes:

In Washington, Dr. Knapp's services to agriculture are officially attested by a bronze plate [the wording of which follows] affixed to one of the archways that connect the two principal buildings of the Department of Agriculture. From that plaque the passerby may read that he stands under the Knapp Memorial Arch—so designated by Resolution of Congress to preserve and honor the memory of the Founder of Farm Demonstration Work. Nearby stands a second archway similarly inscribed to the memory of Secretary James Wilson, Knapp's old neighbor back in Iowa. In a city where monuments overflow from all the parks and plazas these two half-hidden tablets dedicate the only structures in our national capitol that commemorate the work of agriculturalists.

Seaman Knapp is not a famous man today. Few visitors to Washington ever ask to see the plaque or Arch that bears his name. No songs or legends lionize
his deeds. But the Yankee-bred schoolmaster of American agriculture labored so earnestly to start goes on. It goes on day after day, in all the seasons and in farmers' fields throughout the nation—a vivid illustration of Emerson's famous dictum that "Every institution is but the lengthened shadow of a man." 39

Bailey must have been unaware that the United States Maritime Commission launched the "Seaman A. Knapp" liberty ship at Richmond, California, on November 14, 1943, 40 because he makes no mention of it in his book. After his book was published in 1945, Union College from which Dr. Knapp graduated, nominated him as the seventh "Worthy" in the history of the college in February 1953. 41 The wording for the Knapp Memorial Arch, which was named for Seaman A. Knapp by Congress in 1934, and the accompanying tablet, which was erected by Epsilon Sigma Phi on November 17, 1937, in Washington, D.C., is shown on page 58.

Louisiana

His adopted state first honored Seaman A. Knapp by changing the name of the Agriculture, Forestry and Extension Building, which was constructed in 1938, 42 to Knapp Hall in June 1950. 43 This building, located in the southwest corner of the Quadrangle, was being used as the Agricultural Administration Building in 1936. When the present Knapp Hall, which faces Highland Road, was dedicated on June 14, 1957, the name "Knapp Hall" was transferred to it. 44

The second honor bestowed on Knapp was that of having a 50th Anniversary plaque, the wording of which is given on page 60, erected at the entrance of the "old" Knapp Hall on
December 9, 1953.\textsuperscript{45} The events which transpired at the unveiling were recorded by The Daily Reveille, excerpts of which follow:

Commemorating the 50th anniversary of national farm demonstration work, a plaque, dedicated to the memory of Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, Lake Charles educator and agriculturist, was unveiled at a luncheon in the Faculty Club yesterday. Following the ceremony, the plaque was placed at the entrance of Knapp Hall, the LSU extension and forestry building recently re-named in honor of Dr. Knapp. . . .

The plaque was presented to LSU by Epsilon Sigma Phi, national agricultural fraternity. In making the presentation, E. W. Neasham, chief of the local unit of the fraternity, declared that by his contribution to establishment of the Extension Service, Dr. Knapp "made an eternal contribution to the progress and development of American agriculture to the welfare of all Americans and, in fact, to the welfare of the entire world. . . ."

Principal speaker at the luncheon was H. C. Sanders, director of the LSU Agricultural Extension Service. . . . "The civilized world now is beating a path to our door," Sanders said, "to study the operation of the Agricultural Extension Service. But we must have an even stronger and more active Extension Service to help farm people meet the challenge that lies ahead. The annual increase in our population is equal to the population of the state of Louisiana.

"If a decreasing number of farmers are to continue to feed a rapidly increasing population, he said, 'they must make use of the very best farming methods and the best farm management. . . .'"\textsuperscript{46}

This plaque was moved to the "new" Knapp Hall when it was occupied in 1957 and remains in 1986 prominently displayed at the entrance. It should also be noted that Epsilon Sigma Phi is the same fraternity which was responsible for placing the tablet on the Seaman A. Knapp Memorial Arch in Washington, D.C., on November 17, 1937.
In Recognition of
the Public Service
of Seaman A. KNAPP
in Extension Work
for the Department
of Agriculture
From 1898 to 1911

So named by Congress, in Resolution approved by
President Franklin D. Roosevelt, June 16, 1934
to honor the memory of

SEAMAN A. KNAPP
1833-1911

Founder of Farm Demonstration Work

He organized the system of county farm & home
demonstration agents and boys' and girls' clubs
from which developed the Cooperative Extension
Service of the United States

This tablet placed herein under the authorization
of The Seventy-Third Congress by
the National Honorary Extension Fraternity
Epsilon Sigma Phi, Incorporated

William A. Lloyd
Grand Director

Pontus H. Ross
Grand Sec.-Treas.
SEAMAN A. KNAPP
1833-1911

Founder of Farm Demonstration Work

He organized the system of county farm and home demonstration agents and boys and girls clubs from which developed the Cooperative Extension Service of the United States.

This tablet placed here December 9, 1953 under the sponsorship of Alpha Alpha Chapter of Epsilon Sigma Phi, National Honorary Fraternity, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the first demonstration conducted by a farmer.

E. W. Neasham SEAL J. E. Knight
Worthy Chief ESP Secretary-Treasurer

Table 7 indicates that, in 1914 when the Smith-Lever Act was passed establishing the Cooperative Extension Service, Louisiana only had 41 male Extension workers and 13 females; nine years later, the numbers were only 45 and 28, respectively.

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF PARISHES WITH MEN AND WOMEN EXTENSION AGENTS IN LOUISIANA, 1914-1926

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NO. OF PARISHES</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>'15</th>
<th>'16</th>
<th>'17</th>
<th>'18</th>
<th>'19</th>
<th>'20</th>
<th>'21</th>
<th>'22</th>
<th>'23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Louisiana Cooperative Extension Heritage

Director W. R. Dodson, 1914-17

Even before William Rufus Dodson became the first
director of Extension in Louisiana, he was involved with
Extension-type activity in 1910 as the following news
article shows.

DR. DODSON AND DEMONSTRATION

The Southern Pacific Train Arrangements
Will Run Soon
Dr. W. R. Dodson and His Corps of Assistants
Will Have Charge of the Exhibit to be Shown
the People Along Southern Pacific

Dr. W. R. Dodson and his corps of assistants
at the Louisiana State University are making
preparations to gather the exhibits that will be
used in making the Southern Pacific agriculture
demonstration train that is to be operated in
Louisiana by the Southern Pacific with the
assistance of the Louisiana State University.

The schedule of the train provides a two
weeks tour over the Southern Pacific lines within
the state, beginning at Raceland, October 3, and
ending with Erath, October 15. A two hours' stay
will be allowed in each stop.

Dr. Dodson, Prof. V. L. Roy, Dr. W. H.
Dalrymple, Prof. E. L. Jordan, Prof. H. P. Agee,
Prof. F. C. Quereau, J. M. Jenkins and Prof.
Tiebout will assist in arranging the exhibit and
will each deliver talks along their particular
line. The train will be made up of exhibits of
special interest to farmers. There will be on the
train live stock, poultry, swine, methods of
feeding and selecting live stock, methods of
improving crops, cultivating crops, models of
farming implements, etc. The train will be the
first ever run in Louisiana.49

This activity for Director Dodson, no doubt, was an
extension of his work with Farmers' Institutes which he
organized in 1896.
In his first year as director, his staff consisted of 41 men and 13 women agents; his final year, 1917, the numbers were 42 and 20, respectively. Compare Tables 7 and 9. In terms of financial funds, the sources and amounts are shown in Table 8.

Biographical information is an important aid in understanding facts and figures; hence, the following, taken from Dodson's thesis at LSU, is included. It should be noted that it is incorrectly labeled "Ph.D." in the LSU Library card catalogue. According to the LSU Registrar's Office, Director Dodson did not receive a Masters or Ph.D. degree from LSU. This information is not included to be disparaging of the memory of Dean Dodson but to clarify the record. In Dodson's defense, he never purported to have earned a Ph.D. from LSU. He did have an honorary Doctor of Science degree which was awarded by LSU on August 6, 1936. His biography, which appears in *American Men of Science: A Biographical Directory*, 1938, p. 368 and 1944, pp. 458-9, clearly states that his doctorate is an honorary one. Also, this fact is included in his biographical file in the Louisiana Collection of the LSU Library under the article titled "Awarded Honorary Degrees by LSU." It is felt by some that an honorary degree is actually more significant than an earned degree because the educational institution is putting its reputation at stake. In an informal vein, the term "Doctor" is often used as a term of respect and
endearment. This writer can recall one brilliant animal science professor at SLC who had, at that time, not gotten around to completing his dissertation, but who was referred to as "Doctor" because of his knowledge and teaching ability. Obviously, Director Dodson qualified for the title of Doctor under one or all of these reasons.

Dodson was born near Belton, Texas, on July 17, 1867. He received his elementary education in the public schools of Arkansas, and at Clark's Academy in Berryville, Arkansas. He received his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Missouri in 1890, and his Bachelor of Arts degree from Harvard University in 1894. In 1898, he did special work in the Graduate School of the University of Michigan, and in the biological laboratories of Parke, Davis and Company at Detroit, Michigan. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

His teaching experience included that of a public school teacher in Arkansas; assistant professor of botany at the University of Missouri, 1890-1893; laboratory assistant in botany at Harvard, 1894; professor of botany and bacteriology at LSU, 1894-1903.

Other work in science and related activities which he had done included that of botanist and bacteriologist of the Louisiana Experiment Station, 1894-1905, Assistant Director of the same station, 1903-1905; Director, 1905-1918, and again in 1920-28; Dean of the College of Agriculture, LSU,
## TABLE 8

**SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR THE LOUISIANA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>FEDERAL</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>NON-TAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>$86,390</td>
<td>$56,955</td>
<td>$6,847</td>
<td>$22,588</td>
<td>$6,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>315,336</td>
<td>231,677</td>
<td>49,657</td>
<td>34,002</td>
<td>315,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>504,665</td>
<td>279,207</td>
<td>93,361</td>
<td>130,497</td>
<td>504,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>734,697</td>
<td>447,749</td>
<td>193,253</td>
<td>90,595</td>
<td>734,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1,783,693</td>
<td>769,323</td>
<td>857,529</td>
<td>156,841</td>
<td>1,783,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3,867,569</td>
<td>1,361,671</td>
<td>2,191,806</td>
<td>314,092</td>
<td>3,867,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6,191,607</td>
<td>1,873,083</td>
<td>4,014,938</td>
<td>303,193</td>
<td>6,191,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7,282,211</td>
<td>2,742,043</td>
<td>4,225,110</td>
<td>309,133</td>
<td>7,282,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>14,049,923</td>
<td>5,073,438</td>
<td>8,480,129</td>
<td>490,066</td>
<td>14,049,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>22,708,187</td>
<td>5,909,966</td>
<td>16,173,328</td>
<td>608,738</td>
<td>22,708,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>24,446,056</td>
<td>6,508,302</td>
<td>17,280,427</td>
<td>639,129</td>
<td>24,446,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9
**NUMBER OF LOUISIANA EXTENSION SERVICE STAFF BY TYPE OF POSITION, 1914-1986**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>DIRECTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>STATE STAFF SUBJECT MATTER SPECIALISTS</th>
<th>CLERICAL (FULL-TIME)</th>
<th>AREA** AGENTS</th>
<th>COUNTY AND AREA AGENTS</th>
<th>HOME ECONOMISTS</th>
<th>OTHER CLERICAL PROGRAM (FULL-TIME)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>46****</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Includes the staff of both LSU and Southern.
** The category of Area Agent was not used prior to 1967.
*** Includes Assoc. and Asst. County and Home Economics Agents and Extension Associates.
**** Includes Assistant County Agents.
1912-1918, and again in 1920-28; Superintendent of the Iberia Livestock Experiment Station of the US Department of Agriculture, 1928-1936. During WW I, he was on leave of absence and had charge of the food production campaign in the southern states and served as head of the Agricultural Relations Section of Food Administration under Herbert Hoover. He was awarded a gold badge for valuable services in the World War.

In 1896, Dr. Dodson married Minnie Pettengill of Centralia, Missouri. They were the parents of four children, three of whom were graduates of LSU.

His final assignment with LSU was on May 1, 1936, as a special agronomist. He retired from LSU on June 1, 1938 and died at New Iberia on December 15, 1951.

Director W. R. Perkins, 1917-28

William Robert Perkins was born on December 8, 1865, in Oktibbeha County, Mississippi. This county is the location of Mississippi State University which was established as the land-grant college of Mississippi in 1878. In 1887, he enrolled at Mississippi State University at the age of 22 and received from there a B.S. in agriculture in 1891 and a M.S. in chemistry in 1895. On November 2, 1896, he married Evelyn Carother Montgomery in Oktibbeha County.

In the 1880 U.S. Population Census of Mississippi, Director Perkins is listed in Winston County with his
parents, John N. and Jane W. Perkins, as William R. L. Perkins, age 14, farm laborer. The occupation of his father is given as a farmer. In the 1900 Census, he is listed in Oktibbeha County and his occupation is given as a chemist.

Prior to coming to Louisiana in 1915, Perkins' career spanned these assignments in Mississippi: 1899-1904, Associate Chemist, Starkville Experiment Station; 1904-05, Assistant Professor of Agriculture; 1905-08, Professor of Agronomy; and 1908-09, State Agronomist. In 1910, he left Mississippi for a position at Clemson University where he remained until 1912. (Clemson was established as the land-grant college of South Carolina in 1889. [Incidentally, Director H. C. Sanders received his undergraduate degree in agronomy from there in 1919.]) In 1912, Perkins returned to Mississippi and farmed until 1915 when he accepted employment with the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service.

Director Perkins served the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service as a Forage Crop Specialist before he became Assistant Director and State Agent on May 1, 1917. He was appointed Director and State Agent on July 1, 1917, to succeed Dr. Dodson, who filled the newly created position of dean of the Agricultural College, in 1917. In that year, according to Table 7, there were 42 parishes served by men Extension agents and 20 served by women agents. However, World War I had created an increased demand for food which
was complicated by a relative failure of crops in 1916. Williamson reveals that these steps were taken by the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service to aid the war effort.

... The Extension service immediately went into action, and by October, there were 58 county agents, 25 home demonstration agents, 7 Negro agricultural agents, and 2 Negro home demonstration agents, in addition to a corps of 8 supervisors in men's and women's divisions of the work and 14 specialists trained in various branches of scientific agriculture. The number continued to increase each year throughout the war and the years immediately following.

The Extension service became a part of the nation's war machinery, developing into an auxiliary of the war organizations--Council of National Defense, Red Cross, and Food Administration. It became the chief agency assisting federal departments charged with carrying out the many activities provided for under the emergency production and food control acts. The federal government had appropriated huge sums of money to buy nitrates for sale to farmers at cost. The county agents had the task of assembling orders and placing material. Similarly the home demonstration agents had charge of the distribution of tin cans, brought by the million by the national government for use by farm housewives in home canning. In 1918 the amount of food canned and otherwise conserved through the operation of the home demonstration workers in the state was double that of 1917.65

Director Perkins served until June 12, 1928, at which time W. B. Mercier succeed him as director.66 Perkins died after suffering a heart attack at Starkville, Mississippi, on August 21, 1939; he had been in failing health for some months. After resigning as Director of the LCES he became director of the Mississippi Experiment Station at Poplarville. From there Director Perkins went to Mississippi State College, formerly the Mississippi...
Agricultural and Mechanical College, at Starkville where he remained until his death. His exact job titles were: 1928-30, Assistant Director, South Branch Experiment Station; 1930-31, Director; 1932-36, Assistant Director; 1936-37, Acting Superintendent, Raymond Branch Experiment Station; and 1937-39, Vice Director Emeritus. Both Director Perkins and Director Mercier were classmates and alumni of Mississippi State College.

When W. R. Perkins, the former Louisiana Cooperative Extension Director, became Director of the Mississippi Experiment Stations, the Mississippi A. & M. College Alumnus, 1931, carried this article which is important for these historical facts it contains:

**Director of Experiment Stations**

Qualifications and experience has [sic] placed W. R. Perkins in charge of the Experiment Stations of Mississippi and no better selection could have been made, is the belief of those who know the man.

W. R. Perkins was born near the Choctaw Agency in Okitibbeha County. He moved to Winston County very early in life and remained there until twenty years of age. Mr. Perkins discontinued his schooling when twelve years of age and worked on a farm until nineteen, at which time he again attended school; this time at Louisville. In 1888 he entered Mississippi A. and M. College and finished in 1891, having worked his way through, specializing in chemistry.

After graduation Perkins accepted a position as a fertilizer analyst. After three years in that work he became assistant chemist for the Mississippi Experiment Station. Then in order, served as: Agronomist for the Mississippi Extension Service; agronomist for the Experiment Station; taught agronomy; in charge of college farms; director of agriculture school at Clemson, S. C.; farmed in Mississippi Delta; headed livestock extension work Louisiana State University;
Assistant Director South Mississippi Experiment Station; Director, Mississippi Experiment Stations.

Perkins studied at the University of Virginia, Iowa State, and received his M.S. from A. and M. in 1894.

He is a member of S.A.E., social fraternity and K. of P. He belonged to the Kiwanis Club in Baton Rouge and the Rotary Club at Poplarville and at Starkville.69

This article reveals that Perkins received exposure to two states which were bellwethers in the development of Extension: Iowa and South Carolina. Iowa State, the A & M College of Iowa, was the university at which Dr. Knapp taught and of which he served as president. South Carolina was the home of U.S. Representative A. Frank Lever, who was the co-author of the Smith-Lever Act. No doubt, this experience was considered when he sought the directorship of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service in 1917.

As would be expected, Perkins' obituary which appeared in the local Starkville Daily News contains a wealth of additional biographical information. Because of this, these excerpts are listed below; the complete obituary is included in Appendix G.

Prominent Agricultural Leader
Is Death Victim Here Monday

The death of William R. Perkins early Monday removed from the thinning ranks of pioneers in southern agriculture one of the most outstanding personalities and leaders.

A native of Oktibbeha County, Mr. Perkins made his way into prominence and leadership by self-denial and hard work. . . . With limited preparation, Mr. Perkins entered Mississippi State College in 1888, graduating in 1891. During his three years in college, he had no
more than $60.00 in cash. His junior and senior years were financed by small pay from a student job in the chemistry laboratory.

Graduating with a bachelor of science degree in 1891, Mr. Perkins was employed as chemist for the Experiment Station until 1893, when he became agronomist. He was connected with the College as Station Agronomist and Professor of Agronomy until 1910 when he resigned to accept a position with Clemson College, South Carolina.

A practical farmer at heart, Mr. Perkins returned to Mississippi in 1912 to operate a farm. He demonstrated his ability to successfully apply scientific theories to practical operations of a farm, and in 1915 was called to Louisiana State University as Forage Crop Specialist for the Extension Department.

Establishing himself in this position, Mr. Perkins was chosen Director of the Extension Department of Louisiana, a position he held for a number of years. . . .70

It is interesting to note that, while Director Perkins did fit Dr. Knapp's requirement of being a practical farmer in order to be a Demonstration agent, he was also an educated farmer with both a bachelors and masters degree. That he was a self-made man is also obvious. Keep these characteristics in mind as his successor, W. B. Mercier, is considered.

Director W. B. Mercier, 1928-31

Director William Benjamin Mercier was born in Mississippi in September 1868, according to the 1900 U.S. Population Census of Amite County, Mississippi.71 In the 1880 U.S. Census of Copiah County, Mississippi, he is listed with his parents, George and Sarah Mercier, as Willie, age 11, farm laborer. His father's occupation was given as a
farmer. Mercier entered Mississippi State University in 1888 at the age of 20. Note that this was only one year after Director Perkins started there in 1887. Mercier received a B.S. in agriculture from Mississippi State in 1892. The 1900 Census also reveals that he was a farmer and that he and his wife Cora had been married for six years but had no children.

In 1900, he was farming, no doubt, the 1,000 acre cotton farm which he had purchased near Centerville, Mississippi, in 1895 after he resigned as farm manager of the Louisiana Experiment Station. In fact, his successful operation of the Centerville farm is what attracted the attention of Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, the founder of Extension work in the U.S. In 1909, Mercier went to Washington, D.C., as an assistant to Dr. Knapp.

Mercier became a close friend and associate of Dr. Seaman A. Knapp and succeeded Perkins as Director on June 12, 1928. Williamson adds:

... After a long period of service in the Washington office where he had been identified with the direction of the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work, Mercier came to the state in 1923. On November 1, 1931, because of failing health, Mercier was relieved of active administration duties, becoming director emeritus and adviser to the Louisiana Extension service, the first time the title was ever bestowed on anyone in the organization. He was recognized as one of the nation's leading authorities on the subject of Agricultural Extension and compiled a brief history of the work in Louisiana written in 1925. His death occurred in Baton Rouge, July 16, 1939.

Mercier's obituary, which the Reveille carried, states that
he died on Sunday, July 16, 1939 (about one month before Director Perkins), in Our Lady of the Lake Sanitarium and that he was interred in Roselawn Memorial Park at Baton Rouge. It also reveals that he had coauthored the book, *The Knapp Method of Growing Cotton*, 1913, and authored "The Story of Extension Work" as well as many other bulletins and circulars on various agricultural subjects. And, the *Times Picayune* adds that he was survived by his widow, the former Cora Spikes of Westville, Mississippi, two daughters, one sister and five brothers.

The 1935 *Annual Report of Agricultural Extension Work in Louisiana* was "... dedicated to the retired members of the staff, W. B. Mercier, director-emeritus and L. E. Perrin, formerly assistant state agent." It supplements the Williamson information by providing the following:

For more than forty years Mr. Mercier preached the gospel of better agriculture. Today as director-emeritus, the only man in America holding that title, he is serving as counsel and guide to the younger members of the force who are on the active fighting line. Mr. Mercier was graduated from Mississippi A. and M. College in 1892. His first formal work was executed in Louisiana when he was named farm manager of the Experiment Station. He later served as assistant to Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, founder of Extension work. Following this work he was named assistant director of extension [April 1, 1923] and served as Director from 1928 to 1931. He is a member of the House of Pioneers, Epsilon Sigma Phi, and is one of three men entitled to wear a key of that order with a diamond and ruby setting.

His high personal standard of integrity is apparent from this excerpt from his obituary:
Prior to his retirement, Mr. Mercier was made offers [for employment] from commercial organizations but he rejected these offers by saying "I feel it would be unethical to cash in on whatever reputation I may have gained through my small efforts in an organization designed to help agriculture repair its economic independence."

This is reminiscent of the integrity shown by a successor director, Dr. H. C. Sanders, as shall be shown shortly.

The most revealing autobiographical information, however, on Director Mercier is that contained in the Mississippi State Alumnus, October 1936, titled "W. B. Mercier Class '92 Is Valuable Agricultural Leader."

Excerpts follow with the complete article being in Appendix G.

William Benjamin Mercier (class of '92) was born September 6, 1868, at Summit, Pike County, Mississippi. Mississippi had not yet recovered from the ravages of the Civil War and the public schools of Copiah County where he received his early training taught mostly primary subjects.

He had two years of special student work at the Mississippi Experiment Station under Professor Tracey. This was followed by three years as farm manager of the Louisiana Experiment Station at Baton Rouge.

Because of his general interest in agriculture, Mr. Mercier was appointed county agent in Amite County in 1909, but due to his leadership he was not allowed to remain there. Dr. Seaman A. Knapp—-the Father of Extension Work—had been watching his work and later that same year appointed him assistant and agriculturist, Farmers Cooperative Demonstration Work, Washington, D.C.

Constant travel over a wide territory undermined Mr. Mercier's health, and, in 1923, he was persuaded by Director W. R. Perkins to come to Louisiana as Assistant Director of Extension. He served in this capacity until 1928 when, upon the resignation of Director W. R. Perkins, he was named Director.
In 1931, the Louisiana State University relieved Director Mercier of many pressing administrative duties, and named him Director Emeritus. In this capacity he has found time to carry on various research studies, especially those relating to the history and growth of extension work.

This article provides the explanation of Mercier's relationship with Dr. Knapp, the fact that he had served as a County Agent and had been invited by his college classmate, Director W. R. Perkins, to join him as Assistant Director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. It also reveals that he was working on a history of Extension in 1936. This writer has located all of Director Mercier's referenced works except the latter. A previous history by Mercier, titled "Historical Review of Farmers' Cooperative Extension Work in the State of Louisiana From 1904 to 1925," was published as Louisiana Extension Circular 80, which contain Mercier's history as well as the Annual Report for 1925. His descendants, if any are still living, should be contacted to see if they have maintained a copy of his manuscript. It would certainly be an addition to general Extension history and would contribute additional insights into the development of the LCES.78

L. E. Perrin

The information disclosed by the 1935 Report on L. E. Perrin's service to Louisiana agriculture is certainly germane to our study.

Dean of all agricultural extension workers in the United States is the honorary title which may be claimed by Mr. Perrin. The life history of Mr. Perrin
is full of color. He has been engaged in extension work since its beginning in 1905. He is a native of France, served in the Franco-Prussian War, was district agent in the French section of Louisiana, farmed in Texas, appointed special agent in Farm Demonstration work, U.S.D.A., and was assistant state agent in Louisiana when he retired.

**Director J. W. Bateman, 1931-40**

John Wesley Bateman was born "two miles north of Franklinton, [Washington Parish], Louisiana on a 170 acre farm, the 16th of February 1884, the ninth child . . . [of] Hugh L. Bateman and Gabriellen Ellis, his wife. . . ."79 Williamson writes this concise biography of J. W. Bateman, the fourth director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service:

On the retirement of Mr. Mercier as active director, his place was taken by J. W. Bateman, whose experience in Extension activities dated back to the beginning of the corn club movement in 1907, when, as superintendent of schools in Washington parish, he organized one of the first clubs in the state. His interest in teaching better farming practices led to his appointment as director of agricultural education of the State Normal College at Natchitoches in 1911, and later as county agent of Natchitoches parish. Prior to his appointment as Louisiana director of Extension he served several years as assistant supervisor of vocational agriculture with the State Department of Education.80

Bateman's own memories of his tenure with Extension involved his confrontation with the Louisiana Farm Bureau, which is included as a part of Chapter VIII, "Louisiana Extension and the Farm Bureau" and the Depression.

When I took over the job as Director of Agriculture Extension at L.S.U. in the fall of 1931, things were bad. The depression was on and things were getting worse. Banks were closing their doors, merchants were going out of business, factories were
closing, and there was plenty of idleness. Herbert Hoover was President of the United States and Dawes was the Secretary of the Treasury. The government was pumping plenty of money into banks, big ones of the North, and prosperity was "just around the corner" if everyone would be patient. Farms were being foreclosed...

The role played by Extension in this crisis is outlined by Bateman as follows:

The Department of Agriculture had drafted the Agriculture Extension Service to handle the Farm Programs (the A.A.A.), Agriculture Adjustment Administration known as the Triple A.

We had to measure every plot of open farmland on every farm in Louisiana and make a map of it. While this was going on, we promoted Rural Electrification, Farm Credit Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and Debt Conciliation Service.

In the latter, I was given a grant of money to run the Debt Service. I hired three men--Claude Fernandez of Centerville, Louisiana, who was a young lawyer but was teaching Vocational Agriculture; J. H. Dickinson who was an ex-banker from Kentwood, Louisiana; Mr. Schwartzenburg who was a Frenchman of culture and had been Assessor in Avoyelles Parish. I thought this combination ought to be able to handle the most difficult case.

The Frazier-Lemki Law was passed because of the following incidents. There were some 40 to 50 farmers up for foreclosure in Bienville Parish at Arcadia, Louisiana. I went up there with Gabler, Dickinson, and Schwartzenburg to see what could be done to save or stall off these foreclosures. I went to District Judge Wimberly of Arcadia and we recited the cases to him and the conditions. He called the Sheriff and the Clerk of Court and the local newspaper. The Judge had me state the case and then he said, "If the clerk won't issue the papers, and the sheriff won't serve them, and the judge won't judge them, they can't sell them. How about it boys? That will give a little time to work things out."82

One final anecdotal story will suffice to show that Director Bateman's priorities were with the farmers and that
the exigencies of the time warranted creative leadership initiatives.

The Feed and Seed Loan was set up to assist farmers who could not get credit otherwise and that meant nearly all of the small farmers. The large farmers went to the Agriculture Credit Corporation (a Government Credit Organization).

The program was poorly handled and the Extension Service had to throw in its personnel from top to bottom in order to expedite the loans. I sent Wasson, Neasham, Babin, and others to Memphis to expedite processing and follow up each application for a loan until approved.

Each parish had a loan clerk to approve local applications and a loan committee. Some of these clerks were sent in from Alabama and Mississippi (on account of Senator Pat Harrison and Bankhead power) and some of them were very obstinate about approving loans. I got busy through Senator John Overton and got them out of the way and the loans began to come through. There was no such thing as a sound fiscal farm loan. We had to keep farmers at home on their farms and so why quibble. The loans were based on previous years planting, so much for a planted acre of cotton or rice or cane or strawberries. There was not a great loss to the government, if any. 

This story is very reminiscent of those in the news which dealt with the 1986 farm "recession." Extension's response to the 1986 farm crisis will be covered under the administration of Dr. Denver T. Loupe and in Chapter XII, "Community Development Extension Work."

Returning to Williamson's treatment of Director Bateman, what he does not mention in his biographical sketch of Bateman is the fact that he is the only director of Extension, thus far, who has been asked to resign by the University as the excerpts from the following newspaper article published October 4, 1940, show.
The resignation of J. W. Bateman, director of the agricultural extension division of the Louisiana State University since October 1, 1931, was announced here at noon today by Acting President Paul M. Hebert of the university. The resignation is effective immediately.

H. C. Sanders, state agent and assistant director of the division, will be temporarily in charge, consideration of a permanent appointee to the position to come before the university board of supervisors at its next regular meeting on November 9, Dr. Hebert said.

The board of supervisors at its meeting early this week considered widespread criticism of the extension division because what some persons called "political activity" in the campaign for governor this year. Governor Jones has referred in public addresses since his inauguration [to], "too many county agents standing around on [street] corners."

Mr. Bateman was out of town at an extension meeting at the time of the board meeting. He returned to the university this morning and, following a conference with Dr. Hebert, submitted his resignation.

Regardless of the cause of his resignation, it does not appear to have affected him as revealed by this editorial from the Morning Advocate which was written following his death at the age of 85 in 1969.

JOHN WESLEY BATEMAN

The recent death of John Wesley Bateman, at the grand old age of 85, ended a remarkable career of more than 60 active and productive years, most of them spent in public service. During all this long period he was an enemy of idleness and pessimism and a friend of industry and optimism.

He began his career as a public school teacher early in the century and became in turn a parish school superintendent; a parish agricultural agent with the Louisiana State University Cooperative Extension
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Service; state director of Extension; a member of the State Department of Education staff, where he served with the veterans' training division; and Executive Director of the Commission for the Aging, a post which he held until his third "retirement" only a few months ago.

In private life he was for some time manager of extensive lumber and plantation interests in Tensas Parish. He was a native of Southeast Louisiana and a long-time resident of Baton Rouge.

During a great part of his life he was actively engaged in providing educational opportunities for young people and encouraging them to acquire the knowledge and skills that would serve them well later on. As a teacher and parish superintendent he contributed to development of the state's system of public education as it now exists. As a staff member and then director of the Cooperative Extension Service he did pioneer work in building the 4-H Clubs, sponsored by Extension, that have a membership of 80,000 or more boys and girls. This experience prepared him for his work in the veterans' training program and, even, for his service as executive director of the Commission for the Aging.

He was accustomed to looking forward, not backward. His own long and valuable career provided an inspiration for the older citizens who were the beneficiaries of the work of the commission. He believed that in a very real way a man is only as old as he feels, and he, for one, never really felt very old.

It must be pointed out that Director Bateman's resignation occurred during the period of the State's history referred to the "First Louisiana Hayride" during which not only was the Governor, Richard W. "Dick" Leche, convicted but also the LSU President, James Monroe Smith, as well. Apparently, Director Bateman supported the run-off candidate, Earl K. Long, against Governor Jones who was referred to as the reform candidate. Nevertheless, Director Bateman bore no ill will because of his forced resignation.
because he did not mention it in his Memoirs published by the LCES in 1969. He simply stated: "In 1940 Sam Jones was elected Governor and I was discharged from L.S.U."86

**Director H. C. Sanders, 1940-61**

Because of the important role which Director Sanders has played in the history of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, a section of the following chapter will be devoted to his twenty-one year tenure, which is longer than any director has served up to 1986.

**Acting Director J. G. Richard, July 1-Nov. 30, 1946**

Joseph G. Richard, Jr., was born at Labadieville, Assumption Parish, June 14, 1900. He graduated from Labadieville High School in June 1918 and entered LSU in the Fall Semester. After he received a B.S. degree in Agriculture Education in June 1923, Richard served as a Smith-Hughes agricultural teacher at Gilbert High School until July 1, 1925. At that time he became an Agricultural Extension Agent for Terrebonne Parish. In 1934, Richard received his M.S. degree from LSU.87

J. G. Richard, Jr., was appointed County Agent in Terrebonne Parish on December 1, 1929, and served in this capacity until December 15, 1935. While in Terrebonne, he was active in promoting the certified Irish potato program to control mosaic disease and one of the "potato farmers" was Allen J. Ellender, who was known as the "potato king" and later became a U.S. Senator.88
In 1936, Richard was appointed Assistant Extension Horticulturist for the state and on October 1, 1941, he became Assistant Director and State Agent. Williamson writes of him.

... By reason of his background and experience, he was especially qualified to direct the activities of Extension forces in the field, which became his primary responsibility. He came up from the "grass roots," having been born on a farm in Assumption parish, where he received his early education.

All of Richard's mature years were spent in agricultural work since his graduation at L.S.U. in 1923. His first post in his chosen field was that of teacher of vocational agriculture in Franklin parish, where he served for two years. He became identified with Agricultural Extension in 1925, when he was appointed county agent in Terrebonne parish, a place he occupied for 11 years, making a prime contribution to the work by his success in directing the program for improvement of the Irish potato industry in that parish. He continued his work as county agent until 1935 when he received a degree as master of science in agriculture and was assigned to the state office in Baton Rouge as assistant horticulturist. This position he held until his appointment as assistant director and state agent, in recognition of his leadership in agricultural education in Louisiana.

Following WW II, Director Sanders took a leave of absence to serve as a member of an agricultural commission sent to the Philippine Islands to study the effects of the war and to make recommendations for its rehabilitation. During his absence, the organization was led by Richard, "... himself was obliged to undergo an emergency operation, which took him out of the office for several weeks. In spite of all these handicaps, the record of the Louisiana Extension service during the period was marked by signal progress in all the different phases of Louisiana
agriculture."90

Summary

The period from 1914 to 1948 witnessed the birth, growth and development of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. Because its development paralleled that of the Federal Extension Service, these generalizations can be made.

First Steps, 1914-1917--In these days farmers respected muscle and experience and planted according to the moon.91

World War I, 1917-1919--Extension personnel increased as functions grew, funds rose and war duties mounted.92

Decade of the 1920's--Agents typically stressed better farming, economic aspects of agriculture, rotation of crops, and more diversified production during this period.93

The Depression of the 1930's--The Depression brought to an end an era of great effort to "make two blades of grass grow where one grew before." Foreign markets dried up, Americans were unable to buy. Our production was far in excess of demand.94

World War II, 1941-1945--With WW II, an era of farm surpluses ended; greatly increased production was needed. Extension workers carried out their longtime role as "educational arm of USDA" with high distinction during these years.95

Postwar Changes, 1945-53--Constant adjustment was . . . the postwar order of the day for Extension workers and farm families. New and growing consumer demands . . . new technology pouring forth ever-faster. . . .96

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service increased its staff from 49 in 1914 to 204 in 1918, to 181 in 1928 and, at the end of 1936, for the first time a minimum staff of one County Agent and Home Demonstration Agent was employed in every parish in the State on a permanent basis.97
Thus, the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service was posed to confront the postwar challenges; these will now be considered.
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CHAPTER IV

THE LOUISIANA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
FROM 1949-1986

The development of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES) following World War II to 1986 will now be presented. A brief historical review with additional details follows.

Introduction: Organizational Structure

National

As noted in Chapter III, the Cooperative Extension Service was created by Congress when it passed the Smith-Lever Act on 8 May 1914, a copy of which is included in Appendix B. The service was made a part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and at the time of this study (1986), it still remained in USDA. The Smith-Lever Act provided that Extension work was to be carried out in association with the Nation's land-grant colleges, which had been established in 1862 by the first Morrill Act. Legislation establishing land-grant colleges in predominantly Black schools was passed by Congress in 1890. These schools are referred to as the 1890 Land-Grant Colleges and the legislation is called the second Morrill Act.
H. C. Sanders, Director Emeritus of the Louisiana Extension Service, in his book, *The Cooperative Extension Service*, gives a detailed history of the U.S. Extension Service. He also answers questions such as, "Specifically what does Cooperative Extension do? How does it operate? What does it seek to accomplish?" According to Sanders, "The scope of the Cooperative Extension Service may be viewed from three standpoints:

1. the people to be served,
2. the subject matter to be included in the work, and
3. the methods to be used.

The Smith-Lever Act as amended (1962) specifically mentions all three."

Sanders provides excerpts and/or an interpretation of the Smith-Lever Act as follows:

**SCOPE**

**People to be served**

... Congress intended for Cooperative Extension work to be available to all the people of the United States, except those who are attending college.

**Subject matter to be included in the program**

Agriculture and home economics are broad subjects and use of the words "related thereto" further broadens the field. . . .

**Methods to be used**

In Section 2 of the Smith-Lever Act as amended, these words occur: "... through demonstrations, publications and otherwise. . . ."
FUNCTION

Giving instruction

Section 2 of the Smith-Lever Act as amended says: "... Cooperative Agricultural Extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations. . . ."

Planning instruction

"Before the funds herein provided shall become available to any college for any fiscal year, plans for the work to be carried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the secretary of agriculture."

Stimulating a desire for information

This function is not specifically mentioned in the Smith-Lever Act. However, the wording is sufficiently clear. Congress did say, "... and to encourage the application of the same. . . ."

Facilitating information into action

Extension teaching seeks to change practices. A change in a practice often requires both a mental and physical change in a person. . . . It is a good Extension practice . . . to arrange for the availability of resources for Extension clientele.

Reporting to officials and the public

"... and such offices shall be required to report to the secretary of agriculture on or about the first day of January of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the fiscal year and its disbursement, on forms prescribed by the secretary of agriculture." . . . It is good public relations to inform taxpayers as to how their funds are being spent.

State

As is shown in Chapter III, the Extension Department at LSU was organized on September 1, 1909. In 1912, the Louisiana Legislature passed the State's first legislative act enabling police juries to appropriate funds for the
Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work—Act No. 69, which was approved on July 5, 1912. (See Appendix C.) Table 6 indicates that some 68 agents were engaged in Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work by 1914. No doubt, however, some of these agents were part-time workers. Nevertheless, because of its participation in Knapp's Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration work, the predecessor of Cooperative Extension work which was established when Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act on May 8, 1914, Louisiana was well-positioned through this experience to make immediate use of the benefits of this new Act.

Louisiana moved fast. On June 11, 1914, Act No. 8 of the Louisiana Legislature took effect. This act (see Appendix C for complete copy) provided:

> . . . that the Administrators of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College be and they are hereby authorized and empowered to receive the grants of money appropriated under said act, and to organize and conduct agricultural and extension work which shall be carried on in connection with the college of agriculture of said Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, in accordance with the terms and conditions expressed in the Act of Congress aforesaid.

Although Williamson refers to W. B. Mercier as the "... first historian of the Louisiana Extension service..." for his "... brief history of the work in Louisiana written in 19253" [and published by the Louisiana Service as Extension Circular 80, November 1925], it can be seen from the following excerpt from the Report of Co-operative Agricultural Extension Work in Louisiana, 1916-
1917 that the first Director of Louisiana Extension should also be recognized for his historic preservation efforts.

Historical Statement

Agricultural extension work was begun in Louisiana by the Commissioner of Agriculture and the agricultural college and experiment station faculty before any special funds were provided for its support. A number of the first farmers' institutes were attended by some of the faculty of this institution and members of the Experiment Station staff who paid their own expenses to attend such meetings. In 1897 the first appropriation was made by the Legislature for paying the expenses of these institutes. This fund was made available to the Commissioner of Agriculture and Immigration. The money was used during the summer months for defraying the traveling expenses of the Commissioner of Agriculture, members of the Agricultural College faculty and Experiment Station staff, and a few successful farmers employed for a very short period, who held farmers' meetings throughout the state. In 1902 as many as forty-five institutes lasting from one to three days were held. This was really the beginning of the extension work in this state. Subsequently the farmers' institute idea was gradually abandoned, and the Agricultural College and Experiment Stations assumed the financial burden of this service and the appropriation of the Legislature was discontinued.4

Dodson continues his report by giving a description of his Extension staff in 1916. To facilitate a comparison with the Louisiana Service as it existed before WW II, without the necessity of referring back to Chapter III, and to document his commitment to historic preservation, Dodson's summary follows:

There were forty-two white demonstration agents employed in forty-three parishes, and four negro agents working among the people of their own race. The regular demonstration agents give aid to negro farmers as well as to white people wherever it is practicable to do so. The county agents are supervised by three district agents, each one having approximately one-third of the entire state in charge. The state agent has general supervision of the work for the entire
state, representing both the United States Department of Agriculture and the college, and takes care of the bulk of the correspondence, location of efficient men when changes or additions are made in the staff, and helps to secure local aid for the work.

Mr. Mason Snowden, State Agent, has been requested to prepare an historical statement regarding the development of this work in the state, as it seemed desirable to record this data in our official records of the agricultural extension work. His statement is appended herewith.5

The only obvious error made by Snowden in his account was his statement that the Terrell, Texas, Porter Farm experiment of Knapp's in 1903 was "... to prove to the farmers and business men the possibility of profitable farming in spite of the weevil."6 Its actual purpose was to show the value of farm diversification and the importance of following the new agricultural practices advice provided by Dr. Knapp. Williamson stated, "It can readily be seen from the history of the Porter farm experiment that this technique was in no sense derived as a means to fight the boll weevil."7 Nevertheless, Snowden's view became prevalent because the boll weevil infestation followed so closely, 1904, on the success of the Porter Farm experiment and was the justification for expanding Federal funding of it. And the Cooperative Demonstration method ultimately became the leading defense against the boll weevil. Thus the two became so intertwined that many were lead to believe that there was a cause and effect relationship.

The preceding does not detract to the treatment given by Snowden to the historical development of Boys' Corn Club

It is possible that these Circulars were overlooked by Williamson as a source of historical information on the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service because, at first glance, they appear to be Experiment Station circulars. However, it must be remembered that Dodson served as Director of both the Experiment Station and the Extension Division. A few titles will be sufficient to show their importance to the early history of the Louisiana Service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIRCULAR NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organization of Boys' Pig Clubs</td>
<td>June 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. H. Balis, In Charge of Boys' Pig Clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boys' and Girls' Poultry Clubs</td>
<td>Sept. 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. O. Edson, In Charge of Boys' and Girls' Poultry Clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Johnson Grass</td>
<td>Feb. 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. R. Perkins, Forge Crop Agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live Stock Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returning to our State legal foundation, the Louisiana Legislature passed Act No. 16 in 1924. This act authorized parish school boards to participate in the Smith-Lever Act as follows:

Section 25 . . . A parish school board shall have authority to pay all or part of the salaries and expenses of persons employed in the Extension Service to promote agriculture and other industrial instructions for the benefit of children . . . ." (See Appendix C.)
On July 17, 1924, the Governor approved Louisiana Legislative Act No. 246. This act permits parish police juries to participate in the Smith-Lever Act.

Section 1. Be it enacted by the Legislature of Louisiana, that on a two-thirds vote of its members the police juries of the several parishes of the State, under such regulations as they may prescribe be and they are hereby authorized to appropriate and use from parish funds any sum or sums of money not exceeding twenty-five hundred dollars per year in aid of the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration work in their respective parishes, jointly with the agents and representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the several police juries and said agents and representatives. (See Appendix C.)

The State acts are operationalized by means of a formal written instrument known as a "Memorandum of Understanding." A separate Memorandum of Understanding is executed by LSU with each participating parish school board and police jury. A Memorandum of Understanding is also executed between LSU and the United States Department of Agriculture. This Memorandum delineates the reciprocal obligations, duties and responsibilities of LSU and USDA. (See Appendix D.)

The second history of the LCES was written by then Assistant Director W. B. Mercier who became Director in 1928. In the introduction to his Historical Review of Farmers' Cooperative Extension Work in the State of Louisiana From 1904 to 1925, he states:

It seems proper to briefly review not only the past ten years' activities but also the previous ten years of similar work known as the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work, supported and supervised entirely by the Federal Government.
While Agriculture has from the earliest date been recognized as the most fundamental and necessary industry of the nation as a whole and by most of the states individually, it has been only in the last forty years that any systematic effort was made either by the national or state governments to develop and improve it along scientific and business lines. . . .8

The subsequent efforts of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service to achieve the goal of scientific agriculture, home economics and club work follows.

Objectives

In the excellent booklet titled Program Development in the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service by Dr. Bruce Flint, objectives are described in this manner:

It is of utmost importance that all members of an organization know and understand its objectives. The more clearly these objectives can be defined, the easier it becomes to direct the organization's resources toward their accomplishment. Objectives are like compasses, they provide direction.9

The booklet explains that "... Extension's effort is guided by the following general objectives outlined in the Scope Report:"

(1) To help Louisiana producers become more efficient in agricultural production.
(2) To help producers, handlers, and the general public develop maximum practicable efficiency in the marketing, distribution and utilization of farm products.
(3) To help Louisiana people develop maximum efficiency in managing their resources on the farm and in the home.
(4) To provide educational programs that will enable family units to attain high levels of living and a high degree of stability and emotional security.
(5) To help youth attain maximum development of their skills, abilities, leadership, and citizenship potential.
(6) To help people develop their maximum leadership in programs for community improvement and natural and
human resource development.

(7) To provide organizational and educational leadership in programs for community improvement and natural and human resource development.

(8) To keep people informed regarding national, state and local issues that affect their welfare in order that they may make rational decisions regarding their own course of action.10

The general objectives can be grouped into these four program areas:

(1) Agriculture;
(2) Home Economics;
(3) 4-H Youth Program; and
(4) Community Resource Development.

The agriculture program area is concerned with such topics as production, marketing, distribution and income management; home economics with family living, money management, nutrition and clothing; the 4-H program with youth members; and the Community Resource Development with leadership identification and development.

In this study, each of these four areas will be considered in separate chapters and their relationship within the social milieu will also be described using socio-economic information.

To accomplish its objectives, the Louisiana Extension Service uses a work approach known as Program Development. Program Development is defined in the booklet by Flint as

...the continuous process of working with advisory groups, analyzing situations, determining needs and problems, developing objectives, establishing priorities, implementing action and evaluating accomplishments.11

Flint, who is a Professor of Extension and...
International Education and, in 1986, an Associate Director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, "... readily acknowledges that the concept of Program Development presented here is not the only one that exists, nor is it the only way the job can be done." He continues, "However, it is one that has been thoroughly tested, is understood by a large number of Louisiana personnel, and most important—has proven to be effective."12

According to Flint, the program development process may be viewed as having three major dimensions.

I. **Program Planning**
   1. Organizing and/or working with advisory groups.
   2. Collecting factual information.
   3. Analyzing the situation.
   4. Identifying problems.
   5. Developing objectives and establishing priorities.
   6. Developing or revising written program document.

II. **Program Execution**
   7. Selecting program objectives for emphasis.
   8. Developing a plan of work.
   9. Executing the plan.

III. **Evaluation**
   10. Evaluating accomplishments.13

The LCES follows the above outline in carrying out its responsibilities. A detailed description of the tasks required in each of the ten steps is included in Flint's booklet.

The organizational structure of the Louisiana
Cooperative Extension Service will now be examined by the term of service of each of the Directors who have served from the end of World War II to 1986 in order to determine how it was organized to accomplish the previously discussed objectives.

1940-1961: Dr. H. C. Sanders

Introduction

Upon the resignation of Director J. W. Bateman, Dr. Harry Clayton Sanders became Acting Director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service on October 1, 1940. He was designated Director in September 1941 and retired on July 1, 1961. Sanders was born on February 19, 1898, in Lincoln Parish, Louisiana. Because his father had died while he was in High School, he was forced to work on the school farm to support himself. He earned the Bachelor of Science degree in agronomy and a minor in animal husbandry at Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina, in 1919 and the Master of Arts degree in agricultural economics at LSU in 1938. Clemson also awarded him the honorary Doctor of Laws degree in 1962. During the school year 1919-20, he taught agriculture at Carrollton, Georgia; and from 1920 to 1923, he taught vocational agriculture at Choudrant, Louisiana.

Sanders began his employment career with the LCES on July 20, 1923, as County Agent of Bienville Parish. His reminiscences of his service as County Agent are titled
Memoirs of a County Agent and were published by the LSU Extension Service in 1983. The fact that Director Sanders was a "gentleman from the old school" whose word was his bond and whose integrity was beyond reproach is evident from this one event included in his Memoirs.

Some Unexpected Returns From Buying and Selling

One day a man and wife named Martin came to a poultry shipping day with a wagonload of chickens. Mr. Martin had covered the bed, and it appeared to me that the bottom was full. I gave him several coops and served others until he and his wife had caught their chickens. Of course, I had instructed him to put all the roosters in one coop, as the price for them was much lower. After weighing, I figured up the total and wrote Martin a check.

Each night, at the end of a sales day, I checked my "books." That night I had too much money, which meant I had not paid someone all that was owed. I checked each sale and in Martin's, I had made an error of ten dollars. I wrote him a letter addressed to the community where the sale was held, enclosing a check and apologizing for my error. The letter was returned. He did not get his mail through that post office.

I began checking in that community in an effort to find him. Eventually someone suggested that I contact a "Fritz" Sheen. They said he was chairman of the Parish Democratic Committee, and knew everybody in Bienville Parish and where they lived. I called Sheen and he told me immediately where Martin lived, so I resent the letter explaining that I had had trouble finding him.

About 18 months later, I was giving a beef canning demonstration in Martin's community. Always the processing cannot keep up, so I had to stay late to finish and have the equipment ready for the next demonstration. It was in the winter, and as we sat by the fire, about 8 p.m., my host said to me, "One honest man." I looked puzzled and he asked, "Have you not heard?" And I replied, "No." Then he explained.

His community had a post office supplied by a "Star Route." On a "Star Route," no mail is delivered
to residents. The mailman picks up a locked pouch or sack at a post office on a railroad car, delivers it to the rural post office, and picks up a sack to return. People near the community center wanted to keep their post office, rather than be served by rural carriers. They know about when the man arrives and gather around until he does arrive and the mail is put up.

He said further, that he was there one morning, and so was Mr. Martin, who was illiterate. When the mail was up, he came to my host with a letter to read to him. After hearing the letter and seeing the check he said, "I don't believe it. I did not think there was an honest man in the world. That day I told my wife: 'He beat me just like the others.' But, I am wrong, there is one honest man!"16

Director Sanders rose steadily through the ranks. On November 16, 1928, he became District Agent for the Northwest District of Louisiana and moved his family to Baton Rouge. In 1937, Dr. Sanders became State Agent.17

After retiring on July 1, 1961, when he became Director Emeritus of the Cooperative Extension Service, Dr. Sanders served for several years as professor of Extension Education in the LSU Department of Extension and International Education. He subsequently retired from his second career and assumed the position of Professor Emeritus in Extension Education. Sanders is an internationally recognized leader in Extension work. The Progressive Farmer named him "Man of the Year in Louisiana Agriculture" in 1951. He holds the Superior Service Award from the U. S. Department of Agriculture which he received in 1952 and the Distinguished Service Ruby of Epsilon Sigma Phi, National Extension Fraternity. The Superior Service Award is one of the highest honors which is bestowed by the USDA. He is the
editor of *The Cooperative Extension Service* which was published by Prentice-Hall in 1966 and *Instruction in the Cooperative Extension Service, LSU Cooperative Extension Service, 1972*.18

**Organization**

**Staff**

The organizational structure established by Sanders when he became director is shown in Appendix F.

In 1950-51, the State administrative staff consisted of three people—the Director, Assistant to the Director and a Program Analyst. The Supervisory staff numbered 13:

- Assistant Director and State Agent
- State Home Demonstration Agent
- Assistant State Agent
- 4—Men District Agents
- 4—Women District Agents
- Assistant State Agent for Work with Negroes
- Assistant State Home Demonstration Agent for Work with Negroes

There were 48 Specialists; and 54 White and one Negro stenographic and clerical employees.

The field force consisted of:

- 64 County Agents
- 70 Associate and Assistant County Agents
- 64 Home Demonstration Agents
- 42 Associate and Assistant Home Demonstration Agents
- 20 Assistant County Agents for Work with Negroes
- 26 Assistant Home Demonstration Agents for Work with Negroes
- 76 Stenographic and Clerical employees (White)

During the year 8 Assistant County Agents were added to the staff with the last increment of Bankhead-Flannagan Funds.
and local appropriations.

On August 16, 1958, a new structure was implemented when Director Sanders issued Circular Letter No. 10—1958. See Appendix F for a copy of the organizational chart which accompanied it. The most notable changes were as follows:

1) The position Assistant Director and State Agent (J. G. Richard) was changed to: Assistant Director (Parish Operations)

"State Agent" is eliminated from his title. Mr. Richard, through the District Agents, will be responsible for all field operations. . . .

He will serve as Acting Director in the absence of the Director in accordance with his seniority as an Assistant Director.

2) A new position of Assistant Director (Personnel and State Office Operations) was created.

Mr. C. E. Kemmerly, Jr., will have the immediate supervision of the Assistant State Agent and Manager of Livestock Shows, the Assistant State Agent and Professor of Extension Education, the Specialist (Recruitment and Training), the Assistant to the Director (State Office Management), the Program Analyst, and the Librarian. . . .

He will serve as Acting Director in the absence of the Director and in accordance with his seniority, as an Assistant Director.

3) The position of State Home Demonstration Agent (Miss Ellen LeNoir) was retained.

. . . the State Home Demonstration Agent is primarily responsible for the staff services of the home economics phase of the Extension program. She supervises the Home Economics Specialist Project Leaders and initiates all personnel actions relating to Home Economics Specialists.

4) A new position of State Agent (Agriculture) (John A. Cox) was established.

Under the supervision of the Director, in close working relationship with the District Agents and Program Specialists and through the Agricultural
Project Leaders, the State Agricultural Agent is primarily responsible for staff services of the agricultural phase of the Extension program. He supervises the Agricultural Specialist Project Leaders and initiates all personnel actions relating to Agricultural Specialists.

5) The number of District Agents was reduced from four to three as follows:

- Central-Southwest District: E. R. McCrory
- Northern District: N. E. Thames
- Southeast District: D. L. Bornman, Jr.

The District Agents will supervise District Program Specialists and Parish Chairmen.

6) A new class of positions was created—that of District Program Specialists.

- Agricultural: Joseph Lamendola, Southeast; C. W. Kennedy, Northern; Ralph R. Brown, Central-Southwest.
- Home Economics: Mrs. Rogenia Trotter, Southeast; Mrs. Ada Hanchey, Northern; Mrs. Valmae Robertson, Central-Southwest.
- 4-H Club: Edward Gassie, Southeast; C. J. Naquin, Central-Southwest; Bruce Flint, Northern.

The Program Specialists, working together as a team, will be responsible for training the agents in the techniques and methods necessary to develop well organized and functioning Parish Advisory Committees and subcommittees.

7) A new position of Specialist (Recruitment and Training) (Nan Tarwater) was announced.

She will counsel with and recommend to the Assistant Director (State Office Operations) policies relating to the recruitment, training, evaluation, salaries, promotions and retirement of personnel.

8) A new position of Parish Chairmen was created with these duties:

With the approval of the Assistant Director (Parish Operations) and the Director, there may be selected in each parish a Chairman whose duties and responsibilities
will be to arrange for the organization and regular meetings of an Advisory Committee, for regular staff meetings of parish personnel, and for contacts with the Police Jury and School Board regarding finances, personnel, office space, reports, etc. The Chairmen will select, supervise and certify the time of the secretaries and will manage office space and equipment. They will see that records are maintained and regular reports are made. They will be responsible for the development of programs and the execution of plans of work. They will make recommendations for the appointment, promotion, transfer, salary adjustments and travel allowances of parish personnel.

9) The state was divided in three Extension Districts as follows:

**Northern District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bienville</td>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Red River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossier</td>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Tensas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddo</td>
<td>E. Carroll</td>
<td>Morehouse</td>
<td>Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Ouachita</td>
<td>W. Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catahoula</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiborne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Central-Southwest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>Evangeline</td>
<td>LaSalle</td>
<td>St. Landry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Natchitoches</td>
<td>St. Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoyelles</td>
<td>Iberia</td>
<td>Pointe Coupee</td>
<td>Vermilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauregard</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Rapides</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcasieu</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>Winn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Southeast District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>Iberville</td>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>St. Tammany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>Tangipahoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Baton</td>
<td>Lafourche</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>Terrebonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouge</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>St. James</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Feliciana</td>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>W. B. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaquemines</td>
<td>St. Mary</td>
<td>W. Feliciana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) The position of Director (H. C. Sanders) was retained with these duties.

The Director will serve as chairman of the State Budget Committee and . . . State 4-H Committee, and will supervise the Assistant Directors, the Assistant to the Director (Finance), the State Home Demonstration Agent, the State Agent (Agriculture), and the Editorial and 4-H Project Leaders.
Director Sanders concluded his Circular Letter No. 10 by stating:

Except as specifically outlined in this letter there is no change in relationships or responsibility. Reassignment of responsibility is in no way a criticism of anyone. It is an effort to provide more adequately for the supervision and training of Extension personnel. We believe that it will add greatly to the efficiency of the Agricultural Extension Service in Louisiana.

I am sure that all of you will work wholeheartedly in the future as you have in the past to make the organization effective in serving the people of Louisiana.

In summary, the number of Extension staff during the administration of Director Sanders increased from just over 200 in 1940 to over 550 in 1961. The number of Subject Matter Specialists almost tripled in size—from about 25 to over 70.

Funding

The amount and sources of funds for selected years of Director Sanders' administration are shown in Table 8.

1961: Mr. J. G. Richard

After the retirement of Director Sanders on July 1, 1961, and until Director John A. Cox was appointed as the permanent director on August 8, 1961, Mr. Richard served as the Acting Director. It will be recalled that he had previously served as Acting Director during the absence of Director Sanders from July 1, 1946, to November 30, 1946. His role during the administration of Director Cox will be treated in the section which follows.
Richard had a wide range of Extension and agricultural-related experiences during his career. After graduation from LSU in 1923, he taught vocational agricultural at Gilbert High School in Franklin Parish until 1923 when he joined the Extension Service as an Agricultural Agent in Terrebonne Parish. He became County Agent there in 1925 and assisted in the introduction of the P. O. J. variety of sugarcane, which was resistant to the mosaic disease that then threatened destruction of the cane industry.19

In 1935, he joined the State Extension staff as horticulturist. Since that time, he served successively as State Agricultural Agent, Assistant Director, Associate Director and on several occasions as Acting Director.20

From July 1952 to September 1953, Richard worked with the Mutual Security Administration and the U.S. Department of State as a consultant on Extension organization and programs in France and other European countries.21

In July 1962, Richard accepted a 60-day assignment as an agricultural education consultant with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. His duties, which took him to Switzerland, Austria, and Italy, included the direction of seminars for French-speaking agricultural Extension workers from European countries and several African countries where French is spoken. Co-sponsors of the project included the Swiss government.22

Joe G. Richard retired on December 31, 1962, ending a
career of 37 years with the Extension Service. He is the author of numerous Extension publications on fruit and vegetable crops. He is credited during his Extension career with helping introduce the Farm and Home Development system of farm management in Louisiana, parish advisory committee system of planning Extension activities in the different parishes.22

In 1927 he married Miss Jessye Lea Bethune of Poplarville, Mississippi, and they have three sons and one daughter.24

1961-1978: Mr. John A. Cox

Perhaps the following are the first articles which presage the subsequent career, characterized by leadership, of former Louisiana Cooperative Extension Director John A. Cox. It was written in 1937 and appeared in a 1937 Anniston, Alabama, newspaper.

"Louisiana Youth Only Two Points Shy Rifle Record"

Anniston, Ala., July 13, [1937]—John A. Cox, 20-year-old Louisiana State University student from Mira [Caddo Parish], La., and a trainee in the R.O.T.C. camp at Fort McClellan, shot the highest rifle score Tuesday morning on the McClellan ranges that has been recorded in all branches of the United States military forces during the past seven years and cinched the No. 1 position in the 13-man team that will represent the Fourth Corps Area in the Camp Perry, Ohio, national matches.

The world's record was fired in San Francisco, Calif., seven years ago by Maj. "Spec." Easley, of the United States Infantry. His score was 246. Cox's score was 244, two points short of the mark.

Cox made perfect scores in the 500-yard prone firing and 300-yard rapid fire prone firing. In the
500-yard firing, he scored 10 consecutive bulls eyes.25

The other article, of which an excerpt follows, appeared a year later in LSU's Daily Reveille.

"L.S.U. Marksmen Set New Records"

Two new intercollegiate marksmanship records were set by John A. Cox, who made a score of 385, and W. H. Moore, who shot a 382 in a match with Carnegie Tech, February 17, according to Major J. D. Forsythe, coach of the L.S.U. rifle team. The university won over Tech by 14 points.

Cox is captain of company F, and Moore is in company A, engineers.26

Director Cox acknowledged in 1957 that "His hobby since a boy has been collecting guns and shooting (he is a champion shot) and now he collects ornamentals, fruit, nut and citrus trees."27

The agricultural career of Director Cox parallels the period of time with which this chapter deals, namely the period from WW II to 1986. Because of this and the fact that the retirement article written by Tom Herline, Advocate Farm Editor, is so well done and informative for our purposes that these excerpts are listed here; it is included in its entirety in Appendix G.

"Retiring John Cox Reminisces On Years With Ag Extension"

When John A. Cox joined the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service . . . in 1945, he hardly could have dreamed of the changes in agriculture he was destined to witness in the next 32 years. . . .

Cox has watched agriculture move from a time when cotton was picked by field hands dragging their sacks behind them and cane was hand-harvested using a knife. Rice was harvested by threshing machines in the
field. . . .

Cox sees chemical weed control, use of fertilizer and pasture improvement programs as major factors in the growth of Louisiana agriculture during the last 32 years. . . .

Cox teamed up with Steele Burden to establish the Louisiana Rural Life Museum, located on a 450-acre tract donated by the Burden family to LSU. . . .

Cox initiated the Giant Step Program in 1967 with the aim of doubling the value of farming in Louisiana in five years—from $1 billion to $2 billion. Undaunted at only reaching $1.7 billion farm value in 1972, Cox immediately launched Giant Step II, aimed at even more growth. The result: Louisiana now has an agriculture value of $4 billion. . . .

Crawfish, once damned by rice farmers because they made a shambles of their levees, are gleefully raised by rice farmers between growing seasons as a supplemental income . . . he noted. . . .

LSU has had to change a lot to keep up with the changes in agriculture, Cox said. But the number of state office staff members is only 25 more now than it was in 1945, moving from 441 to 467, he said. But more para-professionals are being used, primarily in nutrition education programs. . . . The program uses 250 such aides, Cox said. . . .

The Home Demonstration Clubs that once were among the few organized clubs for rural wives now count 35,000 Louisiana members. They have also changed their name to Homemaker Clubs, Cox said. . . .

Today, 4-H'ers can participate in some 40 or 50 different projects, from hamsters to Simmentals. . . .

Cox served in the Pacific Theater during World War II, until he was wounded by a 150mm Japanese mortar shell. His list of decorations includes the Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, Philippines Liberation Medal and Combat Infantryman's Badge.28

Mr. John A. Cox, who retired on April 30, 1978, had served as Director since 1961. When he became Director, he
submitted the following letter to his staff. It is repeated here because it set what could be called his "human relations" administration.

August 7, 1961

Dear Co-Worker:

You have a significant record of achievement, largely because your leadership has been strong, and because you have followed this leadership. The Agricultural Extension Service, as an organization, therefore, has made progress.

You certainly subscribe to the belief that to grow as an organization, each of us must grow as individuals. We are growing individually, partly through our program of professional improvement. My firm belief is that we will continue to stand tall among our fellow men on the campus and in the State.

We as a group form an integral part of the Louisiana State University. We must always strive to be enthusiastic itinerant teachers taking information to the people and thus effectively extending the boundaries of your University to all corners of the State.

As your new director, may I say to you that I pledge my head, heart, hands and health - in the words of our 4-H motto - to the continuation of the rapid and sound development of a strong and efficient Agricultural Extension Service in Louisiana. Our strength is in our optimism, energy and sense of dedication to public service.

Your counsel and advice will always be welcome.

Sincerely,

s/ John A. Cox
Director

On December 1, 1961, Cox announced in Circular Letter No. 34 these "... administrative changes designed to further strengthen the Louisiana Agricultural Extension Service. ..."
J. G. Richard, promoted to Associate Director for General Administration.

The Associate Director (General Administration) will counsel and advise with the Director in the development of Extension objectives, policies, operating procedures, staffing, financing, planning and reporting. He will serve on the Extension Service budget committee and will be responsible for liaison with federal and state agencies and other organizations.

N. E. Thames, promoted to Assistant Director for Programs.

Through the State Agents and District Agents, the Assistant Director (Programs) will effect complete coordination of specialists' and agents' activities and provide vigorous administrative, supervisory and subject-matter support for Extension programs on a parish, area and state basis.

C. E. Kemmerly, Jr., Assistant Director (Personnel and State Office Operations), will continue to develop a strong section on personnel, recruitment, training, studies, evaluation and fiscal matters. This section will develop an efficient, continuous evaluation process for programs and personnel. He will see that Extension Service personnel have adequate opportunity for professional improvement and encourage them to earn terminal degrees in their subject matter areas. One of Mr. Kemmerly's major responsibilities is the development and maintenance of a policy handbook for Extension workers.

These administrative changes will permit the Director and others to devote more time to appraising the needs of farm people, anticipating changes, desires and interests of those engaged in farming and related industries. This will enable him to wisely shift personnel and resources, so that the Agricultural Extension Service can accomplish its mission more effectively. He will be able to establish closer liaison with Experiment Station personnel and other segments of the University and have more time for planning, staffing, financing, budgeting and reporting. This administrative structure will sharpen Extension's ability to help farmers and people in related industries to capitalize on opportunities presented by
Under Cox's direction the service assumed the structure shown on the Organizational Chart dated May 6, 1975. (See Appendix F.) The salient points which should be noted on this chart are: (1) There was a wide span of control, especially for the state level positions where nine division leaders reported directly to the Director. (2) This did not include the Field Level Positions where three District Agents supervised eleven Assistant District Agents who were domiciled in the field. These Assistant District Agents were responsible for the 64 County Agents and, in some cases, several area agents. There was one County Agent for each of the 64 Louisiana parishes. Supervisees of the County Agent included Associate and Assistant County Agents; Associate and Assistant Home Economists and Extension Associates, who are paraprofessionals. The Area Agent position was created to provide for agents who could work in more than one parish and specialize in narrow subject fields. These might be referred to as subject matter specialists except that they work directly with the clientele. (3) The remaining reportees to the Director included the Associate Director of Programs; Coordinator of EEO and Civil Rights and Assistant Director of Business, Fiscal and Personnel. Thus, there
were 15 people for whom the Director, according to the formal chart, was responsible in providing direct supervision. Most organizational specialists have considered this number of personnel too large to adequately supervise.

There were about 80 specialists grouped into nine divisions. Most held terminal degrees. In fact, the educational requirements for all Extension personnel were commendable. All professional employees had to have either a masters degree or agree to work on one when employed. Extension policy permitted its employees to pursue part-time study.

By the time Director Cox retired in 1978, he had led the Louisiana Service, in the opinion of many, through one of its greatest challenges—integration of its previously separate staffs of Black and white agents. Director Cox considered this to be his major challenge while Director. (See Chapter XIII for more details.) To facilitate the transition, he developed and implemented a new Extension Field Position—that of Parish Chairman. This new leadership position was not automatically filled by the County Agent but could be assigned to any qualified member of the parish staff. Thus women and Blacks had an additional promotional opportunity. In fact the first white women were appointed in 1959. They were Ona Blondin in Lincoln Parish, Lola Caldwell in Caldwell Parish and Mary
Sue O'Neal in Livingston Parish. The first Black woman and man to be selected were Juanita B. Franklin in Orleans Parish and John B. Andrews in Morehouse Parish.\textsuperscript{31}

Cox was suited for these turbulent times because of the life and death decisions which he had to make during his World War II service. As a Platoon Commander, Cox was responsible for deciding who might or might not get killed. When compared with this, anything less could really be considered "kid gloves." Also, Director Sanders made a conscious effort to involve Cox in administrative matters after Cox was made State Agent in 1958. When Cox expressed to Director Sanders some uncertainty about taking the State Agent job, Sanders responded, "If I didn't think you could do it, I wouldn't have asked you to take it!"

Afterwards Director Sanders exposed Cox to both the Southern Regional Extension meetings as well as the Advanced National Extension Seminars held at Madison, Wisconsin. Cox related that he, Sanders, Joe Richard and sometimes Carl Kemmerly would attend. "Mr. Sanders even let me drive." His greatest educational opportunity occurred in 1965 when he was offered the position of Deputy Administrator of the Federal Extension Service during the administration of President LBJ--Lyndon Baines Johnson. Cox was confronted with a quandary. He could take this job or use the year to work on a Ph.D. program which had been approved by Dean Efferson. After consulting with the University
administrators, it was decided that the Washington assignment was too good an opportunity to turn down. During his absence, Carl Kemmerly was the Acting Director.

By 1978, Director Cox had already changed the name of the Extension Service from the LSU Agricultural Extension Service to Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. Director Cox said he did this for two reasons: (1) he wanted to let the public know that Extension served more than just agricultural interests since urban residents were becoming recipients of Extension services in increasing numbers, and (2) he thought it important to acknowledge that urban citizens pay taxes, too!32

At Director Cox's retirement program, a Louisiana 4-H Development Fund was formally inaugurated with donations of $43,500 by about 750 individuals and organizations throughout the state. The fund was named in his honor. See Chapter XI for additional information on the Cox 4-H Fund.33

1964-1965: Mr. C. E. Kemmerly, Acting

In February 1963, Director John A. Cox announced the promotion of C. E. Kemmerly, Jr., to the position of Associate Director of General Administration from that of Assistant Director. Kemmerly was a native of Crowley and held B.S. and M.S. degrees from LSU.34 The latter was granted in 1941 when he completed his thesis entitled "A Handbook on the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation for Agricultural Workers."
Kemmerly joined Extension in 1928 as Assistant County Agent in Franklin Parish but resigned to become principal and vocational agriculture teacher at Oak Grove High School in DeSoto Parish. He returned to Extension in 1933 as County Agent in Winn parish.

In 1935, he became County Agent in East Baton Rouge Parish and in 1936, he was named Organization Specialist on the State Extension staff at LSU. He served successively as State Supervisor of the Emergency Farm Labor Program in the WW II period as District Agent, and as Assistant State Agent. He was named Assistant Director in 1958.

1978-(Present-1986): Dr. Denver T. Loupe

In April 1978, Dr. Denver T. Loupe, an Agronomist and Plant Science Specialist who had then been employed by the Extension Service for nearly 25 years, succeeded Mr. John A. Cox as Director of the Extension Service, a major division of the LSU Center for Agricultural Science and Rural Development. Cox retired after 33 years with the Service, including 17 years as Director.

Dr. Loupe is a native of Gonzales, Louisiana, where he was born on February 4, 1927. He graduated from Gonzales High School in the Spring of 1944 and enrolled for the Summer Semester at Northwestern State College. In December 1944, he enlisted in the United States Navy and served until July 1946. He received his B.S. degree from LSU in 1949 and his M.S. in 1957. His thesis was entitled "The Influence of
Certain Agronomic Practices on Yield of Sugar Cane in Louisiana."

In 1952, Director Loupe began his Extension career as an Assistant County Agent in St. James Parish. He was promoted to the State Extension Staff as an Assistant Agronomist (Sugarcane) on July 15, 1954. In 1972, he became head of the Plant Science Division of the Extension Service. His specialty—sugarcane. Loupe has served the American Society of Sugarcane Technologists as Secretary-Treasurer and as been made a life member for his service.

He married Shirley Ferne Kemp of Jonesboro, Louisiana, in 1949.35

In 1961, Dr. Loupe was awarded his Ph.D from LSU. His dissertation: "An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Selecting Sugarcane Varieties from Plant and First Stubble Crops." He thus became the first director of the Louisiana Service to have a doctorate at the time he was appointed Director.

After becoming Director, Dr. Loupe made these major changes in the organizational structure as of March 1, 1979. (1) He reduced by one-third the number of people having to report directly to him. This was accomplished with the State Level Staff by having the Division Leaders of Animal Science, Plant Science, Economic and Resource Development and Environmental Planning and Management report to the newly created State Agent for Agricultural and Natural
Resources and Rural Development. This, of course, eliminated the need for three people to report directly to the director. The divisions of Communication, Home Economics and 4-H Youth Development were retained. The title of the former division of Program Services was changed to Personnel and Programs. The former division of Coordinated Programs with Southern University was eliminated. However, coordination was carried out by Dr. Loupe and the former administrator of the 1890 Extension Program, Mr. Ashford Williams.

(2) In the Field Level Staff, the positions of the three district agents were eliminated. Direction of the field staff was then controlled through a new staff position, Assistant Director, Field Operations. He was responsible for supervising nine assistant/associate district agents. Note that this number was reduced from the former eleven assistant district agents. The nine district agents were responsible for supervising Area Agents, County Agents, Home Economists and Extension Associates.

The previous changes were articulated by Director Loupe in his Circular Letter No. 29 dated December 27, 1978, and referenced "Reassignment of Supervisory and Administrative Personnel." He stated in part:

Shortly after my appointment as Director, I announced to you that there would be some changes in organizational structure and assignment of personnel responsibilities in an effort to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of LCES in performing its mission. Some of these changes have already been made.
Another change that is being made (as announced at Annual Conference) is a reduction in the number of administrative areas in the field from eleven (11) to (9), a change in geographical areas, and reassignment of some area supervisors' responsibilities.

The changes and effective dates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>PARISHES</th>
<th>TYPE OF AGENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. Tammany</td>
<td>Mr. Bobby H. Fletcher, Asst. District Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ascension, Assumption, Iberville, Lafourche, St. James, St. John, Terrebonne, W. Baton Rouge</td>
<td>Mr. Kermit J. Coulon, Asst. District Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>E. Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Livingston, St. Helena, Tangipahoa, Washington, West Feliciana</td>
<td>Dr. Stanley J. Lamendola, Asst. District Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Iberia, Lafayette, Pointe Coupee, St. Landry, St. Martin, St. Mary, Vermilion</td>
<td>Dr. C. A. Miller, Asst. District Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Acadia, Allen, Beauregard, Evangeline, Calcasieu, Cameron, Jefferson Davis</td>
<td>Mr. Minus J. Granger, Asst. District Agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI  Avoyelles  Mr. Ralph R. Brown
      Grant  Asst. District Agent
      LaSalle
      Rapides
      Sabine
      Vernon
      Winn

VII  Catahoula  Dr. Alvia F. Fugler
     Concordia  Asst. District Agent
     East Carroll
     Franklin
     Madison
     Richland
     Tensas
     West Carroll

VIII  Caldwell  Dr. E. E. Hodgkins
     Claiborne  Asst. District Agent
     Jackson
     Lincoln
     Morehouse
     Ouachita
     Union

IX  Bossier  Dr. David L. Jones
    Bienville  District Agent
    Caddo
    DeSoto
    Natchitoches
    Red River
    Webster

Director Loupe concluded with this request. "With your help, these changes can be effectively made and will become a significant step toward the establishment of one great Extension organization serving all the people of Louisiana."

(3) Other positions were still reporting directly to the Director including the Assistant Director for Business, Fiscal and Personnel, and the Associate Director. However, the Manager of the Livestock Shows reported not the Assistant Director for Business but to the Director.
With the above changes established, only ten people were reporting to the Director; this was a much more manageable number that the former fifteen.

**Physical Facilities**

The article in the *Louisiana Leader*, January 1937, titled "Agricultural Extension Moves to Spacious New Building" provides not only a historical record of the wanderings of Extension but also a photograph of its 1937 home.

From the time it was first established in Louisiana, the extension division has been on the "move." First "home" of the service was the old "pest house" on the uptown campus. From there it moved to Alumni hall on the old campus in 1926 and three years later moved to its quarters on the new campus, the north agricultural building, which it shared with the home economics department of the university. From there it moved to its new buildings during the latter part of November 1936.

Begun last April as a joint project of the Works Progress Administration and the Louisiana State University and only recently completed at a cost of approximately $164,000, the new building is an imposing structure. It is a two-story building of brick and reinforced concrete and conforms in appearance with the other buildings on the campus. Its completion makes Louisiana State University one of the few land-grant colleges in the country to have an extension department occupying exclusive quarters. . . .

From the photograph, the building can be identified as the one which houses the Agricultural Administration offices in 1986 and is situated in the southwest corner of the Quadrangle. In 1955, the contract was let for the present Knapp Hall office building. The *State Times* (July 13, 1955) article, "New Ag Extension Headquarters" offers this
The organization will not only have more extensive accommodations than in the past, but it will have quarters designed especially for it. Because of that, the facilities—the working conditions—will be much better than is the case at present. Currently the service is occupying a building that was planned for classroom work.

Perhaps, though, one of the greatest improvements the new building will afford is the greater ease with which it can be located by visitors. It will be on Highland Rd., which is the main road running through the campus from town.

Ease of location is far more important for the Ag Extension than most other departments of the University, because there are so many visits to that unit by people from all over the state and out of the state too who are not familiar with the campus... 37

In the March 7, 1957, State Times is a photograph of Knapp Hall with this caption: "New Extension Building—Louisiana State University's Agricultural Extension Service recently occupied this new $550,000 building located northwest of the Coliseum. It serves as headquarters for more than 300 agricultural and home demonstration staff members in the state's 64 parishes. A special visitor's parking area is located at the front entrance." 38

When the administrative building was constructed for and occupied by the LSU Agricultural Center in 1981, the administrative staff of Extension was moved from Knapp to there. However, Knapp Hall in 1986 continued to serve as offices for the specialists and their supervisors.

Summary

With a staff of Specialists, most with terminal
degrees, in such fields as Animal Science, Plant Science, Economic and Resource Development, 4-H Youth Development, Home Economics, etc., and a proven procedure (Program Development) for receiving input from the clients (bottom-up planning) and objectively identifying needs, the Louisiana Service is still a very viable community development organization in Louisiana. It has striven to recruit personnel of high academic and professional standards of which the appointment of Dr. Denver T. Loupe as Director is indicative.

Since the organizational history of the Louisiana Service has been covered in general from World War II to 1986, the remaining chapters will examine in more detail specialized areas within the Service. For example, the next chapter treats the history of the Department of Extension and International Education.
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INTRODUCTION

In 1986, Louisiana State University (LSU) continued to administer the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 which established the Agricultural Extension Service. Although it was a landmark in the direct education of farmers, according to Professor Roy V. Scott in his book, The Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agriculture Extension to 1914, the refinement of "... a teaching device effective with ... adults" has continued.\(^1\) The story of the evolution and refinement of the effort to develop a staff of highly qualified teachers within the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES), as seen through the growth of the Department of Extension and International Education at LSU, will now be presented. This discussion will be organized into the following time periods which correspond to the terms of the different Extension Education leaders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning,</td>
<td>Mr. Claude W. Davis and</td>
<td>Mr. Julius M. O'Quin</td>
<td>Dr. Lynn L. Pesson</td>
<td>Dr. Edward W. Gassie</td>
<td>Dr. William B. Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth,</td>
<td>1955-1960: Mr. Julius M. O'Quin</td>
<td>Dr. Lynn L. Pesson</td>
<td>Dr. Edward W. Gassie</td>
<td>Dr. William B. Richardson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity,</td>
<td>1960-1973: Dr. Lynn L. Pesson</td>
<td>Dr. Edward W. Gassie</td>
<td>Dr. William B. Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons,</td>
<td>1973-1985: Dr. Edward W. Gassie</td>
<td>Dr. William B. Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In regard to the creation of the Extension Education Department, former LCES Director (1940-1961) H. C. Sanders (1898- ) stated that his objective originally was not to make extension education a formal discipline for credit. It was to be just an in-service training course. However, at a conference, Dean I. O. Schaub of North Carolina made the statement that every state extension service needs one man on its staff who is devoting his full time to training. This was a new idea to Director Sanders: "It hit me as being a step in the right direction." Dean Schaub further said, "I have my man picked out and I am going to send him to Cornell to obtain his doctorate in rural education. He's going to be strictly for in-service training."²

Sanders said, "I knew that we needed such a service just as bad as anyone else." So he began to plan how Louisiana could follow an approach similar to North Carolina's and where Louisiana could get its man. "We had a man on our staff who was always a good student. In his day, I considered him the best County Agent in Louisiana. He was Claude W. Davis."

The philosophy which Dr. Sanders followed was to utilize the available talents by developing them. Since Davis was an experienced administrator of extension, Director Sanders went to Dean J. G. Lee, Jr., and obtained
his approval of the appointment of Davis as a full professor. Davis began immediately to develop a strong extension education curriculum.

Claude W. Davis was born November 23, 1894, in Delhi and began his employment with the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service on May 1, 1919, as Emergency Agent in Morehouse Parish where he later served as County Agent. He was appointed professor on January 1, 1950, retired on February 1, 1955, and died on March 23, 1969.

A brochure entitled "Degree Programs in Extension Education" also confirms that 1950 was the year in which Extension Education courses were established at LSU. It states:

Extension Education was inaugurated as an academic subject at Louisiana State University in 1950 through the introduction of the Master of Science degree in Extension Education.

In the LSU Graduate School Catalogue, 1951-52, courses in Agriculture Extension Education are listed for the first time under the Department of Vocational Education as follows:

A graduate program for agricultural extension workers leading to the degree of Master of Science has been established by the University. The graduate program is flexible enough to meet the differing requirements of individual extension service workers, and broad enough in scope to permit a wide selection of courses from different fields of knowledge.

The granting of the degree of Master of Science on the basis of a minimum of 30 semester hours of graduate work, including not over 6 hours of thesis credit, or 36 semester hours without the thesis has been approved. The requirement of a minimum of 8 hours of work in 200-series courses is interpreted as not requiring a
concentration of the entire 8 hours within a single major department but that these hours can be spread across a "field," such as general agriculture.

The program of each student must meet all regular requirements of the Graduate School for the Master of Science degree.

170 **THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE.** I, II; 3 cr. Organization, objectives, and functioning of co-operative work in agriculture. Mr. Davis.

171 **PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN CO-OPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK.** I, II; 3 cr. Prerequisite: Vocational Education 170 or experience in Co-operative Extension Service work. Designed to furnish practical experience in formulating and executing parish extension programs and plans of work in agriculture. Mr. Davis.

172 **4-H AND OLDER YOUTH PROGRAMS.** I, II; 2 cr. This course is designed to give present and prospective extension workers a broad knowledge and understanding of the history, function, and organization of the 4-H Club and older youth organizations. Mr. Davis.

200 **THE EXTENSION SPECIALIST.** I, II; 3 cr. The nature and scope of a specialist's work; relationships to extension service and public; methods used in program building, training extension workers, evaluating progress, and preparing reports of accomplishments. Mr. Davis.

In the faculty roster section of this catalogue, Davis is listed as having an M.S. degree from LSU.

From the beginning, the program placed major emphasis on subject matter courses in agriculture, home economics, sociology, management, etc., as part of the curriculum.

The **LSU General Catalogue, 1953-55**, contains only these two changes for the Agriculture Extension Education courses. First, the prerequisite for Course 171 was listed simply as "Course 170" rather than as "Vocational Education 170." Second, the following course was added:

300 **THESIS RESEARCH.** I, II; 1-6 cr. Amount of credit to be stated at time of registration.

The preface to the M.S. degree in Agricultural
Extension Education was shortened to the following paragraph in the LSU Graduate Catalogue, 1954-56:

The graduate program for agricultural extension workers is flexible enough to meet the differing requirements of individual extension service workers, and broad enough in scope to permit a wide selection of courses from different fields of knowledge. The minimum requirement in courses exclusively for graduate students does not require a concentration within a single major department. These courses can be distributed within a field such as general agriculture.  

The LSU Graduate Catalogue, 1958-60 lists J. M. O'Quin as the professor for all five Extension courses in which the only change made from those courses previously described is that Course 171 is renumbered as Course 210. He is cited as having an M.S. from LSU.  

The first graduate in Extension Education was Clarence M. Stroud who received his M.S. degree in August 1952 under the non-thesis program. This option enabled him to take two additional courses or 36 semester hours, instead of writing a thesis and being able to graduate with only 30 hours. Stroud's major professor was C. W. Davis. Bettye L. Davis and Sybil L. Jennings were the first women graduates of Extension Education as well as the first to write theses. Their theses were entitled "Studying Some Homemaking Practices Among Homemakers in the Shady Grove School Community, Iberville Parish, Louisiana" and "Studying Home Demonstration Work with Rural Homemakers in Winn Parish," respectively. They graduated in May 1954. Davis's last graduate was Austin W. Johnson who received his degree in
August 1954. During Davis' tenure, there were a total of 15 who graduated with master's degrees. All were agents or specialists of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, and most of them, 13, chose the non-thesis option. See Table 10.

According to personnel records, J. M. O'Quin was appointed professor of extension education on February 1, 1955, the day that Davis retired, and served until July 1, 1960. He died on December 5, 1968.

O'Quin served as major professor for Claude Gonaux, his first graduate; Gonaux received his degree in May 1955 under the non-thesis option. Again, the first graduate to utilize the thesis option during O'Quin's tenure was a woman, Anne H. Harper, whose thesis was titled "Studying Extension Home Management Work with Farm Homemakers in Webster Parish, Louisiana." O'Quin's last graduate was Arthur Patterson who received his M.S. degree in June 1960. From 1955-60, the period of O'Quin's service, there were 47 graduates who received master's degrees in Extension Education. Of these, 29 chose the thesis option, a decided majority over the 18 who chose the non-thesis option.

In conclusion, the major accomplishments made by Director Sanders to the Department of Extension Education was in having an M.S. degree curriculum established in Extension Education and in having Davis and O'Quin appointed as the first faculty members. They served as the
transitional bridge between practitioner-teachers of Extension Education, whom they represented, and the professional-teachers who would follow.

Their contribution is summarized by Table 10. The following period will cover the years 1960-1973. It is titled "Growth" and the Head of the Department was Lynn L. Pesson.

TABLE 10
NUMBER AND TYPE OF DEGREES GRANTED
BY RESIDENCE OF STUDENT
1950-1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DEGREES</th>
<th>LOUISIANA</th>
<th>OTHER STATES</th>
<th>INTER-NATIONAL</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. W. DAVIS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. M. O'QUIN</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATES**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A doctoral program was not established until 1968.

Growth, 1960-1973: Dr. Lynn L. Pesson

In 1960, Dr. Lynn L. Pesson assumed leadership of the Extension Education Program. He began his professional career in 1948 with the Cooperative Extension Service as an Assistant County Agent in St. Mary Parish doing primarily 4-H Club work.13

After returning to Louisiana from Washington, D.C., where he had worked for and studied the operations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture under a national 4-H Club scholarship and where he had obtained a master's degree in
human development education from the University of Maryland, Professor Pesson was invited to join the state extension office staff as Assistant State 4-H Club Agent on December 1, 1954, to replace M. M. LaCroix, who was placed in charge of International Participant Training.

A summer school was held as part of the masters program in Extension Education which Director Sanders had started with Davis and O'Quin, both career extension workers. The summer courses were taught for three weeks. These were developed and scheduled as a convenience for the students of Extension Education. Since most were already employed by the Extension Service, summer courses were held because they least interfered with their job responsibilities. Pesson was asked to develop and teach a course on 4-H Club work to extension personnel. His initial appointment on September 1, 1960, was as an associate professor of agricultural education in the Department of Vocational Education. This was because Extension Education's M.S. degree program was originally placed there in 1950.

Director Sanders afforded this behind-the-scenes description of Dr. Pesson's appointment: Sanders wanted the person who was going to teach extension education to have a joint appointment with the Service and the academic department. Therefore, he first went to Dr. J. C. "Red" Floyd, who was Head of the Department of Vocational Education, with this idea. Sanders said that, although
Floyd was receptive, he was not enthusiastic. However, when he mentioned Pesson's name, he became enthusiastic.

Elaborating further on the purpose of the Extension Education program, Dr. Sanders stated that the introductory Extension course was developed for all Extension personnel hired during the year. All new personnel were brought to Baton Rouge for the three-week course. All their expenses were paid. The course carried three hours of graduate credit. Some field and state office personnel, particularly those with Ph.D.'s, objected to being required to take the course. Sanders, who also wanted to teach some courses, obtained an appointment as associate professor of agricultural education, an appointment which he held along with his appointment as director but for which he was not paid additional money.14

Director Sanders stated that Pesson had the wholehearted approval of the LSU administration. He had gotten his doctorate at LSU in vocational agricultural education.15 But he received a 4-H Fellowship which enabled him to study in Washington, D. C., for twelve months; he was then permitted to go to the National Extension Center in Wisconsin for one semester. These various outside credits were transferred to LSU. Summarizing the assets of Pesson, Sanders said, "Here was a top young man who everyone knew was bright and who had valuable outside experience."

"After employing Pesson, it was not long until we began
to think in terms of a doctorate program in Extension Education," Director Sanders related. "We learned as we went along." The first proposal to establish an Ed.D. in Extension Education, Sanders explained, "was turned down flat because we had assumed it was so self-evident to everyone that Extension needed a doctorate that we had not done any groundwork."

Within a few days of passing his doctoral examination, Pesson was told by Director Sanders, "This is what I want you to do. First, I want you to switch from 4-H Club work to being a professor of Extension Education. This is necessary because the university is not satisfied with our master's program. Second, I want you to spruce it up, clean it up, and I want a doctoral proposal a year from now."

The importance of the preceding leadership role of Dr. Sanders as the director (or Chief Executive Officer--CEO) of the Extension Service is described in the following excerpt of an article in the Harvard Business Review entitled "Why History Matters to Managers."

. . . One of the most important things a CEO can say is, "This is our philosophy, this is the general direction in which we are going, this is the perspective from which we need to view the issues before us at the moment." Having a historical concept supplies a solid reference point.

. . . It seems to me that history in business is not useful just as a kind of academic or intellectual exercise. It has to do with an established set of facts—in the same way that a financial exhibit has to do with an established set of numbers—which one then has to interpret. An underlying concept or vision is fundamental to all the major decisions that get made at
the top of a corporation. 16

In the accomplishment of the tasks assigned to him by Director Sanders, Professor Pesson and his colleagues certainly benefited from Sanders's clearly stated philosophy.

The first doctoral proposal included a request to confer both a Ph.D. and an Ed.D. Pesson proposed letting the students choose the degree they preferred. However, Sanders acknowledged that, because he was not prepared to make the presentation, it was unanimously rejected by the Committee on Courses and Curriculum in the College of Agriculture. He still said that the Ph.D. had two disadvantages for Extension work: (1) the foreign languages were not necessary and (2) too many research courses were required. 17

Pesson also believed they were correct in their rejection for these reasons: First, he characterized himself as a neophyte; second, he was a one-man faculty; third, the masters program had not been cleaned up; and fourth, Extension Education was uncertain about its future direction. It was a neophyte discipline and had not been conceptualized clearly. The methodology developed by Tyler, however, provided the theoretical framework which made it possible to present clearly the objectives and purposes of the proposed Extension Education program. Stated straightforwardly by Pesson, "We now knew what we were and
what we wanted to be."18

The LSU Graduate Catalogue, 1962–64 reveals that Pesson had implemented at least part of his assignment from Director Sanders—he had expanded the course offerings and for the first time there was more than one faculty member, Dr. J. H. Jones, Jr.:

Two options are offered to students, Plan A and Plan B. Under Plan A, the student is required to complete a minimum of thirty semester hours of course work including a thesis. Plan B requires a minimum of thirty-six semester hours of course work without a thesis. Detailed information on degree requirements are available upon request.

170. THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE. I; 3 cr. Mr. Pesson.

200. THE EXTENSION SPECIALIST. II; 3 cr.
Prerequisite: Registration by permission of the instructor only. Mr. Pesson.

209. THE 4-H CLUB PROGRAM. II; 3 cr.
Prerequisite: Course 170. Mr. Pesson

210. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK. I; 3 cr.
Prerequisite: Course 170 and at least two years experience in Extension work. Mr. Pesson

211. LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK. II; 3 cr.
Prerequisite: Course 170 and one year of experience in Extension work. Mr. Jones

216. EVALUATION OF EXTENSION WORK. II; 3 cr.
Prerequisite: A basic course in statistics at the graduate level. Mr. Jones

265. RESEARCH PROBLEMS IN COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK. I, II; 3 cr. Staff.
Prerequisite: Course 216.

270. ADVANCED EXTENSION METHODS. I; 3 cr.
Prerequisite: Course 170 and two years of experience in Extension work; or five years of experience; or by permission of the instructor. Mr. Pesson.

300. THESIS RESEARCH. I, II; 1–6 cr.
Amount of credit to be stated at time of registration.19

Professor Pesson and his staff would continue to develop professionally as reflected in the ongoing
refinements made to the Extension Education curriculum. For example, Pesson was introduced to Dr. Ralph W. Tyler, author of the book, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949), in which he described his concepts of education which revolutionized Extension Education. Also, the concepts of Tyler were introduced nationally through a series of seminars which Pesson was instrumental in setting up.

The *LSU Graduate Catalog, 1966-68* revealed that these changes had taken place since the 1962-64 one was published.

1) Dr. Edward W. Gassie had replaced Dr. Bob Dolan who had been employed by Extension on June 10, 1963, as an Associate Specialist in Training and Professor of Extension Education, and who resigned on August 17, 1964. Gassie had joined the faculty on January 14, 1965, and was assigned these courses:
   a) 209. THE 4-H CLUB PROGRAM II
   b) 211. LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK. II

2) Course 200, THE EXTENSION SPECIALIST. II, was deleted.

3) Course 170, THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE. I., was assigned to the staff rather than to Dr. Pesson.

In 1966, after courses were straightened out and faculty was expanded, a new effort was initiated to establish a doctoral program in Extension Education. Pesson was then able to focus more clearly on what was needed in the program because of his familiarity with the work of Tyler. Using the Tyler rationale, a committee of the resident faculty of the College of Agriculture began by looking at the job that was being performed by extension personnel. By defining it, and then determining what it
would take to equip a person to do that job in relation to the person's background, academic models were considered and a firmer concept of Extension Education training programs was made.

This resulted in an entirely new degree being proposed, a Doctor of Agricultural Science, which was a blend of technical and social science material geared to Extension Education. A joint major would have resulted if the degree had been approved. It was a good proposal which some of the leadership in the College of Agriculture accepted and it was passed by the Committee on Courses and Curriculum with a few dissenting votes. However, the Dean of the College of Agriculture, Dr. J. Norman Efferson, called a meeting of his entire graduate faculty. An entire afternoon was devoted to discussing, debating and arguing the merits of the proposals. The resulting vote was roughly a 50-50 split. Based on this, Dean Efferson tabled the proposal.

These refinements in the 1966-68 Extension Education curriculum are reflected in the LSU Catalog, 1968-70. Note that the course list included a course description for the first time.

1) Dr. Bruce Flint had been added to the faculty on February 1, 1967, and was assigned this course:
   210. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT. II; 3 cr.
   The development of effective Extension Education Programs. Mr. Flint

2) Dr. Mary Louise Collings had been added to the faculty and was assigned this new course:
   213. CURRENT PROBLEMS AND APPROACHES IN EXTENSION EDUCATION. I; 3 cr.
   Application of research findings in solving
problems of Extension teaching. Perquisite: Course 211 or permission of instructor. Miss Collings

Dr. Collings (1902— ), the first woman to teach Extension Education at LSU, was appointed as a visiting professor on July 10, 1967, and served to August 8, 1968. She was first employed by the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service in 1927 but resigned on September 1, 1944. Collings left the Louisiana Service to accept employment with the Federal Extension Service and when she retired from her federal appointment, she accepted the visiting professorship at LSU for one academic year to teach Extension Education. After this she moved to North Carolina where she worked with Edgar Boone in the North Carolina Extension Service.

The remaining courses for 1968-70, their description, prerequisites and assigned staff follow:

170. COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, I; 3 cr.
An overview of Cooperative Extension Work. Mr. Gassie.

211. LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION, II; 3 cr.
Organizing and leading Extension Education Programs. Mr. Gassie.

216. EVALUATION AND RESEARCH METHODS, I; 3 cr.
Concepts and principles of evaluation and research applied to problems in Extension Education. Prerequisite: A basic course in Statistics at the graduate level or permission of the instructor. Mr. Jones.

265. RESEARCH PROBLEMS, I, II; 3 cr.
Prerequisite: Course 216. Staff.

270. ADVANCED EXTENSION EDUCATION. I; 3 cr.
Prerequisite: Advanced graduate standing and permission of the instructor. Mr. Pesson.

300. THESIS RESEARCH. I, II; 1-6 cr.
Amount of credit to be stated at time of registration.
A reconsideration of the doctoral proposal began with Pesson, Jones, Gassie and Flint as the faculty. Dean Efferson established a committee composed of the heads of several departments from the College of Agriculture with Pesson as chairman. This committee discussed and studied the proposed Extension Education degree program for about six months. They then recommended an Ed.D. degree and a separate Department of Extension Education within the School of Vocational Education rather than simply a curriculum of study within the latter School. Even the head of Vocational Education, Dr. C. L. Mondart, who had replaced Dr. Floyd, concurred with this recommendation and agreed that this was the way the program should be set up. The proposal was approved.

The "Degree Programs in Extension Education" brochure provides this information:

In 1968, the Department of Extension and International Education added a program leading to the Doctor of Education degree in Extension Education through the Graduate School. This innovative program leads to a degree that is considered professional in nature. It is designed to give the practitioner a solid, fundamental background in the subject matter he teaches and the process of educational change in informal situations, plus the competency to conduct evaluation studies and to interpret and analyze research findings.

Thus, with a doctorate program established in Extension Education, a heretofore elusive goal finally became reality. In the LSU Graduate Catalogue, 1970-72, the Doctor of Education, Ed.D, degree is described for the first time.
SCHOOL OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION  
Extension Education  
M.S., Ed.D.

The Doctor of Education degree program requires a minimum of 84 semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree including at least: 30 semester hours in educational change; 30 semester hours in an area of technical concentration; and 12 semester hours in research methodology and statistics. Qualifications for admission include: master's degree in Extension Education or a related field; two years experience in Extension or similar work; and acceptance by a screening committee appointed by the Graduate School Dean. Detailed requirements can be obtained from the Head of the Department.^^

Course changes in the Extension Education curriculum which were mandated by the establishment of the Ed.D. degree included the addition of these five courses and dissertation research.

151. COMMUNICATIONS IN EXTENSION EDUCATION. II; 3 cr.  
The synthesis and application of concepts and principles of communications in an extension education program. Mr. Gassie.

175. PRINCIPLES OF ADULT EDUCATION. II; 3 cr.  
Nature, scope, and importance of adult education; some social and psychological factors that affect adult motivation and learning; and methods and techniques for providing adult learning experiences. Mr. Flint.

176. INFORMAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH. II; 3 cr.  
The organization, leadership and evaluation of informal youth education programs.

269. COMPARATIVE EXTENSION EDUCATION. II; 3 cr.  
A comparative analysis of the various systems of extension education on a worldwide basis and the factors affecting the various systems. Prerequisite: Agricultural Economics 184 and Sociology 201 or equivalent. Mr. Pesson.

280. ADVANCED RESEARCH DESIGN. II, 3 cr.  
An advanced course in research design with emphasis on research concepts and their application to extension education. Prerequisite: Course 216. Mr. Jones.

400. DISSERTATION RESEARCH. I, II; 1-9 cr.  
Amount of credit to be stated at time of registration. Staff.

Another course change involved Course 213, which in...
1968-70, was listed as CURRENT PROBLEMS AND APPROACHES IN EXTENSION EDUCATION, an application of solving problems of Extension teaching. It was redirected and renamed as follows.

213. PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF EXTENSION EDUCATION. 1; 3 cr.
   Synthesis and application of learning and teaching concepts in the execution of an extension educational program. Prerequisite: Course 210 or permission of instructor. Mr. Gassie.28

The first Ed.D. graduate from the Department of Extension Education was William Howard Smith who received his degree in the Spring of 1971. The title of his dissertation is an "Analysis of Factors Associated with the Present and Future Emphases of the Florida Cooperative Extension Service."29

Pesson related that two key things took place which helped insure the establishment of the new doctoral program and the creation of the new Department of Extension Education. First and foremost, the new faculty were accepted as equal professors by the academic community in general and specifically by those in the College of Agriculture. As an example, Pesson said, without boasting, that he felt that they had achieved this goal when he was chosen by his colleagues in the College of Agriculture to represent them when the faculty Senate was first established. Pesson later became Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, which is a positive reflection on the Extension Department which he previously served as head.
Pesson pointed out that the department evolved and matured from a department headed by practitioners, who, although they were dedicated, had only master's degrees, to a department headed by professionals with doctoral degrees. Because of its early history, a conscientious and concerted effort had to be made to overcome the stigma caused by some people who believed that the Extension degree was not academically distinguished. Second, course instruction was clarified for graduate training and the decision was made to establish a professional degree.

In regard to the "international" component of the Department of Extension and International Education, Pesson explained the genesis of it. Historically, he said, the Extension Education Department was assigned the responsibility for coordinating the training of foreign visitors. For a while, in fact, Pesson was called "Coordinator of International Programs for the College of Agriculture." His other two titles were "Specialist, Extension Education," and "Professor and Head, Department of Extension Education." The functions of Coordinator of International Programs were eventually combined into a Department of Extension and International Education.

As the department grew and developed, it began to attract foreign students who wanted degrees in Extension Education. One such student was Dr. Satish Verma, who first came to LSU from his native India to work on a master degree
in Extension Education, which he received in 1965.\textsuperscript{30} He was sponsored by FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations) of Rome. In 1970, he returned to acquire his doctorate in Extension Education at LSU, which was awarded to him in 1971.\textsuperscript{31} Verma was first employed as an Instructor in the Department of Extension Education on March 25, 1970, promoted to an Assistant Professor on December 18, 1971, then to an Associate Professor on July 1, 1976, and finally to full Professor on July 1, 1981.\textsuperscript{32} Verma was the first non-American teacher of Extension at LSU.

The success of the Extension Education program at LSU, Pesson believed, can be seen from the fact that Extension had one of the larger doctoral programs on campus in the late 1970's. It was well accepted, particularly in the South.\textsuperscript{33}

Summary of Growth Period, 1960-1973:
Dr. Lynn L. Pesson

In summary, a number of "firsts" occurred in the Extension Education Department under the leadership of Dr. Lynn L. Pesson from 1960 to 1973. Most prominent of these was the establishment by him and his staff of Extension Education as a Department within the School of Vocational Agriculture in 1968 and Extension's achieving its long-sought authority to grant a Doctorate in Extension Education, an Ed.D., also in 1968.

These outstanding achievements were based on carefully laid plans, which included the expansion of the staff from a
"one man Department" to one staffed with professional and doctoral-degreed faculty. Among the expanded faculty were: Dr. J. H. Jones, Jr., who was added in 1959, Dr. Bob Dolan, 1963, Dr. Edward W. Gassie, 1965, Dr. Bruce Flint, 1967 and the first woman to teach Extension Education at LSU, Dr. Mary Louise Collings, 1967, and the first non-native teacher, Dr. Satish Verma, 1970.

The first student for whom Jones served as major professor was Earl E. Hodgkins, who was graduated with an M.S. in January 1960. Pesson's first student for whom he was the major professor was Minus Joseph Granger, who received his M.S. degree in January 1961.34

The successes were made possible because of a team-approach taken by Pesson and the unfailing support from the Directors of the Louisiana Extension Service, Dr. H. C. Sanders, who served from 1940 to 1961, and Mr. John A. Cox, who served from 1961 to 1978; the Head of Vocational Education, Dr. J. C. "Red" Floyd; and the Dean and later Chancellor of the Agricultural Center, Dr. J. Norman Efferson.

Table 11 presents a numeric summary of Pesson's tenure as head of the Extension Education Department in terms of the number and type of degrees granted. Of 169 graduates who received masters degrees during Pesson's tenure, 140 chose the thesis option while 29 chose the non-thesis option.
The next section will deal with the period of "Maturity," 1973-1985, when the Department was led by Edward W. Gassie.

TABLE 11

NUMBER AND TYPE OF DEGREES GRANTED
BY RESIDENCE OF STUDENT
1960-1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DEGREES</th>
<th>LOUISIANA</th>
<th>OTHER STATES</th>
<th>INTER-</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS*</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maturity, 1973-1985: Dr. Edward W. Gassie

When Dr. Gassie joined the Extension Service in 1951, he did so as an Assistant County Agent for 4-H Club work in Caddo Parish. Mr. Neal R. Dry was serving then as the County Agent. In August of 1955, Dr. Gassie was selected as the Associate State 4-H Club Agent and was moved to the state office in Baton Rouge. Calvin Shirley was the State 4-H Club Agent at the time. (See Chapter XI for further references on 4-H Clubs.) Gassie served as the Associate 4-H Club State Agent from 1955 to 1958.

In 1958, Dr. Sanders restructured the State organization from four to three Districts as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT NAME</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PARISHES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central-Southwest</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of these were staffed with program specialists for agriculture, home economics and 4-H. Gassie became the 4-H Club Program Supervisor for the Southeast District, which consisted of twenty-two parishes and was headquartered in Baton Rouge. Because this district was only a portion of the state, it relieved Gassie of statewide travel and also gave him a greater opportunity to observe the impact of his actions and contributions. He served in this capacity until 1964.

In 1965, Gassie received his Ph.D. degree from LSU in agricultural education; his masters was in extension education. The title of Gassie's dissertation was "Factors Associated With Job Performance of Assistant and Associate County Agents Doing 4-H Club Work." After receiving his doctorate, Gassie was asked by Pesson to join him as a part-time professor of Extension Education and to also work as a part-time specialist in the Staff Training and Development Division.

In 1973, Gassie became head of the Extension Education Department when Pesson became Vice Chancellor. When Gassie joined the Department in 1965 with his joint appointment as Extension Specialist for Staff Development and Associate Professor of Extension Education, his time was allocated approximately 25 percent and 75 percent between teaching and staff training, respectively. In 1986, it was 50-50.

By 1974-75, the Extension courses were listed by the
new four-digit computer identification numbers and they assumed the arrangement and content which they continued to exhibit up to 1986 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4010 (170)</td>
<td>COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK (3)</td>
<td>Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4011 (151)</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION IN EXTENSION EDUCATION (3)</td>
<td>Gassie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4025 (175)</td>
<td>PRINCIPLES OF ADULT EDUCATION (3)</td>
<td>Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4026 (176)</td>
<td>INFORMAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH (3)</td>
<td>Pesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7030 (210)</td>
<td>PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7031 (213)</td>
<td>PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF EXTENSION (3)</td>
<td>Gassie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7032 (211)</td>
<td>LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION (3)</td>
<td>Pesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7036 (216)</td>
<td>EVALUATION AND RESEARCH METHODS.</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7039 (269)</td>
<td>COMPARATIVE EXTENSION EDUCATION (3)</td>
<td>Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7040 (270)</td>
<td>ADVANCED EXTENSION EDUCATION (3)</td>
<td>Pesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7050 (280)</td>
<td>ADVANCED RESEARCH DESIGN (3)</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000 (300)</td>
<td>THESIS RESEARCH (1-9 sem.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8900 (350)</td>
<td>RESEARCH PROBLEMS (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000 (400)</td>
<td>DISSERTATION RESEARCH (1-9 sem.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although not listed above, Douglas Darden, who was an Editorial Specialist with the Cooperative Extension Service, taught gratis one three-hour course from August to December 1974. On January 1, 1975, he became an Associate Professor of Extension Education and remained as such until his resignation on June 30, 1976.

In 1980-81, the Graduate Faculty of Extension was composed of:

Professors: Flint, Gassie, Jones, Pesson;
Associate Professors: McFatter, Soileau, Verma; and
Assistant Professors: Williams.

Dr. Bobbie McFatter became the first permanent woman faculty member when she joined the Extension Education Department in 1977 as an Assistant Professor after completing her doctorate in Extension Education in 1976. On June 1, 1980, she became an Associate Professor. In 1979, Dr. Robert Soileau became an Associate Professor. The first
Black teacher of Extension was Dr. Leodrey Williams who became an Assistant Professor on January 1, 1979. Williams was also a product of the Extension Education Department, having obtained his doctorate degree there in 1975. On April 1, 1980, he transferred to Southern University as the Administrator of the 1890 Extension Program and was appointed Adjunct Assistant Professor of Extension on July 1, 1980.

The only teaching assignment which changed in 1980-81 from 1974-75 were for the following courses:

- **4010 COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK (3)** Williams
- **4011 COMMUNICATIONS IN EXTENSION EDUCATION (3)** McFatter
- **4025 PRINCIPLES OF ADULT EDUCATION (3)** McFatter
- **7032 LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION (3)** Soileau
- **8900 RESEARCH PROBLEM (1-6)** Verma

Course number 4026, **INFORMAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH (3)**, which was previously taught by Pesson, was not listed.

By 1985-86, these individuals composed the Graduate Faculty in Extension Education:

Professors: Gassie, Jones, McFatter, Pesson; Verma; and

Associate Professors: Kotrlik and Soileau.

Although her appointment on January 1, 1985, was too late for inclusion in the **Graduate Catalog** for 1985-86, Dr. Barbara Holt was appointed as an Associate Professor in both Home Economics and Extension Education, in which she was continuing in 1986.

On March 1, 1980, Flint became the full-time Associate
Director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service but continued to hold his professorial appointment in the department. At the end of 1985, McFatter, who was devoting all of her time to the Extension Service, where she served as the Division Leader of Home Economics and Specialist in Family Resource Management, relinquished her classroom responsibilities but maintained her professorial rank and serves as an affiliate member of the graduate faculty.\(^7\)

Dr. Joe Kotrlik was also an Associate Professor in Vocational Agriculture Education and first taught Extension Education in July 1, 1983.\(^8\)

Faculty assignments were not included in the 1985-86 issue of the LSU Graduate Catalog. The courses, however, were identified by new symbols of the semester in which they would be offered—"S" = Spring; "Su" = Summer and "F" = Fall rather than the formerly used ones—"I" = First or Fall Semester and "II" = Second or Spring Semester.

Also, these two additional courses were new:

- **7041 SEMINAR IN EXTENSION EDUCATION (1) F**
  May be taken twice for credit. Pass-fail grading.
- **7900 INDEPENDENT STUDY IN EXTENSION EDUCATION (3)**
  May be taken twice for credit. Independent study under the guidance of the graduate faculty.

And, course number **4026, INFORMAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH (3) S**, was again listed. Grading for both 8000, THESIS and 9000, DISSERTATION RESEARCH, was given as "S"/"U"—"Satisfactory"/"Unsatisfactory."\(^9\)

In response to the question about what was his most
satisfying or greatest achievement in Extension work, Gassie confided that his choice would be the establishment of the doctoral program in Extension Education and the subsequent benefits which accrued because of it. He also rated it as one of his greatest challenges. The establishment of the program was not easy, according to Professor Gassie, because, "It took us seven solid years to convince our own people that a doctoral program in Extension Education was needed." Numerous meetings, conferences and councils were held with faculty and administrators.

The intention of the Extension Service from the beginning was to establish a unique doctoral program in Extension Education for the professional Extension development practitioner— not a Ph.D. in research but an Ed.D. in applied teaching for the Extension field workers. The envisioned curriculum was to train the student for his job better than the traditional Ph.D. program. This argument ultimately convinced the administrators of the merits of having the new program over the objections of individual departments which were contending that they could train the Extension workers. Professional jealousies, as well as the perceived threat from the existing departments that they would be deprived of students, had to be overcome.

However, when the proponents for the Ed.D. Program pointed out that students in their program would be required to take 30 hours in other departments, since it would be an
interdisciplinary degree, this turned the tide of opposition. The opposition now saw the Ed.D. Program as a potential generator of students rather than as a depriver of students.

Administratively, Extension Education remained a part of the School of Vocational Education since it was established in 1950. Among those whom Gassie recalled as being most instrumental in the establishment of the Department of Extension Education were Dean Hanchey of the College of Agriculture, H. C. Sanders, Director of the Extension Service, and Lynn Pesson formerly head of the Department and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs in 1986. While diplomatically not citing himself, it must be recorded that Gassie played an integral role in finalizing the arrangements for the Extension Department because Pesson was in Malaysia from January 1, 1967, to September 1, 1968, helping to establish their four-year agricultural university.

In the College of Agriculture, only the Departments of Home Economics and Food Science competed with the Extension Education Department in terms of the number of graduate students in the 1970's. There were approximately 250 Malaysian students at LSU—which made them one of the largest foreign student bodies at one university in the U.S. (The Morning Advocate, October 1, 1984, p. 3-B, confirmed this in their article entitled "Data Shows LSU with Large
Population of Foreign Students." LSU was ranked 14th with 2,130 students. ". . . many students from Third World nations are attracted by LSU's agricultural offerings and engineering courses, two skills that are needed in any nation that is trying to move from subsistence agriculture to an industrial economy [according to Erin Schmidt, director of international students at LSU.]." One factor which helps to explain why so many Malaysians choose LSU is that LSU Extension and other Agricultural Center staff assisted with the establishment of the College of Agriculture in Malaysia. Both Pesson and Flint spent a year in Malaysia. Additionally, Gassie pointed out that Louisiana's climate is very similar to that of Southeast Asia and Central and South America. He also noted that our basic crops, rice and sugar cane, are their staples.

A size-type factor was responsible for the large number of Malaysians students at LSU as well. Having a large group enabled the Malaysians to be almost self-sufficient in many ways. Gassie explained that, because of this, the Malaysians had a lot of native organizations at LSU for self support, such as a loan fund and built-in baby sitters. Their large numbers enabled them to practically transport their complete culture to LSU. This would not have been possible if they had been fewer in number. Because this condition existed at LSU, the University received the best advertisement—word-of-mouth—to potential students in
Another attraction of foreign students to LSU was the reputation of former Chancellor J. Norman Efferson, an internationally known expert on the production, processing and marketing of rice. Chancellor Efferson established a philanthropic Agriculture Development Council--ADC--to which the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations contributed support. Because of it and Dr. Efferson's many international contacts, additional foreign students were drawn to LSU.

The way for the developing countries to increase their agricultural production, according to Gassie, is more through informal training as taught in Extension Education--than through the traditional classroom. When LSU arrived in Malaysia, Malaysian students were being trained in the classical British tradition. This included use of rote memorization of the scientific names, which is of no use to a Malaysian farmer wanting to increase his production.

The demand for admittance to the Department of Extension Education in the 1970's was greater than its staff could accommodate; therefore, the number of international students was limited. From the roster of Extension staff it appeared that there were seven full-time faculty members. Actually, many of these were part-time. In fact, there were only 1.94 full-time equivalents. (At LSU, if a faculty appointment was full-time, the person was considered to be contributing 100 percent of his time to teaching; that is,
he would be a full-time equivalent. However, if he was contributing only 50 percent of his time, he would have been considered to be a .50 full-time equivalent. The 1.94 full-time equivalent for Extension Education was calculated as follows: Gassie, .50; Jones, .49; Pesson, .20; Verma, .35; Soileau; Kotrlik, .10 and Holt.20 = 1.94.) Some faculty members only contribute 10 percent of their time to teaching in the Extension Education Department. In fact, since Extension Education never had full-time academic appointments, this resulted in faculty-to-student ratio of roughly 1:50—not the most desirable academic situation.

An equally important consideration in determining how the Department of Extension Education was able to function with a low full-time faculty equivalent was the overall guiding philosophy which characterized Extension Education from its inception to maturity, namely its interdisciplinary nature. For example, roughly only one-third of an Extension Education doctoral student's 84 hours were required to be taken in educational changes courses in the Extension Education Department; one-third were to be taken in the area of technical concentration, such as the socio-economic sciences, plant sciences, animal sciences, home economics or agricultural engineering; and one-third in the field of research methodology and statistical analysis. Hence, because Extension Education was interdisciplinary, it was able to operate by using the faculty in the fields of
concentration of its students to supplement its own faculty. Also, although an Extension Education faculty member was part-time on a yearly calculation, the member often devoted a disproportionate amount of his time to teaching during the school semester.

To keep the faculty-to-student ratio respectable as well as manageable, the number of enrolling international students had to be restricted. The triage method practiced by Extension Education on applicant students follows. Gassie said that preference was first given to Louisiana state residents, second to other U.S. residents and, third to international students. Gassie acknowledged that it was difficult to limit admittance when it had been requested, particularly when there was an accompanying overwhelming need for improving agricultural production in the native country of the applicant student. International students composed roughly 20 percent of Extension's total enrollment and these were selected on the basis of who had the highest grade point average.

Most of the international students returned to their home countries to teach or to interact in other ways with individuals who have an interest and need for graduate work in Extension Education, such as the Malaysian Rubber Research Institute or the Federal Land Development Agency. Again, the word-of-mouth advertisement which resulted from the returning LSU-trained students filling these positions,
Gassie believed, was responsible for LSU's large enrollment of international students.

It is important to note here that Gassie knew of no U.S. Land Grant institution which awarded an undergraduate degree in Extension Education. This statement, of course, includes LSU. He also differentiated Extension Education from Vocational Agriculture degrees, which are awarded to teachers for use in secondary education, usually high school, but which are undergraduate degrees. Approximately 75 percent of the Land Grant Institutions award a master's in Extension Education. This arose because they also administered the Cooperative Extension Program, and from observing this staff, they determined that additional training was needed in specialized areas, such as human behavior management, theories of social change, e.g., adoption and diffusion from rural sociology. The objective here was to supplement the specialty degrees of their staff whether at the undergraduate, master's or even doctoral level. It was the latter group which was least convinced initially of the value or benefits of additional training in Extension Education.

With the awarding of the doctoral degree, the Ed.D. or Doctor of Education in Extension Education, LSU joined a rather unique and exclusive group of universities. Gassie believed that there were only three universities in the U.S. which awarded this degree, which has been granted by LSU.
since 1968.

If money had not been a constraint, one requirement which Gassie believed would have been an academic improvement in the training of international students would have been to have had them return to their native country and to have conducted their thesis and dissertation research there. However, instituting this requirement was not practical since no sponsor provided for this in their student grants. Gassie underscored his point by explaining that just the cost for airfare between the U.S. and Malaysia was about $2,000 in 1978. In the absence of this ideal solution, most international students were reluctantly permitted to substitute additional courses for thesis credit. Attempts to permit students to gather data by correspondence did not prove workable.

The Extension Education Department has made invaluable contributions to the improvement of not only Louisiana agriculture but also international agriculture by stressing this concept: "One must begin an agricultural education program where the people are. Don't assume. One of the greatest errors is to assume that your clients know more about your subject than they really do!"^0

Summary of Maturity Period, 1973-1985:
Dr. Edward W. Gassie

To summarize Dr. Gassie's leadership, he nurtured and sustained the Department of Extension and International Education. He had helped create the department as well as
the doctoral program in 1968 while serving as a faculty member after his appointment in 1965, so he was committed to its educational philosophy. The core of pioneering faculty, consisting of Jones, Flint, Verma and Pesson (who continued to teach selected courses after his appointment as Vice Chancellor) was expanded. The expanded faculty included the first permanent woman faculty member, Dr. Bobbie McFatter, in 1977, and the first Black teacher of Extension, Dr. Leodrey Williams, in 1979. Courses were also refined and expanded.

With Dr. Gassie as chairman, only the Departments of Home Economics and Food Science competed with Extension Education in terms of the number of graduate students in the 1970's. Out of the 118 master degrees granted, 70 were under the thesis option while 48 were non-thesis. Many were international students from Malaysia, Southeast Asia, and Central and South America as is shown in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DEGREES</th>
<th>LOUISIANA</th>
<th>OTHER STATES</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS*</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATES</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section deals with the transition of the Department of Extension and International Education into a
new Department of Agricultural, Extension, and International Education.

New Horizons, 1985- : Dr. William B. Richardson

When the oil and gas-dependent State Legislature started to look for places to cut the budget in 1985 (the price of a barrel of oil had fallen from $30 per barrel in 1980 to $14 per barrel in 1986, which caused a decline in state severance tax revenues of $50,000,000 for every $1 drop in the price of a barrel of oil), academic institutions were not spared in the budget cuts. One of the adjustments which the LSU Board of Supervisors made to this new reality was to merge the Department of Extension and International Education with the Department of Vocational Agricultural Education to form a new Department of Agricultural, Extension, and International Education on January 31, 1986. Dr. William B. Richardson was appointed chairman of the new department.

With professional acceptance of the fait accompli, Dr. Gassie acknowledged that this change certainly had definite advantages for Extension Education if Extension could maintain its identity. Gassie saw the importance of a continuing identity for Extension in the fact that there were so few degree programs at the doctoral level in Extension in the U.S. (According to a survey conducted by the Federal Extension Service in 1984, out of 56 possible university respondents, 44 returned the questionnaire and of
these only six had a specific doctoral program in Extension Education.\textsuperscript{51} Gassie felt that Extension, with the correct emphasis, would continue to be a drawing card for both state, national and international students. This was not, Gassie said, any criticism of the doctoral degree program in Vocational Agricultural Education but merely a recognition of the general availability of this degree at almost all Land Grant Universities in the U.S.

In fact, Gassie was quite complimentary of the new arrangement when he pointed out that more resources would be available to Extension since they could now call upon the expertise of the entire faculty of the new department. He optimistically stated, "They have a young faculty which is well trained in research methodology and statistics, like Mike Burnett."\textsuperscript{52}

The transition changed the curriculum very little since the same Extension courses which had been previously available were also available in the new department. A student majoring in Extension Education would simply concentrate his course work in Extension rather than in Vocational Agricultural Education. The major change which occurred was that an Ed.D. degree would no longer be granted; a Ph.D. would be granted for either a concentration in Extension or Vocational Education, which meant that Extension became more research-oriented. Required hours were increased from 84 beyond a bachelor's to 90, with all
of the increase being in the research field. Gassie indicated that the following courses would constitute the new curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and Statistics</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension (or Vocational) Education</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor(s) and Electives</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No more appropriate quote with which to end this section could be found than that which is inscribed on the National Archives: "The Past is Prologue."

**Summary**

Extension Education began in the Vocational Education Department in 1950 as a course of study at the masters level; it was made a separate Department of Extension and International Education in 1968 and authorized to grant an Ed. D. degree at the same time; and in 1986 it was merged with the Department of Vocational Agricultural Education to form a new Department of Agricultural, Extension, and International Education--thus an "ending" became a "beginning."

Extension Education's 35 year history in term of number of degrees awarded is shown in Table 13. When Director Sanders began the Extension Education Program, he did so under this mandate from the University President: If Extension was to receive additional funding, it must upgrade its staff academically. To meet this mandate, Davis and O'Quin concentrated completely on in-service training to
upgrade Extension's own professional staff.

Under Pesson, efforts continued to be largely directed toward the upgrading of Extension's own personnel, which consisted of a combination of older as well as younger staff. However, some efforts were directed to attracting out-of-state and international students who did begin to enroll in the Program.

During Gassie's tenure, there was a decline in enrollment attributable to the upgrading of Extension's own staff because only newer personnel were being drawn upon since, for the most part, the older personnel had already participated. There was, however, a large increase in out-of-state and international students.

It would be premature to offer any analysis of Richardson's term because not enough time elapsed to establish a pattern.

At the present time (December 1986), Richardson serves as Associate Dean of the College of Agriculture and Gassie is Acting Head of the new Department of Agricultural, Extension and International Education.
TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF EXTENSION EDUCATION UNDER DIFFERENT LEADERSHIP
IN TERMS OF NUMBER AND TYPE OF DEGREES GRANTED
BY RESIDENCE OF STUDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION LEADERS</th>
<th>MASTERS</th>
<th>DOCTORATES</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>OS*</td>
<td>IN*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING, 1950-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Claude W. Davis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Julius M. O'Quin</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROWTH 1960-73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lynn L. Pesson</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATURITY, 1973-85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Edward Gassie</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HORIZONS, 1985-***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. W. B. Richardson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OS = Other State
*IN = International
**A doctoral program in Extension Education was not established until 1968.
***As of 30 May 1986

A doctoral program in Extension Education was not established until 1968.
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CHAPTER VI
LOUISIANA EXTENSION'S IMPACT
ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Introduction

In the book Adult and Continuing Education Through the Cooperative Extension Service, the authors Warren Prawl, Roger Medlin and John Gross examine international extension in their Chapter 9 titled "A Look at Extension Service Around the World." They hold:

Man has always battled Mother Nature in order to grow enough food to survive. But when the Green Revolution of the 1960's came along some agricultural scientists began to predict that this was all behind. They said that a modern agriculture based on the latest scientific findings would be able to provide sufficient food for everyone.

Unfortunately, this has not happened. Millions of people still go to bed hungry each night. Nutritionists and population experts write that 10 percent to 12 percent of the world's 4 billion plus people are either hungry or malnourished or both. Yet many agronomists and economists insist that the present land base and available technology are adequate to produce enough food for today's population.

The solution which they posit for the preceding problem follows.

The only solution is deceptively simple: The additional food required must come from an expansion of the productive capacities in those countries of the world where the shortages exist. There is no other road to food sufficiency. The Cooperative Extension Service must contribute fully to this effort.

The role played by the personnel of Louisiana Cooperative
Extension Service (LCES) in seeking to fulfill this mandate will now be considered.

Also, the importance of the sociological role theory will be evident in this chapter because so many of the Extension staff have joint appointments or have portions of their time allocated to academic departments or to the Experiment Station. For example, Dr. J. H. Jones, Jr., devotes time to the Rural Sociology Department, to teaching Extension Education courses and to serving the LCES in the areas of research and program analysis. This has resulted in "synergistic" benefits and has served to substantiate the wisdom of the founding father, Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, in having a partnership administration of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Because of this overlapping responsibilities caused by individual Extension staff occupying different status-positions with regard to the LCES, LSU and even the Experiment Stations, it is therefore often difficult to equitably allocate credit to an individual organization when all three have staff participating in a particular project. This will be true of almost all the projects and activities which follow. However, no attempt is being made to minimize the role or responsibility of the other entities even though consideration is being given under the rubric of the Extension Service.

The remainder of this section will consist of
information provided by interviewees who have directed most of Extension's and LSU's efforts in international agriculture. The remarks are grouped according to a scheme suggested by Dr. Lynn L. Pesson, presently Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Dr. Pesson suggested that the role of Extension in international agriculture could be viewed two ways: (1) by looking at programs which Extension and LSU administered to international participants at its Baton Rouge campus and (2) by looking at the programs which Extension administered in the host countries. These viewpoints will form the division for the remainder of this section and will be considered under these titles respectively, (1) Extension's International Activities at Home and (2) Extension's International Activities Abroad.

Extension's International Activities at Home

Audubon Sugar School

Louisiana has long been viewed as a leader in the sugar industry. Director Denver T. Loupe said this was particularly true in the engineering aspect of the industry. It was commonly acknowledged for many, many years that one could not go to a sugar mill anywhere in the world without finding an LSU graduate. This held true until the early 1970's.

During the 1930's LSU had a deep involvement with international agriculture through its commitment to research in the area of sugarcane technology. According to
Chancellor J. Norman Efferson, LSU then operated and continues to operate the only school of its kind in the world, the Audubon Sugar School. This school provides education for sugar chemists and sugar managers from all over the world. In fact, this involvement with international sugar production began before the Civil War soon after LSU was established as a university.

The reason for this development was simple: sugarcane was Louisiana's most important crop. It continues to be an important crop although no longer the most important in the state. Since most of the sugarcane was grown in the tropics and few educational institutions were located there, LSU developed into the top sugar center in the world.

The preponderance of LSU graduates in this field is demonstrated by Chancellor Efferson when he points out that he has encountered LSU graduates in Indonesia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Central and South America. A tremendous number of graduates are in Cuba. Ironically, he said, LSU built the Cuban sugar industry.

International Sugarcane Technologists Congress

Early History

Because of the importance of sugarcane production, the establishment of an organization composed of those individuals involved in its production and manufacture was an expected occurrence. Such an organization is the International Sugarcane Technologists Congress. The first
meeting of this group was held in Cuba in 1912. In 1938, the Congress met in Louisiana. During World War II, the meetings were suspended.6

Recent History

The involvement of Louisianians in this organization would be anticipated. One such person is Dr. Denver T. Loupe. Loupe has served as Secretary-Treasurer of the American Society of Sugarcane Technologists since 1961. Because of his service to this group, he was designated to represent the mainland sugarcane growing areas of Louisiana, Florida and Texas at the International Congresses which are held every three years in a country chosen at the previous Congress.

Loupe's association with the International group began in 1965 when the Congress met in Puerto Rico. In 1968, he attended the meeting in Taiwan and at this time the Congress was invited to come to Louisiana in 1971. The 1974 meeting was held in South Africa, at which Loupe served as the Vice-Chairman. Brazil hosted the 1977 conference, which Loupe also attended. The Philippines hosted the conference in 1980. The objective of the Congress is simply the exchange of information relating to the production of sugarcane and sugar. Loupe points out that they have been extremely free with their information, which they share through formal papers or symposia.

The 1971 Congress, which was held in New Orleans,
stands out for Loupe as both a personal and a professional success. About 800 official delegates were in attendance from 61 foreign countries. The group toured the sugarcane-growing area of South Louisiana, staying one night in Lafayette and one night in Baton Rouge.

At the Taiwan meeting in 1968, Loupe chaired the session on Extension Education and was able to provide the participants with practical recommendations. In 1971 Dr. Charles A. Miller, one of the nine Extension District Agents serving the State, was chairman of this session and he had as one of his participants, Dr. Lynn L. Pesson, who in 1986 was Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs. In addition, between congresses numerous visitors have come to Louisiana, according to Loupe, to learn methods of dissemination. He has visited some new countries on certain projects.

In Louisiana, sugarcane is grown on a row or ridge. This method, which was originated here in Louisiana, is known throughout the world as the "Louisiana method." Most visitors want to see this system of production. They also want to see the many mechanical devices used in sugarcane production. (Louisiana has several manufacturers of sugarcane equipment, which depend on exports for most of their sales. Loupe has mixed feelings about developing nations wanting to use these labor-saving tools when their most abundant resource is human labor.)
The most beneficial aspect of international experience for Loupe was the opportunity which it has given him to learn. "This experience was invaluable because it prepared me for other tasks down the road," he said.\textsuperscript{7}

Marshall Plan

As recalled by Dr. Lynn L. Pesson, the involvement of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service with international agriculture began in the early 1950's. At this time, the predecessor programs administered by AID (Agency for International Development), which were products of the Marshall era, began to send foreign agriculturalists to the U.S. for informal training. Dr. Pesson related that one of these was a young bearded Pakistani who was sent to St. Mary Parish where Pesson was an Assistant County Agent responsible for 4-H work. Pesson said that having the opportunity to work with this person was one of the highlights of his early life. The visitor was taken to 4-H meetings by Pesson who stated, "When the visitor told about his native Pakistan, the children's eyes got as big as saucers."\textsuperscript{8}

AID--Agency for International Development

Louisiana has been involved with helping AID, an organization of the U.S. State Department, beginning with the old Point-4 Program in 1948, according to Chancellor Efferson. AID later brought groups of international students to the U.S. for training. Shortly after initiating
this program, AID came to LSU and stated that it had forty
Indonesians whom it wanted to train as tractor drivers.
These students, Efferson related, were bright young men but
they had never operated tractors or any other kind of
mechanized equipment. LSU accepted the proposed task.9

Indonesian Students

A six-month course was developed by LSU to train the
forty Indonesians as tractor drivers. Included in their
driver training was the requirement that they learn how to
tear a tractor down and how to put it back together.
Because of their culture, some Asians do not like to get
their hands dirty. This fact, coupled with the pressure of
the course, caused twenty of these students to return home
prior to their completing the course. They had to be
willing to work to finish the training.

Twenty students completed the course with outstanding
records. They were so outstanding, in fact, that now,
unfortunately, half of these LSU graduates are top
commanders of their tank corps in the military. They at
least know mechanics and they have remained loyal to LSU.
Indicative of this loyalty is the fact that they established
an LSU Alumni Association in Indonesia. When Chancellor
Efferson visited with them, they could not do enough for
him.10

Indian Students

Another country which wanted similar training services
was India. India wanted to train people as rice drying and milling specialists. They wanted an extensive program. So Chancellor Efferson took Macon D. Faulkner, Director of the Rice Experiment Station, and Dr. H. Rouse Caffey, formerly Professor of Agronomy and Associate Director, Agriculture Experiment Station, and in 1986 Chancellor of the LSU Agricultural Center, to India to analyze its problems and needs.

They selected five of India's brightest graduate engineers, brought them to LSU and gave them an intensive two-year course in process engineering. The students were required to write a detailed thesis on some aspect of rice processing for a masters degree. They did a very commendable job while at LSU. They are now the leaders in India's rice industry.11

Thai Students

Fifteen to twenty rice breeders from Thailand were also trained by LSU. Now all the top people in Thailand's Ministry of Agriculture are LSU graduates.12

Latin American Students

Chancellor Efferson related that a large group of Latin Americans came to LSU because they could get an education related to their problems at home. Our subtropical climate is similar to theirs and our major crops, like theirs, are sugarcane, rice, tropical corn and beef cattle, particularly Brahman.
During this time Chancellor Efferson developed some life-long friendships with several Latin Americans. Notable among these is one in Peru who has sent all of his sons to LSU. In fact, he designated Chancellor Efferson as their official guardian while they were at LSU. This responsibility included the authority to control the disbursement of funds, if necessary. Dr. Efferson is pleased that their behavior and grades never warranted the exercise of this authority. They were exemplary students, he reports. The Chancellor also has friends in Nicaragua and Venezuela.13

Malaysian Students

Under the Malaysian contract, five Malaysian students were brought to LSU in 1965 and three in 1966. Based on their experience at LSU, they told their friends and colleagues what a fine institution LSU was and what an outstanding education they had received there. Most became administrators in their colleges in Malaysia. Because of their positions and influence with their government officials and after oil was discovered in Malaysia, the Malaysian government started sending students to LSU. Ultimately, there were more than 300 Malaysian students studying at LSU in some area of agriculture or home economics. Now that their university is fully operational, the number of Malaysian students at LSU is declining slightly, but there are still more than 250 at LSU. LSU has
the largest group of Malay undergraduates outside of Malaysia or any other university in the world. This statement also holds true for Malay graduate students.

Since so many Malay students have graduated from LSU, Chancellor Efferson went to Malaysia to help organize an LSU Alumni Association. More than 100 people attended the organizational meeting and became charter members. Efferson had taken a film of the highlights of the 1977 football games to show at the meeting. The Malaysians liked the film so much that he had to show it twice that night. The Malays then took the film to a national agricultural fair and showed it on a large screen which was visible to up to 5,000 people. The film of the highlights of the football season was played about fourteen times over the next four days.14

Summary: Louisiana Foreign Training Program

The Annual Report of the Extension Service for 1957, revealed the extent which the Louisiana Foreign Training Program had grown. It provides this information:

From a modest beginning in 1950, this program has consistently gained in momentum and has become a major activity, beginning in 1952. The following is a tabulation of itinerant training by calendar years since 1952:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NO. COUNTRIES REPRESENTED</th>
<th>NO. OF TRAINEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The . . .[above] does not include the foreign
students sponsored by Federal and other publicly financed agencies.

During the year 1957, the following countries had trainees who were assisted with their programs in Louisiana by the Training Specialist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>NO. OF TRAINEES</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>NO. OF TRAINEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian Congo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Union of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extension Education Department

Historically, according to Dr. Lynn L. Pesson, the Extension Department was assigned the responsibility for coordinating the training of foreign visitors. This explains the genesis of the "international" component of the former Department of Extension and International Education.15 For additional information on this subject, see Chapter V which is a history of this department.

Extension's International Activities Abroad

Worldwide Rice Study

When Chancellor Efferson joined the faculty at LSU, he established his area of specialization as the economics of
rice production, including management and marketing. Shortly thereafter, the U.S. Department of Agriculture asked Efferson to make a worldwide study of all countries which grew or consumed great quantities of rice. LSU granted him a leave of absence for three years. One year was spent traveling all over Asia. He pointed out that he spent four months in China in 1948 just prior to the Communist takeover in 1949.

Every country in North Africa and Europe was visited by Chancellor Efferson in late 1948 and early 1949, while Central and South American countries were visited in the remainder of 1949. Half of 1950 was spent in writing up the results of the trip. About twenty reports were published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture based on Efferson's study. He also wrote a book on the world production and marketing of rice.¹⁶

Nelson Rockefeller

Because of this study, Efferson in particular and LSU by extension became known to many diverse people in different geographic areas. Many of these contacts later called on Efferson and LSU for help. The most famous, perhaps, of the people whom Chancellor Efferson met during his worldwide study of rice was the former Vice-President of the United States, Nelson Rockefeller, whom he met in Venezuela.

Rockefeller had just bought three big farms in
Venezuela and one in Ecuador. He first called on Dr. Efferson for help on his rice farm. In his role of management consultant, Chancellor Efferson recommended that Rockefeller hire Rufus Walker who, at that time, was the director of LSU's rice experiment stations. Walker went to work for Rockefeller permanently. Later, however, he did transfer to the Ford Foundation and remained there until his retirement.

Although Professor Efferson was not formally trained in coffee production, he ended up managing Rockefeller's coffee farm in Ecuador. Chancellor Efferson admits that he initially made mistakes but learned quickly and now knows as much about coffee as anyone in the U.S. Dr. Efferson is still frequently called upon to give advice on management of the Rockefeller coffee farm.

Rockefeller also had a farm in the Llanos, an area behind the mountains where 220 inches of rain falls in six months while the other six months are dry. These extreme conditions caused problems with cattle and water management. Under Chancellor Efferson's direction, a program was developed to overcome these adversities. It has been widely adopted in the Llanos of Venezuela and Columbia.17

International Rice Research Institute

Because of the reputation which resulted from work with the above and similar projects, Chancellor Efferson and LSU began to be contacted by certain international agencies
seeking help. In 1958, the Rockefeller Foundation asked Chancellor Efferson to go to Asia with two of their officials in order to evaluate sites for an international research institute whose objective would be to improve agriculture. After considering all countries in Asia, the Philippines was chosen as the location for the International Rice Research Institute. It has been the center for all international agricultural developments since that time.\textsuperscript{18}

**Agricultural Development Council**

Concurrent with the establishment of the rice institute, Professor Efferson drafted a recommendation for a program in international economics. It was submitted to John D. Rockefeller III and he established the Agricultural Development Council. Efferson was appointed as one of the first board members when the Council was first established in 1958 and served until his retirement. Issues of concern for the Council included education in macroeconomics, rural sociology, and agricultural education in Asia. Numerous programs related to these topics have been sponsored by the Council.\textsuperscript{19}

**India**

The first person from Louisiana whom Pesson remembers as taking a consulting job overseas was A. K. Smith, County Agent for St. Landry Parish. Smith took a leave of absence from the Extension Service and went to India. Pesson recalled thinking how far away India was when this occurred.
Also, according to Pesson, the first formal contract which the LSU College of Agriculture had to help another country was with India and it was to assist with the marketing of their rice. An LSU faculty member was sent there.20

Malaysia

LSU's first full-blown contract to support development in another country was with Malaysia. This project was funded by the Ford Foundation. Three of the original five LSU faculty members were from the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. They were Dr. C. A. Miller, Horticulture and Crop Husbandry; Mr. Joseph L. Smilie, Agricultural Engineering; and Dr. L. L. Pesson, Agriculture and Extension Education. The remaining two members were Dr. Leon G. Standifer, Botany and Plant Physiology and Dr. James E. Johnston, Animal Husbandry, who served as the senior staff person.21

The Rockefeller Foundation asked Efferson to choose a physical scientist to go with him to Malaysia to appraise the prospects for improving Malaysian agricultural productivity. Malaysia was a new nation which had acquired its independence from Great Britain in 1965. Malaysia had no educational facilities whatsoever but had great potential. Chancellor Efferson selected Dr. James E. "Jim" Johnston, who was a top dairy professor at LSU at this time. They spent four months surveying the needs of Malaysia and,
after returning to the U.S., made numerous recommendations. These recommendations were ultimately acquired by the Ford Foundation, which then asked LSU if it would accept a contract to implement the recommendations. LSU accepted a service contract which spanned the years 1964 to 1973. During this period, the Ford Foundation paid LSU approximately two million dollars to help build an agricultural university in Malaysia. When LSU began work on this objective, Malaysia had only a two-year educational institution which gave a degree in practical agriculture. It now has one of the best agricultural institutions outside of the U.S.

This was accomplished by LSU's sending five or six of their faculty members to Malaysia for two-year terms. These included professors of plant pathology, agriculture education, extension education, horticulture, etc. For a detailed description of the Malaysian project, see \textit{Institutional Development: The College of Agriculture in Malaysia} by Dr. Floyd L. Corty and Vice-Chancellor Lynn L. Pesson. The book was published by the Center for Agricultural Science and Rural Development at LSU in 1973.

The foreword of this book was written by Chancellor Efferson. Since it succinctly describes the importance of international agricultural development and capsulizes the objective of the Malaysian project, it is included here for ready reference.
Most developing countries need trained personnel to apply modern technology in efforts to overcome the inertia of traditional low-level productivity. Generally, agriculture is the basic activity of 50 to 75 percent of the people in less developed countries. Improving both the agricultural productivity and the distribution of farm products will inevitably raise the standard of living of the farm people and contribute to the welfare and greater self-reliance of the whole nation.

Changing Malaysia from a rubber-tree mono-culture to a more diversified agriculture was accepted as a desired policy with inception of the first Malaysian five-year plan of 1965-70. Providing trained agriculturists in support of this policy was chiefly the responsibility of the College of Agriculture. Accordingly, the College was recognized as the important key to agricultural development. To adequately fulfill its training role, the College itself needed strengthening, particularly in its ability to convey practical and relevant agricultural knowledge. This report gives an account of the role played by Louisiana State University in meeting the training objectives, the relationship of LSU with the College, the development program and the problems, and an appraisal of the accomplishments.22

J. NORMAN EFFERSON

After nine years, the Ford Foundations felt the job was complete in Malaysia and terminated its contract with LSU. Dr. Efferson concurred with this decision.23

Benefits of the Malaysian Experience

Based on his own involvement, Dr. Efferson has come to believe that international experience is good for Louisiana. For instance, he is quick to point out that many of the top people at LSU gained invaluable experience in Malaysia. International experience gave them the extra breadth of training which was necessary for more complete professional development. These people include the following:
Dr. Lynn L. Pesson, Professor of Extension and International Education and Vice-Chancellor; Dr. R. Howard Hanchey, former Professor of Horticulture and Dean, College of Agriculture; Dr. Charles A. Miller, District Agent for the Central-Southwestern District of the Cooperative Extension Service (Dr. Miller was the first County Agent to obtain a Ph.D.); Dr. Leon C. Standifer, Professor, Department of Horticulture of the Central Experiment Station; Mr. Joseph L. Smilie, Specialist, Agricultural Engineering, State Office Staff, Extension Service; Dr. Floyd L. Corty, Professor of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness; Dr. Bruce Flint, Professor of Extension Education and Associate Director of the LCES; and others.  

Taiwan

When the sugar industry of Taiwan wanted a marketing expert to spend six months studying their sugar industry and since Chancellor Efferson was unable to go, he recommended that his director of residential instruction, Dr. M. D. Woodin, get the assignment. Dr. Woodin accepted and spent six months in Taiwan where he rendered a needed service. He acquired some very interesting experience there. Dr. Martin D. Woodin is past president of the LSU University system.  

Sri Lanka (Ceylon)

In 1978, LSU signed a $600,000 contract to help Sri Lanka improve its rice drying, storage and milling. The
contract was developed by Gassie and Smilie who had responsible for writing and delivering it to Sri Lanka for signature by local officials. Two staff members, one of whom was Smilie, were then sent for two-year assignments. Chancellor Efferson visited there to obtain first-hand knowledge. Rice is the staple food of the people of Sri Lanka. They eat 300 pounds of rice per person annually, but they produce only about half of it and must import the rest. Since they consume a type and quality of rice which Louisiana does not produce, we are not hurting our own rice industry. Chancellor Efferson is sensitive to and conscious of the need to avoid spending the taxpayers' money in helping other countries compete with us. But Dr. Efferson favors helping countries improve their income so they can buy from the U.S.26

Honduras

As a consultant to the Honduran government, Director Loupe made a study of areas for the potential expansion of sugarcane production. In formulating his recommendations, he considered such factors as soil type and varieties of sugarcane.27

Brazil

Dr. Loupe also has served as a consultant to Brazil on the use of herbicides.28

Advantages of International Experience

Because of the experience provided by the preceding
assignments, LSU has developed a reputation for having personnel who are knowledgeable about various phases of international agriculture. Such people are Dr. H. Rouse Caffey, formerly Associate Director, Agricultural Experiment Station, and now Chancellor, LSU Agricultural Center, who is considered one of the leading rice breeders and general agronomists (he has served on the World Bank, International Development Bank and the Asian Bank where he advises in his area of expertise); Mr. Macon D. Faulkner, Professor and Superintendent, Rice Experiment Station, who has served a six-week term in Burma where he advised the World Bank on irrigation possibilities; Dr. Charles A. Miller, who has become an expert on tropical horticulture and has experience in Africa; and Dr. Lynn L. Pesson, who has made outstanding contributions with his educational and institutional development programs. He has also spent some time in Haiti working on a project.

Dr. Alvin L. Bertrand, Boyd Professor Emeritus of Sociology, is an internationally known sociologist who has had international experience. He is also a former student of Chancellor Efferson.

In 1978, Chancellor Efferson served on two assignments. One, for the Ford Foundation, was to appraise the agricultural policy programs for Thailand, the Philippines and Pakistan. For the other, he was in Bangladesh to review their overall research programs in order to assess their
strengths and weaknesses. According to Dr. Pesson, the French heritage and language of Louisiana has sometimes served as an asset to LSU in its international work. This is particularly true in those countries which are former colonies of France. Some of the staff at LSU who have been involved in international development work and who speak French include Dr. Charles A. Miller, Dr. Floyd L. Corty, Dr. Alvin L. Bertrand and Dr. Lynn L. Pesson.

Continuing Involvement in International Agriculture

Dr. Efferson pointed out that the services of LSU in the area of international agriculture were still being sought.

Importance of International Experience to Louisiana Agricultural Efforts

Although Chancellor Efferson has had extensive international experience, he still saw his first responsibility as the agricultural development of Louisiana: "My first job is in Louisiana. I am hired to improve, maintain and develop Louisiana's agriculture and to train Louisiana students. But we can help Louisiana by our international involvement because it enables us to improve our overall capability." However, Dr. Efferson was quick to reveal that he would not hesitate to cut out the international programs if they were interfering with LSU's obligation to Louisiana.
Summary

When asked to select the most successful international agricultural development project with which LSU has been associated, Dr. Edward W. Gassie responded with his choice and the reason he chose it. At the beginning of the LSU contract with the Ford Foundation, the Malaysian College of Agriculture granted only a two-year diploma and had a student enrollment of about 300. When the contract was concluded at the end of five years, the Malaysian College of Agriculture had been transformed into a university with a four-year degree program and an enrollment of approximately 3,500. Gassie attributed the success of this project to the fact that at least 75 percent of those LSU employees who worked in Malaysia had experience with the Cooperative Extension Service.\textsuperscript{33}

This experience was invaluable in making both academic and, most importantly, practical contributions. Generally speaking, Extension staff can relate very effectively to audiences in informal situations. This ability Gassie believes probably results from a combination of both formal, in-service training and innate propensities. It is, however, invaluable in making contributions at a very basic grass roots level as was needed in Malaysia.\textsuperscript{34}

Regardless of the precise cause of the success of this project, the fact remains that 100 percent of the consultants to Malaysia were employees of LSU and that this...
project was a crowning success for LSU. There was a consensus among the interviewees that the Malaysian project was the most successful of all the projects with which LSU has thus far worked.

Fundamental to the success of this program was the reliance of the consultants on Seaman A. Knapp's demonstration method and the Extension Education principle that "learners learn best by doing." This principle was used by Dr. Pesson when he required his students give method demonstrations to Malaysian farmers without using the scientific names of plants. His students still remembered the British teaching method of memorizing scientific names (Malaysia had been a British colony and the students had been schooled under the British system), and they had used them throughout their first presentations. He failed all the students because it was an impractical system, not one based on concepts and a recognition of the educational level of the client population—the farmers. The Malaysian farmers obviously did not know or care about scientific names. Again, those who are trained in Extension Education know that one must begin at the educational level of the learner, whether he is a farmer or a housewife.35

The demonstration method was personally used by Mr. Joseph L. Smilie when he was in Malaysia. Upon seeing a poorly drained field, he immediately procured a bulldozer. Smilie then proceeded to personally operate the dozer to
crown the field so it would drain properly. The Malaysians were quite surprised for two reasons: (1) The Malaysian culture holds that white-collar workers should not work with their hands; and (2) they did not realize the importance of proper drainage in crop production. After the plot was leveled for proper drainage and planted, the Malaysians were able to see with their own eyes the difference in the productivity between the crowned plot and another one not so well drained. Simply stated, there had been a demonstration.

The importance of determining the educational level of the learners was made vividly apparent to Smilie when he began teaching a course in farm machinery in Malaysia. Assuming that his Malaysian students were equal in experience to students in America, he began by talking about tractors, combines, disks and plows. After a few days of blank faces from some of his students, it dawned on him that most of his students were from rural areas and were not familiar with tractors and combines. He then began to talk about garden plows and push-type plows and stopped talking about transmissions and differentials.

Smilie believes that foreign travel has made him a better person. He says without hesitation that "going to Malaysia was the best thing I ever did." He obtained a perspective and education that would otherwise have been impossible. All educational institutions should be involved
in international development, according to him. Smilie no longer has the usual biased American view that foreign aid is a one-way operation—from us to them. He now describes benefits that can accrue to Americans if they have the right attitude.36

The above is an example of the actual implementation of the advice given by Dr. Knapp in 1906. He said then:

The men who act as field agents must be practical farmers; no use in sending a carpenter to tell a tailor how to make a coat, even if he is pretty well up on coats. The tailor won't follow. The farmer must be a recognized leader, progressive, influential, and able to carry public opinion with him. . . .

Can agricultural conditions be changed by simply talking? No. By demonstration? Yes.37

Thus, Knapp's demonstration method continues to be viable after he implemented it on the W. C. Porter farm at Terrell, Kaufman County, Texas, in 1903. The personnel at LSU have mastered it as well as other Extension Education concepts which have evolved since then. This, of course, contributes to LSU's continuing impact on international agriculture and to the fact that the U.S. has the highest agricultural productivity per farmer in the world.

From a national perspective of Extension Services, Prawl, Medlin and Gross reached the same conclusion when they posed the question, "Has Extension failed internationally?" They concluded: "Extension services no doubt have weaknesses, but what would have happened if a strong international push for extension service was not made
30 years ago? World hunger is a grim reality today, but the problem would be far worse without extension education at work."³⁸

They issue this caution, however.

Still, the only way to grow stronger is to admit weaknesses and then go on. Extension services have three general problems:

-- farmers lack confidence in extension workers;
-- changes lacking sufficient research data are advocated and thus often fail;
-- social or economic incentives are not sufficient to influence change.³⁹

Their description of what should be the Extension Service's role follows:

Extension service's role is to motivate farmers, homemakers and youth to produce more and to improve their homes by showing them how. Extension activities impart knowledge, upgrade skills, and promote an attitude toward progress. Extension workers enhance communication by demonstrations. They serve as liaison and buffer between local people and high-level government officials by presenting a realistic view of a prevailing situation. They can show local leaders and cooperators that their government is concerned with their welfare. They continuously help to develop leadership through example, guidance and training, thus increasing their clientele's ability to overcome their own problems.⁴⁰

This serves as an appropriate introduction to our next chapter. Chapter VII deals with the Communications Division of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service and how it performs its function of facilitating the transmission of information from the research generators, usually the University and the Experiment Station, to the ultimate users whether they be farmers, fishermen or homemakers, etc.
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CHAPTER VII
THE COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION

Introduction

Like the entire Extension organization, the Communication Division, has made many changes following World War II. Those changes which have taken place since 1948 in communication methods and techniques, as practiced by the Communications Division of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES), are discussed in this section. Primary information was obtained from interviews with Mr. Ted R. Holmes, Communications Division Leader, 1978-83. Holmes first joined the LCES as a student worker in the Communications Division in 1957. He became a full-time employee of the Agricultural Experiment Station in 1958 and served until 1966. At that time he resigned to accept employment in related areas, namely TVA, and later worked for the USDA and Northeast Louisiana University. He has remained with the LCES since his return in 1970. Although Holmes provided the bulk of the original information for this unit, conclusions drawn from it, as well as any errors, are entirely this writer's.

Media Survey

The importance and success of the Communications Division in dispersing information from the Cooperative
Extension Service can be seen from the results of a survey taken by Holmes.¹ These are shown in Table 14. He received a phenomenal 100% response to his questionnaire. The time period covered by the survey is one month.

In order to determine how these results were obtained and how they compare to past practices, each media type will be examined separately. Past practices refer to those in use in 1958 when Holmes joined the Editorial and Publications Department of the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, which was combined functionally with the Extension editorial group to form a single unit. Those media types to be considered and the order of consideration are newspapers, radio, TV, and direct means of communication such as direct mail, publications, or bulletins, as they were formerly known, and audiovisuals.

**Newspapers**

Holmes felt that most of the Extension's attention until 1958 was devoted to print media, particularly newspapers, from which they were receiving a good response. Radio was not neglected and Extension received a fairly good response from this medium. About that time, as shall be seen, Extension was beginning to venture into TV. But Holmes maintained that the bulk of Extension's mass media efforts in the late 1950's and early 1960's were concentrated on newspapers.

One interesting point which Holmes made was that there
### TABLE 14

INFORMATION PRODUCED BY THE
LOUISIANA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
DURING A ONE-MONTH PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Channel</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Regular Columns</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Other Articles</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers, Radio and TV</td>
<td>Calls for Information</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail</td>
<td>Postcards, Newsletter</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Data summarized by Ted R. Holmes, Chief Editor, Communications Division, Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, from his 1979 survey in which he received a 100% response.
are about 140 newspapers in Louisiana. He attributed this fact, to some extent, to one technological development—the offset printing process. Some other factors were suburban development and the rise of ethnic and special interest groups who possessed literacy and buying power to support newspapers. This process made feasible the establishment of "free" newspapers or shopper guides, as they are known.

Printing Processes

Letterpress Printing

The offset printing process, to a great extent, replaced the old letterpress method of printing. The letterpress process was also known as the "hot type" process. This was a descriptive name which arose from the procedures actually used in the letterpress process. The letterpress method consisted of pouring molten metal in "letter" shaped forms, hence the origin of the "letter" portion of the name "letterpress."

Each page of newspaper copy had to be constructed by placing the type, that is, the letter-shaped forms, in a stick. A stick was a small rectangular tray which could be adjusted to the desired length of the line. This procedure is known as "type-setting." After several lines were set in the stick, they were then transferred to a "galley" or "tray."

From the galley proof, the compositor designed the page layouts. This work was called "page make-up." Based on the
page make-ups, the pages of type were then imposed in a metal frame called a "chase." The spaces for margins and other purposes were filled in with wood or metal strips called "furniture." This entire array of type, furniture and chase was called a "form."

For a rotary press, a papier-mache stereotype (also called a matte) was pressed against the form, impressing into the stereotype all type, artwork, etc. This was placed inside a cylinder and hot metal was poured inside of that to produce a cylindrical plate.

On a flat-bed press, the form itself was inked and the paper was pressed directly on this inked form.

Most type during this century has been set on Linotype machines (until 10-15 years ago, that is). This in effect replaced the stick since the machine turned out an entire line of type at one time and arranged these in galleys.

**Offset Printing**

When Holmes started work, he said there were very few newspapers in the state that were printed on an offset press; today he knows of no paper that is not printed on one. The offset press has had a tremendous impact on printing, particularly on the way photographs and illustrations are handled. It also made phototype and computerized composition practical. Before considering some of these specific impacts which the offset press has had, let us briefly review what the Funk & Wagnalls Encyclopedia says
about lithography in general and offset lithography in particular.

Lithography is a process of printing or artistic reproduction which depends for its action on the mutual repulsion of grease and water. The original process of lithography (Gr. litho, "stone;" graphein, "to write") was discovered by the Bavarian dramatist Aloys Senefelder (1771-1834) in 1798. He found that if a drawing were made on a flat piece of limestone with a greasy crayon, the lines of grease would attract and hold an oily or greasy ink when the stone was wet, whereas other portions of the stone would take no ink. A piece of suitable paper rolled into contact with the stone by means of a hand roller therefore received an impression from the original lines and reproduced the drawing. Senefelder's discovery was at once taken up by artists and printers and is the basis for all types of modern lithography.

Offset lithography. One of the disadvantages of direct printing from a lithographic plate is the deterioration of the plate after a number of copies have been run off. To overcome this handicap, the process of "offset" lithography was developed. In offset, the original plate does not come into contact with the printing paper but instead transfers the image to an intermediate rubber blanket or cylinder on the press, from which, in turn, the paper is printed. The rubber surface is softer than paper and does not damage the plate.

Prior to offset printing, Holmes explained that, before a picture could be included in a newspaper, it was necessary for an engraving to be made of it in metal. This was a time-consuming, complex and expensive process. The photograph, when engraved in metal, is known as a "cut." In order to get photographs included in newspapers before the offset press was utilized, it was almost always necessary for the Extension Service to provide the engraving or "cut" at its own expense, Holmes said.

Regarding preparation of the cut, Holmes related that
Extension had a contract with an engraver in Shreveport (and earlier, he thought, in New Orleans) to prepare their cuts. When agents in the field sent in photographs, an engraving was made, if warranted, and the cut returned to the agent for use in the local newspaper. The impact of the offset press on this portion of Extension's communications work is apparent from the following statement by Holmes. "We spent a lot of time having cuts made, but I guess we haven't had one made in the last fifteen years for our own printing or anyone else's."

In contrast to the letterpress process of printing which used hot type, Holmes pointed out that the offset printing process uses cold type to prepare the plate from which the printing is done. The offset plate is a thin metal plate and the type is made from a machine similar to a typewriter. Photographs come from a screened negative or a screened print. This, of course, is a much more economical means for including photographs or illustrations in newspapers than the old engraving method.

With the advent of offset printing, more and bigger pictures could be included as well as more art work and extra colors. Offset printing is much faster than letterpress printing, particularly with its need for engraving. Elaborate pictures and beautiful layouts were rare, if not nonexistent, in newspapers printed by letterpress.

The technical characteristic of offset printing is
described in Funk & Wagnalls as follows:

In modern commercial lithography, the plates are first roughed or grained to give them a surface that will hold water, sensitized with an emulsion containing albumen and bichromate, and then exposed to light under a photographic negative of the subject which is to be reproduced. Light hardens the albumen in the exposed portions of the plate, but in the unexposed portions the albumen-bichromate mixture is unaffected and remains soluble. When the plate is inked and washed with warm water, the soluble areas of the emulsion and the ink on them are washed away, leaving a positive ink image on the plate.

The offset press also contributed to the establishment of more daily newspapers because it requires less cash outlay, that is, a smaller facility can be used since fewer presses are needed and fewer workers are needed to operate the offset presses, according to Holmes. Offset printing requires less training for operators than letterpress printing.

Holmes felt that offset printing has provided Extension with more opportunities to use visuals with their articles. He said he is not sure that Extension has responded to this change as fully as it might. Offset printing lends itself to the total visual message. Illustrative material such as artwork, drawings and pictures can now be easily included in newspaper articles.

Some state extension services now provide "camera-ready copy" to newspapers. This is something which Louisiana has not done because there is no standardization among Louisiana newspapers on style of type face, number of columns, etc. However, Holmes said that the cutline, which is the
description of the illustrations, is sometimes provided. This is possible, he said, because the type used in cutlines often differs from the type used elsewhere for emphasis purposes.

Recently an entire newspaper page devoted to the sugarcane industry was distributed to the state's newspapers. It was essentially, Holmes stated, a pictorial story of the problems faced by the sugarcane farmers. A very short feature story accompanied the pictures. Many of the papers used the story as submitted; others cut out certain pictures and inserted ads. Holmes cited this as an example of the things that can be done by Extension now that the offset press is in common use. Such a story would never have been undertaken had the letterpress process still been in use. Being realistic, Holmes pointed out that local newspapers are very receptive to this type of story, particularly around the Christmas holidays when many of their staff are on vacation and, therefore, not available to prepare articles themselves.

News Releases

A packet of material is developed every week by the state office for distribution to each newspaper in the state. Some agents, particularly those who write a local column, do not want this material sent directly to the newspaper. Holmes said that in these cases these newspapers are removed from the mailing list and the material is then
sent to the agents for use at their discretion. The Communication's staff encourages those agents who write columns to be as innovative and creative as possible by localizing the standard information provided by the state office.

In the past all information from the state office was sent directly to the agents. But some people felt that the material was lying unused on the desks of some agents because they were too busy to review it and to send it to the newspapers. So the system of distribution was changed, when Holmes was not with the Service, to direct mailings to the newspapers. Now the criticism, particularly from some agents, is that the newspapers are not discriminating enough about what they print. For example, some north Louisiana newspapers have run stories on sugarcane which the agents felt would have been more appropriate for south Louisiana, while some south Louisiana papers have carried stories on north Louisiana cotton.

Because of these diverse views, Holmes anticipates that a new policy on distribution of material from the state office may be implemented in the future. He envisions that the new policy will include elements from both the old and current method of distribution. That is, some material, particularly that having statewide significance, will be mailed directly to newspapers while all other material will go directly to the agents themselves.
Clipping Service

In order to be aware of the types and volume of articles on the Extension Service contained in Louisiana newspapers, the Service subscribes to a clipping service for collection of articles appearing in newspapers during every third month. The survey helps to reveal the quality and content of the articles actually used. This information is then used to develop training programs which are designed to correct deficiencies found in the review of articles collected in the random survey or to maintain the quality of the articles if they are found to be of an acceptable standard. If the survey can be taken as an indication of success, the Service is effectively utilizing the newspaper medium because the Service averages between 700--1,500 clippings per month.

Radio

When Holmes first joined the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, the basic service which the central office was providing for the radio medium was the preparation of a spot service and training field personnel to produce their own programs. A radio spot is simply a script which is written in radio style. It relates mostly to Extension information and some current events. This service is still being performed by the Service. It is essentially a rewrite of the newspaper packet into radio style.

As recently as 1979, agents had radio programs of
various sorts. Some went to the station and did live 5-, 10- or 15-minute programs, while others provided only taped spots. The state office also provided taped spots, but only to those stations which asked for them. The number of stations which did so was about 40-50.

In formerly providing the taped service, the state office had found it profitable to separate the taped programs into these subject-matter categories: (1) agriculture, (2) horticulture, and (3) home economics. This grouping was important because it enabled a station to select the program most appropriate for its own listening audience. For instance, urban stations generally were more interested in those taped programs dealing with horticulture than those dealing with agriculture. This was because urban listeners could relate to such horticulture topics as lawn care, gardens and house plants.

In 1984, tapes were only provided to radio stations for special campaigns or when specifically requested by agents. Some weekly taped interviews are provided to the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation for their radio program on the Louisiana Network. The Communications Division also cooperates with other organizations such as the Southern States Network. Additionally, an insect report is available during the summer from an automated telephone recording which interested stations access simply by dialing the specified telephone number.
Visual Aids

Increased use of visual aids represents a recent trend in extension communication work, according to Holmes. They include the production of sound slides. The team approach is evident here with coordinated inputs from Ms. Sandra Avant or other specialists in print media, radio, where Mr. Mike Futrell and Mr. John Brooks are the specialists, graphic design with Ms. Ruth Thompson and Mrs. Mary Thrasher, and Mr. John Woznick, visual aids specialist. Topics receiving major emphases recently include nutrition, community development and "how-to" films. "How-to" films are informative productions whose objective it is to make people aware of things they can do for themselves. These represent a broad range of subjects beyond the given examples.

Holmes was quick to point out that the purpose of visual aids is to supplement printed information, not to replace it. However, Extension has to rely more heavily on the visual message since the advent of television because the clientele have become so visually oriented. The purpose of the Communications Division, he said, falls into these three areas: (1) training, (2) production, and (3) distribution. To facilitate the latter function, the Communication Division maintains an audio visual library at the state office.

There is a tremendous demand for the visual aids
because they are "professionally" done. Often they are more attractive than something an agent could be expected to put together. Because they are a packaged program, they have a "slick" image. This fact, however, can contribute to over-use of visual aids as occurred when the students of one 4-H agent asked, "What slide program are we going to see today."

Holmes envisions that an energy crisis or State fiscal problem may dictate more use of visuals in order to reduce travel by Extension specialists, who have traditionally traveled extensively by automobile. A few other states are presently using a "tele-a-lecture" system. This is a system in which visuals are shown on a screen at a meeting at which the specialist is not in attendance. The specialist stays in contact with the meeting participants by way of a telephone. They can ask him questions and he can answer them or add explanatory comments.

Television

When television first came into general use, there was a big push to get people on TV. This effort was facilitated because local television stations had to provide a certain amount of public service time. Extension programs qualified for this public service time. However, a 30-minute program required a tremendous expenditure of time on the part of Extension workers. Most agents did not like to be involved in this type of activity, although efforts were made to
rotate the responsibility for the programs.

Gradually, Extension began to weigh the efforts expended against the benefits gained. The conclusion was that these programs were not an extremely effective teaching device. In addition to suffering from the fact that television was a mass medium, Extension programs were often shown at inconvenient times, such as 6:30 a.m. on a Sunday morning, when few people were watching. As more programs became available to TV stations, their reliance on Extension programs declined.

By 1986, Holmes revealed that Extension concentrated its effort on the production of short awareness programs which maybe about 30 seconds in length. Since many stations have adopted a policy of not using any film which they themselves do not produce, the preparation of news features by outsiders is often a waste of time. However, since the radio information also goes to TV stations, the station will often call up and want to do an interview for a news program because of the material made available to them. Although there are now few planned Extension programs on TV, there are a number of spontaneous news programs.

Holmes believes that the use of video programs will increase in the future, but not necessarily through the broadcast media. The energy situation might become a factor. The video disk, he said, has tremendous potential because it is economical, has unlimited distribution
possibilities, and has almost unlimited storage capacity. In regard to the latter characteristic, Holmes stated that the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* could be placed on one disk. One disk, he said, is all that would be necessary for recording their entire publication library.

**Other Audio Visuals**

There are other audiovisual media produced by Extension which is not described here in detail because they are fairly self-descriptive. These include exhibits, videotapes, overhead transparencies, photographs, teaching slides, posters, etc. They also support the 4-H photograph projects and other educational work.

**Direct Mail**

Direct mail has the potential for being the most personal and, therefore, the most effective of the media methods considered thus far. It permits the maximum freedom in audience selectivity as well as message selectivity. For example, only cattlemen in a particular area may be selected as the recipients of a direct mail message. For maximum effectiveness, only one concept and one topic should be dealt with at a time. Holmes said that one should do a good job of selling one idea at a time then move to others.

Different types of direct mail include circular letters, postcards, newsletters and flyers. At one time much reliance was placed on the circular letter to the exclusion of the others. By 1986, Holmes felt that, as a
result of training given to the agents, a balance use was occurring among the different types of direct mail methods. He reminds everyone that mass media is just that, it goes to everyone. This is fine for awareness development, that is, to inform the public of what programs are available, but it is not as effective for teaching. Direct mail is more personal and, therefore, can be more effective.²

Publications

Ample recognition must be given to publications which, Holmes stressed, are one of the oldest and most enduring of the educational mediums used by the Extension Service.³ In fact, initially leaflets became the publication hallmark of the Extension Service. These are now published as numbered bulletins. See the "Contents" section of the order brochure entitled Publications. The "Foreword" states in part:

Extension Service publications are largely for popular use. They contain how-to-do information and directions, which are based on research and practical experience, and are distributed mainly through Parish Extension Service offices.⁴

Usually only one subject is dealt with in one bulletin. Most often, the reader is given all he or she needs to know about a particular aspect of a subject or use rather than having that subject comprehensively treated. Holmes acknowledged that a few past bulletins did attempt to comprehensively address some subjects. He now believes that the present trend is for complex subjects to be divided into a number of logical, smaller components, where each can be
dealt with in a separate bulletin, absorbed in one sitting and used for the completion of one task. They are also sequentially arranged to promote learning. (See Tyler for organizational alternatives.) As an example, he cited the swine production manual which was made up of a number of separate fact sheets. However, when these individual sheets were combined into one booklet, they constituted quite a resource library. They were normally formatted, printed and punched for insertion into a three-ring notebook. This made for easy retrieval which facilitated use by the swine producers and for updating.

Of course, the same technology which impacted the way newspapers are published, namely the change from letterpress to offset production printing, also affected the publication of bulletins, Holmes pointed out. This change increased not only the speed of publication but also increased the use of more pictures which resulted in more attractive publications.

Annual reports on the activities of the LCES were prepared by the Publication Section.

Although the most frequent publication titles dealt with "how to" activities for such diverse subjects as fertilization and planting of plants, feeding and care of animals to health care for humans, a tremendous number pertained to 4-H Club literature. In 1982, some 300 plus titles were produced. Holmes hastened to point out that not
all of them were new titles—that many were revisions or reprinting. The need for reprinting is often caused by the lack of adequate storage space needed to fulfill future demands. This means that some publications, usually 4-H, are printed on only an "as needed" basis which is usually for one year.

Pesticide publications are particularly susceptible to the need for revision because EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) is constantly revising its approved chemicals—continually, some are banned and new ones recommended for use. In the area of pesticide use, it is important to note that Extension has been responsible for the Pest Control Operator's Training Program. It is a joint endeavor with the Louisiana Department of Agriculture, which is responsible for the actual licensing decreed by EPA. This responsibility resulted in a Pest Applicator's Manual being prepared to facilitate the prospective pest applicant in passing the required written test. A slide program was developed to assist with this educational training responsibility and numerous meetings were called by the County Agents and their staffs throughout the State. Holmes recalls that some 60,000 individuals received the initial pesticide training in 1977-78 from the Louisiana Extension Service and others have been trained since.

Recovering from Flooding

Because of the prevalence of flooding in Louisiana, the
Extension publication entitled Recovering From Flooding has, unfortunately, been a very popular publication. It has information, as the title implies, on such subjects as how to clean flood-damaged carpets, prepare hygienic foods, salvage furniture, etc. A recent severe flood in New Orleans prompted a very quick overnight revision of this publication. A group of subject matter specialists were assembled in one room. While some were on the phone with a New Orleans radio station, others were revising the publication. When revised, it was rushed to the LSU Printing Press where the printing proceeded into the night, enabling 40,000 copies to be delivered the next morning to New Orleans. This was probably one of the largest recent rush projects to confront the Publication Section.

Natural Disasters

Hurricanes have also required the development of special publications. In fact, a review of the Annual Reports reveals the prominent role played by Extension in Hurricane Audrey (June 27, 1957), Hilda (October 3, 1964) and Betsy (September 9, 1965). Extension is also involved in almost all local flooding situations. Because of the frequency of hurricanes and heavy spring rains, Extension has developed a standard newspaper package kit which contains pertinent information on flooding. It is sent out to the affected areas. Following each flooding event a radio information kit is also provided to stations. A
related publication is entitled "How to Prepare For and Recover From Flooding." Needless to say, numerous training meetings have been held on the contents of this bulletin.

Even though the Publication Section is in the Communication Division, the material is initially authored by subject matter specialists in the applicable fields, such as agriculture, community resource development, home economics, etc. Sometimes publications are coauthored with someone from the Experiment Station, or a publication from another state or the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which deals with a pertinent subject, may be utilized in its entirety or used as a model to alter a publication for use in Louisiana. All publications are edited by a Publication Editor who also coordinates the printing.

Until 1983, some publications were printed by commercial printers; afterwards all were printed by the LSU Printing Office.

Formerly, most Extension publications were directed toward rural peoples and to the topics which were of interest to them. However, with the growth of the urban population in the State, the scope of Extension has broadened to include topics related to home management, family living, consumer education, lawn care and urban gardening. The basic sciences upon which farm and other rural-oriented education is developed can easily be adopted to a broader audience. This is especially true with horticultural
information and programs related to home management, health and human nutrition.

**Technological Adaption of Extension to An Urban Perspective**

A more profound technological communication change, which illustrates Extension's ability to respond to specific needs in the five-parish New Orleans urban area, was the establishment in 1982 of a bank of prerecorded, taped telephone messages on the most frequently requested subjects. These are usually in the area of horticulture or home economics. This system, known as Tele-Tips, was brought about because the parish staffs had become "desk bound" by the extensive number of phone calls they were receiving. Often when the agents went into the field under the old system, phone clients would then complain that the agents were never in their offices. After a number of complaints from the parish staffs that they were unable to do any face-to-face work in the field, this technological system was designed to alleviate the more general questions, thus enabling the agents to concentrate on unique problems which required their problem-solving skills.

A lot of extension material was placed on tapes of about two minutes duration. Then a catalogue of the tape numbers and their subjects was published. They were distributed through garden and home shows, etc., after wide coverage in area newspapers and on radio and TV. If the phone client has the catalogue, he can directly specify
which number tape he wants the operator to play. There are four tape players which can be used simultaneously. If the caller does not have a catalogue, then the operator can tell the caller which subjects are available on tapes and then connect the caller to the appropriate tape.

Holmes conceded that it was difficult to determine whether this tape bank had really alleviated any work on the parish staff or actually increased it because the ending statement invited the caller to contact the parish staff at a specified number if additional or other information was needed.

A humorous incident occurred a few weeks after the system was established when the operator determined that the same man had been calling each day for several days and asking that different tapes be played. During one call, he said, "I'm almost finished." When asked by the operator to explain that statement, he replied that he didn't want to have to call up every time he wanted to know something, so had been duplicating a set of tapes for himself.

The Present as a Technological Prologue for Extension's Future

The Extension Service originally began using computers almost as soon as the LSU computer system network was established in the early 1960's. These were primarily used for administrative purposes to compile reports, etc. In the late 1970's Extension acquired its own minicomputer, an IBM System 30, which was not used extensively because no
provision had been made for a computer programmer-type person. Around 1980, an IBM System 6 was acquired by Extension. It had more word processing capabilities. However, Holmes pointed out that an early precursor of the word processor was the old mag-card typewriters which were used in the early 1970's. These could be considered primitive word processors since corrections could be made to the materials placed on them. Multiple copies could be made on the mag-card typewriters and the cards could be assembled from several typewriters to create reports, etc.

In 1982, the top administrators and the business and personnel officers moved to the new LSU Agricultural Center Administrative Building. This move created enough vacant space at Knapp Hall for a computer/word processing center. About this time, Jim Land was employed to head the computer services operation. The LSU System also initiated a committee to study the computer needs of the entire university system and to develop a computer system which would be compatible. Land was a member of this committee and used his experience on it in developing the Extension computer system.

Holmes quickly expressed to Land his interest in learning the communication application and capabilities of the new computer system because he felt that this was the technology of the future as far as communications was concerned. He found a willing teacher in Land because Land
had a background in both communication and computer science.

The IBM 5520 Administrative System was among the systems found by the University Computer Study Committee to be capable of fitting into a compatible network. Extension implemented the committee's recommendation and has reaped the benefits according to Holmes. It started with seven terminals, with four of them being placed in the Communications Division. (These were originally supposed to be only "on loan"). The number of terminals by 1984 numbered almost twenty and by 1985 all writers in the division and most secretaries in the State Extension Office had access to a terminal or to a personal computer that would function as a 5520 terminal.

The implementation approach was based on the past experience of the editors who were accustomed to compiling their drafts at their typewriters and then having secretaries type the corrected versions. It was felt with the adoption of the computer system that the editors could clean up, that is, correct their own drafts without the use of secretaries. Actual practice has borne this out because the Communication Division by 1984 was operating with half of the number of secretaries previously employed. Productivity actually increased because editors were able to go directly from a draft to a final copy in one process.

Also, subsequent stories were able to be quickly assembled by utilizing portions of previously stored
documents. This greatly expedited work because the revised material did not have to be retyped in order to tailor a story to a local area. Another value was that more polished and professional work resulted since revisions and corrections could be made with ease.

Electronic Mail

Simultaneously an electronic mail system was implemented. The first system was developed by Dialcom Computer System of Silver Springs, Maryland, as a contract service for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The original contract provided a nationwide system that served USDA and the Land-Grant Colleges. Now many other federal departments and some private agencies are tied into the system. The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service was an early user of the electronic mail system, beginning first with a small portable computer. An IBM Display Writer is now used because all editing and correcting of outgoing messages can be made right on the Display Writer before tying into the system to distribute it. Thus distribution takes seconds, instead of minutes. Also, when incoming messages are received, any number of copies can be made and they can then be distributed electronically throughout the organization.

In early 1983, IBM Display Writers were placed in the nine District Offices and an in-state electronic mail network was set up with the 5520 system serving as traffic manager. Initial use was for administrative messages but it
has potential for transmitting educational material, particularly in emergency situations such as acute infestations by new pest, etc. Such communications can be within the state, with other states or with Washington, D.C.

Computer Programs

Computer programs are now available for use by farmers and homemakers on their home computers. Some educational work is being done by Extension in the area of programming for home and business use. Also, computerized programs in such areas as dairy herd improvement, animal nutrition, soil fertility and timing of cultural practices are already available commercially and are being used by Extension specialists. The former, for example, enables the farmer to have the data needed to facilitate his culling decisions while the latter provide "least cost" ration alternatives.

The trend in specialization of computer programs was noted by Personal Computing when it included the article, "Down On The Farm" in its December 1984 issue. To support this development, it stated that "The increasingly specialized magazine market will have a new entrant come January when Farm Computer News hits the stands.

Aimed at farmers who use computers to manage their businesses, Farm Computer News is billed as "the magazine of farm technology" and will be published by Successful Farming on a bimonthly basis. The magazine hopes for an initial subscription base of 10,000 with an annual subscription rate of $20.5

Even traditional farm-oriented magazines such as Progressive Farmer now carry computer advertisements.
Excerpts follow of a Radio Shack advertisement entitled "Farm Computing Is Now More Affordable Than Ever" which appeared in the November 1984 issue of the Progressive Farmer:

Radio Shack's TRS-80 Model 4
Is Now $700 Below Last Year's Price

Now you have a single source to meet all your agricultural computing needs. Radio Shack offers everything for the farm-base system, including computers and agricultural software. . . .

Our AgDisk computer programs (sold separately) are a valuable decision-making tool for today's farmers and ranchers. Agribusiness programs for farm accounting, financial management, machinery analysis and crop calculations are a "must" when narrow profit margins leave little room for error. And our AgDisk software templates even make the popular VisiCalc spreadsheet analysis program easy to use for agricultural applications. You can get the answers to "What if?" question instantly, so you can see how decisions about loans, crops, cattle and feed will affect your farm or ranch. Finally, the AgriData information service gives you 24-hour access to agricultural news, market analysis, commodity exchange information, weather reports and much more--all by telephone (requires modem).6

Educational Computer Programs

Education itself has not been immune to the affects of computerization. Ag Ed Network considers itself to "the first on-line educational network for agriculture." Other pertinent facts on Ag Ed Network:

... It is a dial-up, interactive information and communication service. Basically that means that the vo-ag teacher connects the classroom computer to the AgriData computers over the toll-free lines to get the educational material and current information they need to teach their students. Ag Ed Network offers over 500 single topic teaching units to support the vo-ag curriculum. In addition, Ag Ed Network features FFA news, FFA information, an idea exchange and software
reviews.

Ag Ed Network is part of AgriData Network, America's agricultural information and communications network. AgriData Network provides farmers and ranchers with up-to-the-minute news, market and weather information. It offers the best strategies from several advisory services, the latest technological information plus details on health and herd management. Accurate information, 24 hours a day nationwide and worldwide. 

In answer to the question, "Why was Ag Ed Network Developed?" this information was provided:

In 1983 a group of agribusiness leaders identified the skills necessary for success in the 1980's-business planning and decision-making, management, marketing expertise and a knowledge of current economic issues--and they identified the computer as one of the most important tools needed to implement these skills. In addition, teachers, state supervisors and teacher educators were asked what they would like to see improved ag education. They wanted:

---Access to live information
---On-line curriculum lessons
---A news commentary for students
---FFA to provide information
---A guide to usable software
---An idea exchange
---Electronic communications
---A practical teaching tool

Consequently, Ag Ed Network was designed and tested by teachers of vocational agriculture. An advisory board of teachers and educators from high schools across the country, from departments of agriculture and from universities created the concept of this live educational network so that today Ag Ed Network has everything requested.

Future Computer Developments

A study is presently underway to evaluate the utility and feasibility of placing individual personal computers in each parish office. Holmes believes that the only deterrent to this proposal will be the budget.
justifications will be electronic mail, program libraries, decision programs, etc.

The only limit on computer applications will be the budget and administrative policy. Already there exists the ability to electronically publish materials. Also, programs such as The Source and CompuServe are available. Now agriculturally-oriented videotext networks are already appearing. Farmers can access these from their homes via their telephones, thus enabling them to obtain up-to-date market information, agricultural news, different newspapers, computer games for their children, educational programs, farm management programs, etc.

Extension Committee on Policy

The Extension Committee on Policy, a group which studies ways in which the Extension Service can respond to national needs and outlines general policies for program development, recently examined the question of whether the Extension Service should prepare its own videotext programs or whether it should cooperate with commercial producers by providing information. Their recommendation was that Extension should cooperate with the commercial producers. This decision is in conformance with Extension's philosophy of not competing with commercial endeavors and follows the precedent established with farm magazines of providing them with information.
Missouri AM Radio Experiment

At an ACE Convention, a speaker described a forthcoming experiment whereby computer programs can be broadcast over AM radio. To retrieve the program, the farmer/homeowner would only need to couple his computer to his radio at the designated time. It was envisioned that the computer programs might be commercially sponsored. For example, one scenario could be that Ralston-Purina would promote a program enabling farmers to select the optimal ration for his livestock. Hence, the radio announcer would state, "The computer program for today is 'Calculating Alternative Beef Cattle Rations;' and it is brought to you by Ralston-Purina. Please activate your computer at the sound of the tone." Transmission of the program might take 3-5 seconds. By recording it on a diskette, the farmer could then use it at his convenience. This method would enable farmers to receive free computer programs.

Regional Agricultural Computer Initiatives

The North Central Research Committee--NCR--90 is unique because it is the only committee of its type in the United States. It is a long-standing official committee of the North Central Agricultural Experiment Stations' regional research committee system. It was created to provide a means of information exchange among agricultural communicators and researchers in the region involved in agricultural communications research or its application.
In 1984, its annual conference was entitled The Application of Computer Technology to Communication Processes and was held in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The foreword to the 1984 Conference gives this information:

The official committee title is "NCR-90 Mass Communication Research." Since it is the only organized committee in the country concerned with communication research, NCR-90 and its members are looked to for national leadership in this area.

... NCR-90 has sponsored two major national conferences related to research and communications—one on evaluation, held in Des Moines in April, 1977; and this one on computers and communication. Thus, NCR-90 holds a unique position of leadership in the area of agricultural communications research among the land-grant universities of the country.

For further research or readings on agricultural application of computers, the bibliography of this conference report should be consulted.

Computer Enhancement of Visual Aids

The potential of this computer capability has not been realized yet, according to Holmes, who sees great opportunity also for an educational organization to apply computer graphics to create visual aids from data in storage, to produce design elements electronically and to save them for possible later modification and incorporation into new communication packages.

Satellite Transmissions

Communication transmission is now global when satellites are used. This technology will have profound ramifications not only for Louisiana agriculture but the entire
world. It is easy to envision a scenario where Louisiana research could be disseminated to areas having similar climates and products or vice versa for the mutual benefit of all concerned. Most daily newspapers already receive their wire services via satellite and the production of facsimile printed material.

Because of its illustrative value, an article entitled "Computer Joining Tractor as Part of Modern Farm" has been placed in Appendix H.

**Communications Staff**

A review of the staff which has made the previously described communication accomplishments possible here in Louisiana is now in order. Just as specialization has occurred in other professions, so it has occurred in communications. However, Holmes is quick to state that his office practices a teamwork approach to projects. This fosters flexibility and awareness of problems and opportunities for all team members. He believes the division is understaffed in the visual and electronic media compared with written or print media area, but a better balance has been achieved recently. Those employed in the print area are Sandra Avant, Assistant Specialist; Tom Merrill, Assistant Specialist; Phillip H. Massey, Specialist; and Ted R. Holmes, Specialist (Editor). Those who have recently resigned include: Catherine L. Arnold, Associate Specialist; Thomas C. Boyd, Associate Specialist; Jack

The electronic media area includes Michael Futrell, Associate Specialist and Division Leader as of August 1, 1984; John Brooks, Assistant Specialist; and V. H. "Red" Hebert, Specialist. Futrell and Brooks generally concentrate on radio and audio tape production, while Hebert usually devotes his attention to TV. John Wozniak became Assistant Specialist in the audiovisual section after the resignation of Johnny R. Gordon in August 1984. The art staff, which supports both visual aids and publications consists of N. Ruth Thompson, Specialist, Mary W. Thrasher, Assistant Specialist, and Frankie Gould, Assistant Specialist. Jane Honeycutt serves as publications editor.

Extension and the Experiment Stations have a combined communications office. Mike Futrell and Mary Thrasher's time is divided almost equally between Extension and the Experiment Stations, while twenty percent of Holmes' time is charged to the Experiment Stations. Three editors devote their attention to publications which are more dressed up, that is, they have more color which is usually functional and more illustrations than formerly. The publications staff includes Donald E. Dider, Editor, Experiment Station; Gail M. Smith, Assistant Editor, Experiment Station; and John R. Tarver, Assistant Editor. Jack V. Lord became
Assistant to the Director for Communications in late 1984 to handle media relations for the research staff.

An information campaign is an example of a team approach. This team would possibly consist of Sandra Avant who offers specialization in the print media; John Brooks, who specializes in radio communication, and Red Hebert, whose specialty is TV.

Professional Organization

To end this chapter without reference to the professional association of land-grant communication workers would be a disservice. The professional organization was first known as the American Association of Agricultural College Editors or AAAACE for short. In 1986, it is known as ACE which stands for Agricultural Communicators in Education. The objective is still the same: To help train communication people who work for land-grant institutions in basic communication theory such as the importance of psychological and sociological factors; to facilitate the exchange of information and to promote professionalism.

In fact, to accomplish its objective ACE publishes a monthly newsletter and a quarterly journal. An award and critique program is held each year as well as regional and subregional meetings.

Three LSU editors, Marvin Osborn, Bentley Mackay and Marjorie Arbour, have served as president of AAACE and Holmes was the Southern Region Director for 1985-1987.
ACE was instrumental in establishing NPAC—National Project in Agricultural Communication. It was a program which served as a nationwide bank of information on communication research, particularly as it related to dissemination of agricultural knowledge, and sponsored intensive workshops whose purpose was to help people become better communicators and teachers of communications. Holmes believes that NPAC probably did more to promote the scientific study of communication than anything else. It gave impetus to much of the communications research done in the U.S. during this century. NPAC was supported by the Kellogg Foundation and the participating universities. It existed in the 1950's and 1960's. Each phase of the training program was taught at three workshops held in different areas of the U.S. LSU hosted one of these national workshops on visual aids in 1960. Holmes was the resident coordinator. He said efforts are presently underway by ACE to reestablish a program similar to NPAC but a financial sponsor has not been found yet.

A number of LSU people were involved with NPAC including: Marjorie Arbour, A. V. Patterson, Jr., Edgar Boone, Dr. J. H. Jones, C. W. Price, Pat Morgan, Gordon Loudon and Holmes. Holmes pointed out that Director Sanders was a strong supporter of NPAC. This was probably, according to Holmes, because the training which was developed by NPAC ultimately reached every Extension specialist and agent. It
taught them a lot about how people communicate and how they learn. It implanted in the minds of Extension workers a caring concept of education. They were no longer just teaching agronomy, horticulture, animal science, home economics, etc. They were teaching people 10

Conclusion

The present staff of fifteen professionals in the Communications Division contrasts with a staff of seven which existed when Holmes joined the service in 1958. Before his employment, the seven positions were (1) chief editor, who was Marjorie Arbour (she had the distinction of being the first female chief editor of an agricultural communication office in the U.S.); (2) Charles Price, the newspaper specialist; (3) Gordon Loudon, radio specialist; (4) A. V. Patterson, Jr., visual aid specialist; and (5) Lorraine Bass, artist; (6) Tom Bourg, extension publications editor; and (7) Lawrence V. George, experiment station publications. Such new programs as sea grant, integrated pest management, food and nutrition, and energy imposed new demands for educational material and resulted in expansion of the Communications Division.

Also, a shift in roles has occurred through the years so that the communications staff are considered educators on their own—not just production people—artists, editors, journalists. Ideally, they work as a part of a team of educators, contributing their own knowledge of the education
process and helping to plan educational programs and methods. This concept has not yet been fully accepted by all of the people they work with, according to Holmes. Holmes related that some people still come and say, "I'm doing an educational program and I want you to produce the material I have planned." The successes of the programs in which the communications staff was involved in the planning have persuaded many, however, to call in the staff early in the process.

This chapter marks the end of our general consideration of the Louisiana Extension Service; starting with the next chapter, the topics will be more specialized. Chapter VIII, "Louisiana Extension and the Farm Bureau," serves as a reminder that Extension does not function in a vacuum--its programs are shaped by the agricultural policies of the various levels of government which themselves are often influenced by farm lobbying organizations, the largest of which is the Farm Bureau.
NOTES

1Personal interview with Mr. Ted R. Holmes, Specialist (Editor), Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, at Baton Rouge on 21 November 1978.

2Ibid.

3Mr. Holmes, October 26, 1984.


5Personal Computing, December 1984, p. 308.


7Questions and Answers About Ag Ed Network, Handout, n.p., n.d. (It was in the possession of Mr. Ted R. Holmes on November 1, 1985.)

8Ibid.


10Mr. Holmes, October 26, 1984.
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CHAPTER VIII
LOUISIANA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
AND THE
LOUISIANA FARM BUREAU

The relationship of the State's official off-campus agricultural educational agency, the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES), to the State's largest farm organization, the Farm Bureau, will be examined in this section. Since the LCES was established in 1914 as a result of Congressional passage of the Smith-Lever Act, a federal or national overview will be presented first. The primary source for this overview will be the book by William J. Block, *The Separation of the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service: Political Issue in a Federal System*, 1960. The overview from the State perspective will utilize the Ed.D. dissertation of Dr. Daniel Ray Robertson, "History of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation," LSU, 1982, and Frederick W. Williamson's book, *Origin and Growth of Agricultural Extension in Louisiana--1860-1948*.

The stated purpose of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 was to aid in "diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same." It was to operate on a cooperative plan, with each state college initiating its
plan of work and submitting it to the Secretary of Agriculture for approval. A basic grant of $10,000 was made to each state, with an additional amount being prorated on the basis of the state's rural population. The latter funds had to be matched by the individual state, either from its own or local governmental appropriations, or from private contributions.¹

This last provision, permitting private contributions for local Extension work, caused the following situation to develop according to Robert C. Clark.

... Local or county sponsorship of the Extension program has always been of major importance. In some states, these sponsoring groups, or county associations were called farm bureaus. Extension workers were, in many instances, enthusiastic sponsors of farm bureaus, since such an organization provided a clientele group that was interested and easily identifiable. The group was also a source of much needed local financial support. This interest was reflected in the passage of laws in many states that required the organization of a county farm bureau, or similar organization, with a minimum membership as a basic condition for the employment of a county Extension agent. This movement culminated in the formation of a temporary nationwide association in November, 1919, organized under the name of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Both the Grange and Farmers' Union were opposed to the service being officially allied with any farm organization.

Many states later saw fit to repeal the law that required the organization of a county farm bureau as the local sponsoring group for Cooperative Extension. In its place, a county agricultural Extension service committee was established by law to sponsor Extension programs.²

As a historical aside, J. J. Lancaster provides this description on the origin of the Farm Bureau:
The Farm Bureau had its beginning in Broome County, New York, in 1911. Its chief purpose was to provide financial support and guidance for Extension-type work in the county. From this beginning, the Farm Bureau movement spread to other areas of the country. In several Central, Northeastern, and Western states, local Farm Bureaus were the major supporting organizations for Cooperative Extension Service work at the county level. Through a period of vigorous growth and development, Farm Bureau became interested in many other problems that concerned farmers apart from education. In 1919, these Farm Bureaus were federated to become the American Farm Bureau Federation, a general farm organization.3

Although the Louisiana enabling legislation authorizing participation in the Extension Program did not officially or statutorily require Farm Bureau financial support (but permitted each parish police jury and school board to participate), the Louisiana Farm Bureau has been and continues to be closely associated with the LCES. The reason for the development of this situation follows.

War and the rumors of wars, unfortunately, stimulate agricultural production. World War I was no exception. Even before the entry of the United States into WW I the need for increased food production stimulated Congressional appropriations to extension work. Extension Service employees, both in Washington and the field, recognized the greater effectiveness of their demonstration methods when farmers were organized in definite local associations.4

Also helping to cement the Farm Bureau/Extension relationship was a Depression spawned Congressional act which was a part of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "alphabetic soup" agencies designed to provide relief for
American farmers. It was the AAA--Agricultural Adjustment Act--of 1933 which proposed to control agricultural production and to make direct payments to cooperating farmers. Within the entire Department of Agriculture there was only one agency with a nationwide field organization which could be used at once to explain the complexities of the program and to administer it. This was the Cooperative Extension Service, with a representative, the county agent in almost every agricultural county of the nation. This use of the Extension Service was to be as valuable to the Farm Bureau as its exaggerated claim to be the sole spokesman for the American farmers.5

According to Block, the precedent for the ultimate official separation of Extension from Farm Bureau occurred in 1939. He describes the event which culminated in this year in this manner:

Following the passage of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in 1936, a gradual reorganization of the department took place, in which the agricultural agencies outside were brought in and the state Extension Services withdrew from their administration of the production control program. By 1939 the SCS, Soil Conservation Service, Farm Security Administration, Rural Electrification Administration and Farm Credit Administration were within the department and had greatly increased its direct services to farmers. These agencies, which at times competed with each other for appropriation, personnel, and policy influence, also tended to deemphasize the importance of the Cooperative Extension Service, which had largely returned to its educational program. The separation of the AAA program from the Extension Service and the consequent formation of a straight-line agency from Washington to the field had inevitably brought fieldmen from the various action agencies into conflict; while it had been acceptable to some
Extension Services, others had opposed it. Consequently, at a meeting between departmental representatives and those of the land-grant colleges, a division of responsibility was agreed upon. Under the terms of the Mount Weather Agreement, signed in 1938, research and education were allotted to the colleges, and the action programs reserved to the department.6

The year 1939 also represents another milestone for Extension—almost 97% of the U. S. counties had at least one Extension representative, the County Agent, numerically, 2,990 out of a total 3,070 counties.7

When the war broke out in Europe in 1939, it had little immediate impact on the farm economy. Existing supplies were far in excess of domestic consumption, and not until the lend-lease program began well over a year later did the increased demand promise higher prices. The entry of the U. S. into the war and the accelerated demand for food and fiber production once more, as in the early 1930's, renewed interest in policies affecting agriculture. Conflict over the incentives used to increase agricultural production and the price and wage ceilings used to limit inflation broke out.8 However, as the U. S. moved from the role of neutral, to that of supplier, to that of participant in WW II, new agricultural policies developed.9

In its December 1940 convention, the Farm Bureau proposed to reorganize and decentralize the Department of Agriculture. For example, "in the states, administration of departmental programs would be divided between the state Extension Service, which would supervise the Soil
Conservation Service and Farm Security programs, and a state committee which would head the field operations necessary to administer the AAA. . . ."10 The more successful attack on a departmental program occurred in 1942 when the Farm Bureau halted the land-use planning program which was supervised by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Farm Bureau was able to halt what it termed "a needless activity" when Congress refused to appropriate funds for that purpose in fiscal 1943.11

The first attempt to obtain statutory separation of the farm bureaus and the state and local Extension Service units where they were allied by sympathy and interests which had not developed from any state law authorizing farm bureau sponsorship of Extension work was in 1943.12 Louisiana, as noted previously, fell in this category because it had no state law requiring the State Extension Service to work with the Louisiana Farm Bureau. Previous to this, Farm Bureau spokesmen had ignored the attacks as being beneath the dignity of an answer. However, in support of the Farm Bureau-Extension alliance, the public replies often came from Extension leaders who had no statutory or contractual ties with county farm bureaus. Block states, "Such were the assurances of unity expressed in an official Farm Bureau publication and at its national convention in 1940 by southern directors." In support of this statement, he provided this footnote:
Dean J. G. Lee, Jr., of the Louisiana State College of Agriculture, wrote that "we think we should work with and through this Farm Bureau organization to put over its program," because it is "forward-looking" and has a "strong organization in this state." 

Williamson unabashedly supports the preceding information on the position of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service toward the Louisiana Farm Bureau when he included the following description of the origin of the latter Farm Bureau in his book.

... the Farm Bureau movement introduced certain improvements in marketing methods which persisted after the organizations themselves ceased to exist. The practices insisted on by the cooperatives, including proper grading and attractive packaging of fruits and vegetables, were recognized as highly important to profitable distribution and were incorporated in the later activities of farming groups in the state. For that reason the history of the cooperative movement has a significant place in the story of the evolution of Louisiana agriculture, as well as in the story of Agricultural Extension, which was intimately identified with the development of the cooperative program. The story centers in the activities of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation which was the parent of the various cooperative organizations in the state.

The movement for a cooperative farming organization had its beginning in midyear of 1921, when representatives of twenty-eight parishes in which local groups of the American Farm Bureau Federation had already been formed, met at Baton Rouge for the purpose of organizing a State Farm Bureau Federation. A few weeks later another statewide meeting was held at the farm of Dean W. R. Dodson. A temporary organization then was set up, out of which plans were developed for compiling a constitution and by-laws and the formation of a permanent organization. J. H. Carpenter, Rosepine, was president; W. E. Hopper, Zachary, vice-president; and Guy G. Tanner, Baton Rouge, secretary. Harry F. Kapp, who eventually became a potent figure in the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, was named organizer of the campaign. Presiding at the meeting was W. R. Perkins, director of Agricultural Extension.
At the annual county agents' meeting in January, 1922, a systematic scheme was adopted for state-wide Farm Bureau promotion. At the time the permanent organization was effected, there was a total membership of 1,500. When the first annual convention was held a year later, the membership had increased to 5,000. By June, 1923, the roster of Farm Bureau members totaled 7,711. Fifty-two of the parishes each had a local organization.14

From Farm Bureau's perspective, the purpose of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service was educational as can be seen from this Williamson quote:

When the second annual convention was held in June, 1923, Harry F. Kapp had become secretary-manager of the state federation. In his report to the convention, Mr. Kapp emphasized the close relation between the Farm Bureau as a cooperative organization and the Agricultural Extension service. He said: "It has always been urged that the Farm Bureau is an educational factor and that its primary object is and should be to awaken the farmers of this state to the fact that they and they only are responsible for the progress of a prosperous agriculture. The Farm Bureau was set up primarily to assist the Extension division of Louisiana State University in obtaining economical and intelligent production. Following this, the next great step would be to secure economical and intelligent distribution of farm crops through selling associations set up by the farmers themselves." This philosophy served as a guidepost during the years of the cooperative activity.15

Those marketing associations which Williamson identified as being organized by the Farm Bureau included the Cotton Cooperative Association, which was but one of seven, 2) the Lespedeza Growers Cooperative Association, 3) the Louisiana Farm Bureau Rice Growers Cooperative Association, 4) the Perique Tobacco Cooperative Association, 5) the Louisiana Truck Growers Exchange, and cooperatives for the last two commodities, 6) sweet potatoes and 7) cane
syrup, came later.\textsuperscript{16}

The transition from WW II to peace provided a new occasion for a reconsideration of Farm Bureau-Extension relationships because such agencies as the War Food Administration were being abolished.\textsuperscript{17} Secretary Anderson of the USDA pointed out that the "basic" Extension patterns of relationship were a product of the WW I decade and that a re-examination of them would be desirable.\textsuperscript{18}

By 1948, the geographic spread of the asserted violations of prohibited activities by Extension department regulations was impressive, and the activities themselves, gave the appearance of a great amount of illegal and discriminatory work for farm bureaus by Extension employees. The states from which the photographic reproductions or clippings came were Alabama, Arkansas, \textbf{LOUISIANA}, Texas, Michigan, Wyoming, New York, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska. Of the eleven, there were formal Extension-farm bureau agreements in only the latter five! Some of the charges dated back to 1941, and some had been published before.\textsuperscript{19} Block explains the continuation of this relationship in this manner: "State Extension officials, particularly those who had been in the field at the birth of the state farm bureaus, had strong ties of emotion and organizational interest with those bodies."\textsuperscript{20}

The administration and most of the staff of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service certainly fit the
latter description. Williamson provides:

The place occupied by the Agricultural Extension service in this [Farm Bureau] program was one of primary importance. Extension workers stimulated production of all farm commodities through the teaching of approved scientific practices, stressing the importance of both efficient production and efficient marketing. The close relation between Extension, the Farm Bureau, and the commodity selling organizations was clearly recognized by those directing the three-fold agricultural endeavor, and complete cooperation was relied on for ultimate success.  

In contrast to the details which follow on the abolition of the official relationship between the LCES and the Farm Bureau, Williamson simply states:

. . . after the emergency period a change of policy was adopted. Henceforth, Extension personnel had no connection with cooperatives as such, although manifesting sympathy with every effort designed to make the lot of the farmer and the homemaker an easier and happier one.

The content of the policy changes follows.

Block provides that during 1947-48 an ad hoc committee was appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities to evaluate Extension programs, policies and goals. He states, "An advisory committee to this joint committee was also selected. It was composed of directors of Extension from Ohio, LOUISIANA, North Carolina, Vermont, and Wyoming, plus Federal Extension Director M. L. Wilson as ex officio member." In his footnote to the last statement, Block reveals:

In 1948, the Louisiana director was replaced by Director Knapp of West Virginia. In the latter state,
farm bureaus were statutory sponsors of Extension work. Although Block does not identify the Louisiana director by name, it would have been Dr. H. C. Sanders since he served from 1940 to 1961.

The analysis of the members of the preceding advisory committees is concluded by Block as follows:

. . . none came from formal relationship states, although Louisiana Extension personnel had been charged with widespread Farm Bureau recruiting during WW II. The makeup of neither committee appeared predisposed toward those who wished to maintain or expand farm bureau-Extension relationships. The arrangement thus posed an unusual opportunity for those who advocated separation.25

Nevertheless, Block indicates that those who continued to advocate separation in 1951 placed emphasis upon violations of the True-Howard agreement and Department of Agriculture regulations. County agents were charged with spending considerable time to recruit members for Farm Bureaus and with misusing the franking privilege. In support of this, Block cites the president of the North Dakota Farmers Union, Chester A. Graham, who "... said that, while organizing for the Farmers Union in the South in 1943, he met considerable competition from Louisiana Extension workers, who were performing a similar service for the Farm Bureau."26

True-Howard Agreement or Memorandum

To digress for a moment, this agreement was signed in Washington, D.C., on April 21, 1921, by A. C. True,
Director, States Relations Service, USDA, and J. R. Howard, President, American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF). The purpose of this memorandum of understanding, which was between the executive committee of the AFBF and the States Relations Service, USDA, is given in its preamble as follows:

Since questions have arisen regarding the relations of the farm bureaus to the cooperative extension service of the State agricultural colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture, it has seemed desirable for the national organization representing the farm bureaus and the extension service to formulate and recommend to their State and county organizations the following general outline of a policy which may govern the relations of the farm bureaus and the extension service in their cooperative enterprises.27

Sections on the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service followed the preamble. They contained a description and objectives of these organizations. Then the "Basis of Cooperation" was enunciated.

In an assessment of the True-Howard agreement, True acknowledged in 1923 that it "... was useful in establishing definitely the policy of the AFBF regarding the relations of the farm bureaus to the extension forces, and had a restraining influence on State and county farm bureaus and county agents when they were inclined to go too far in commercial activities."28

However, True conceded that considering the lack of ideal conditions caused by farmers' financial difficulties further clarifications were inevitable. The first occurred
on August 25, 1922, when Secretary of Agriculture, H. C. Wallace, issued his statement.29

Returning to our topic, in 1952, aid for the pro-separation group also came from the academic field. During this year, The Politics of Agriculture was published. It was written by Professor Charles M. Hardin of the University of Chicago, one of the few political scientists to specialize in the field of agriculture, the book's foreword was by M. L. Wilson. Although centered upon conflicts of our soil conservation policies, an introductory chapter was entitled "Extension and the Farm Bureau." Both sides of the separation controversy were presented but the author concluded that the Extension Service and Farm Bureau should be legally separated. The primary basis for his judgement was that "no public educational agency should be united with an organization engaged in business and political." Professor Hardin acknowledged that "actual separation," the breaking of informal patterns of communication and cooperation, would be much more difficult to attain. As with most other books which were on the pro-separation side, this one spoke for those who viewed Extension as an important public agency, which should have no obligations to a specific farm organization.30

Continuing with his chronological coverage, Block describes the 1952 presidential election as "... not only a political landslide, but it had very important
consequences in the field of agricultural policy. Considerable re-examination and change in the latter took place in the next three years. Among the most significant changes was the expansion of the Extension Service, a long-sought objective of the Farm Bureau officials.31

Top personnel changes in the Department of Agriculture following the election did not indicate any great preliminary advantage for either the advocates or opponents of separation. The appointment of Ezra Taft Benson, former executive secretary to the National Council of Farm Cooperatives and one-time Extension agent, as Secretary of Agriculture was more favorably received by Farm Bureau and Grange officials than by Farmers Union leaders, but this was offset by the major appointment in the Federal Extension Service.32 (Mr. Benson in 1985 was elected to head the Church of the Latter Day Saints, the Mormons, at Salt Lake City, Utah.)

Block stated that the appointment of Ohio's Extension Director, C. M. Ferguson to replace M. L. Wilson as director to the Federal Extension Service was evidently satisfactory to both sides. Coming from a state where a farm bureau sponsoring arrangement with the state Extension Service had been repealed some 20 years before, Director Ferguson was well qualified to head the Extension Service during a period of expansion.33 However, when Congress recommended that Extension's budget be doubled and SCS's reduced, Block
quotes both ranking members of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Appropriation Committee as stating that it was "... due to the Farm Bureau ties to Extension within the department."34

In 1954, Extension eventually got an additional $8.3 million after the House members reversed its Committee on Appropriations on the floor to enable Extension to do marketing work with individual farmers. This additional funding enabled Extension to acquire 1,000 new employees.35

What is now considered an agricultural policy landmark was issued by Secretary Benson on November 24, 1954--Memorandum 1368. He issued it to keep peace among the different farm organizations. It went far beyond the Wallace regulations and established, by authority of the secretary, new regulations governing all employees of the Department of Agriculture.36 However, although important, Block quickly points out that "the issuance of 'Memorandum No. 1368' did not automatically separate the farm bureaus from their sponsoring arrangements with the state Extension Service."37

Federal involvement in regulation of state Extension Services in what many considered a state's right was easy for Block to justify. He stated that "Extension Service employees ... enjoyed at least three privileges as federal employees. They were 1) the use of the penalty mailing privilege, 2) disability and death coverage under the U. S.
Employees' Compensation Act, and 3) retirement and Civil Service regulations.\textsuperscript{38}

Anticipating federal action because of the preceding facts, three states during legislative sessions of 1955 accomplished separation of their Extension Services from their state Farm Bureaus by statutory means. The three states were: Iowa, New York and Missouri.\textsuperscript{39} By 1958, four years after the Benson order, only in these three states were there formal ties of any sort between farm bureaus and state Extension Services: Illinois, Vermont and Arizona. According to Block, formal separation had been virtually accomplished.\textsuperscript{40}

Thus, for Block, Extension's acceptance by farm organizations and Congress is evident in the expansion of Extension employees from 12,717 in 1954 to 14,812 in 1958. Block concludes by stating that the problem which he saw confronting Extension was its retaining clientele support and receptiveness among diverse and conflicting organizations which were complicated by the rapid urbanization and suburbanization of the nation.\textsuperscript{41} In this, as we shall see in the concluding chapter, Block was prophetic.

Block makes this one final reference to Louisiana in his summary chapter:

During subsequent years, Louisiana's Democratic Senator Ellender and North Dakota's Republican Senator Young attained high rank on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and were frequent allies of...
the National Farmers Union. Despite this, and their frequent opposition to the American Farm Bureau Federation, neither gave any indirect aid similar to the biting criticism of Whitten or Andersen, to those who hoped to split the farm bureau away from this preferred position.42

Dr. Robertson in his history of the Louisiana Farm Bureau provides no example of Senator Ellender ever opposing the Louisiana Farm Bureau on its legislative agenda. Perhaps the above remark of Block can be explained by considering that the Louisiana Farm Bureau might have differed from the National Federation. This interpretation would make both Robertson and Block consistent.

Dr. Sanders' book, The Cooperative Extension Service, takes up the issue of the Extension Service-Farm Bureau relationship where Block's book ends in its year of publication, 1960. Contributing author, J. J. Lancaster, states that "... the official relationship ceased soon after 1954,"43 which was the year that Agricultural Secretary Ezra Taft Benson issued Memorandum No. 1368.

Lancaster continues by providing information made available after Block had written his book.

Department of Agriculture policy regarding Extension relationships with farmer organizations was strengthened and clarified in a statement issued by the Department in March, 1960:

It has long been the established policy of this department that its employees shall refrain from participating actively in meetings and in other activities concerned with the establishment of general farm organizations. This is a necessary corollary of the equally long established policy of the department that it shall deal fairly with all organizations and deal with each upon the same basis. As a continuation
of this policy it should be understood by employees of the department that it is not permissible for any of them to:

1. Participate in establishing any general farm organization;

2. Act as an organizer for any such farm organization or hold any other office therein;

3. Act as financial or business agent for any general farm organization; and

4. Participate in any way in membership campaigns or other activities designed to recruit members for any such organizations.

Thus, for almost half a century, from 1914 when the Smith-Lever Act established the Extension Service to 1960 when the Agricultural Department issued the above statement, the Extension Service and Farm Bureau enjoyed a very close working relationship and in some states this relationship was statutorily establish. Now, they would embark on a new relationship; one that was not statutorily established but one established by mutual interest, needs and respect.

Dr. Robertson in his dissertation, History of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, LSU, 1982, chronicles not only Farm Bureau's origin but its independence from the Extension Service as well. However, his chapter which is of most importance to this discussion is Chapter III, "Farm Bureau and the Extension Service." Since his coverage of this relationship is similar to the preceding one, it will not be necessary to quote extensive passages from his dissertation in support of this work, whose purpose is to take an Extension perspective. Suffice it to say that those
who desire a detailed treatment of the relationship of the LCES to the Louisiana Farm Bureau should peruse Dr. Robertson's dissertation as these excerpts show:

... Although Extension worked with all organized groups in the state, the great determination that it had to be sure that Farm Bureau was a success can be verified by the efforts of Extension to hire organizational specialists to work with Farm Bureau. In 1923, Floyd Spencer was made Assistant Director of LSU Extension and organizational specialist to work primarily with Farm Bureau and its programs. This he did for many years. In 1941, after the depression years had all but killed membership in Farm Bureau, H. G. Chalkley, then state president of Farm Bureau, demonstrated that he was not willing to let his organization die. He requested help from Extension. In answer to his request, Mr. Carl E. Kemmerly was brought from his position as county agent into the state office and made organizational specialist to succeed Mr. Spencer. Kemmerly started membership campaigns that brought the Farm Bureau from less than 1,000 members in 1941 to over 10,000 members in less than two years. Mr. Kemmerly, who was later to become Associate Director for the LSU Extension Service, undoubtedly did more to promote LFBF (Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation) during his 35-year relationship with the organization than did any other one individual. During the 1940's and 50's he pushed the Farm Bureau organization like no other person. He started the membership increase that has continued to build to the present time. Mr. Kemmerly attended 39 consecutive Farm Bureau conventions. Although he was given many honors, Mr. Kemmerly received his most outstanding honor in 1974.

Carl E. Kemmerly, Jr., has been presented the Distinguished Service Award by the Louisiana Farm Bureau during the 52nd Annual Convention. LFBF president James Graugnard presented the award to the retired Associate Director Emeritus of the LSU Cooperative Extension Service for his lifetime contribution to agriculture and Farm Bureau.

The award is the highest individual honor bestowed by LFBF and it is not an annual award. In fact, it has only been given once before, to the late Senator Allen J. Ellender in 1972. (LFBF News, August 1974, p. 4)
Director J. W. Bateman (1931-40)

Apparently, according to the following excerpts from Director Bateman's Memoirs, there was another reason for the decline in Extension's support of the Farm Bureau during his administration--him.

... the Farm Bureau, under the leadership of Harry Kapp, Secretary-treasurer, was campaigning all over the State to lower taxes, bypass the merchants and buy cooperatively from the factory, let him sell the cotton, rice, and strawberries for the farmers and use the County Agents to sell fertilizer for the Farm Bureau. He was a great campaigner and no doubt meant well. He was calling in the County Agents here and there and practically running the Extension Service. He made a speech in Minden and the same one in Many in which he was quoted as saying, "If L.S.U. could not operate on its budget, it should close its doors."

He was ignoring me, the new Director of Extension. Floyd Spencer was State Agent and was supposed to have control of the County and Home Agents. I called Floyd in to talk the thing over. He was very worried over what was happening to the farmers, but evidently agreed with Mr. Kapp as to the proper measures for relief. He wanted to know what I proposed to do to relieve the farmers.

Friction began to develop at once and it was spreading throughout the Extension Service. Meetings were being held with District Agents without my knowledge of the purpose or plans. I reported the situation to Dean J. G. Lee and Dr. James Monroe Smith. Dr. Smith told me to take the lead and do what I thought best.

I called in Floyd Spencer, the State Agent and told him of the situation. I told him that I was going to put the Extension Service back on the tracks and take the County Agent off the Farm Bureau rails. Floyd dropped his eyes to the floor momentarily and then leaned across the desk and said, "Director, you are right." I then told him that no meetings of any kind would be held or called except over my signature and handed him an order to all personnel that they would henceforth cease selling anything for Farm Bureau or servicing the Farm Bureau in any manner and that no trips out of the parish were to be made except by
permission or direction.

The Farm Bureau was selling fertilizer, seed, etc., and using the County Agents freely as sales agents for the Farm Bureau. They were going hither and thither on the orders of the Farm Bureau.

When I pulled the County Agents from under the leadership of the Farm Bureau, I was severely criticized by many well-meaning men. Some called it politics. It was not politics. It was a difference of opinion as to what should be done. I could not see how a man without knowledge or experience or finances could cure our troubles in agriculture.

Mr. Norris Williamson, a State Senator from East Carroll Parish, and a bitter political enemy of Huey P. Long was the President of the Farm Bureau and I were always friendly. I had known him well and we had met many times to discuss agriculture problems when I lived in Tensas Parish. Frank Dimmick, a planter and banker of Sunset, was a farm leader and stood well with the Farm Bureau. He also was a bitter anti-Long man and a good friend of mine. I was trying to serve agriculture and acted many times without any consideration of the political consequences. Never once in all the time that I was Director of Agriculture Extension did the Governor, any Governor, tell me what to do or interfere in a political manner with the programs, plans, or personnel. I served under Governors Huey Long, O. K. Allen, Jimmie Noe, Richard Leche, and Earl Long.

Now and then Dean Lee or Dr. Smith, the President, would ask for facts concerning matters and they always got the facts. 45

The relationship between the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service and the Louisiana Farm Bureau has evolved from one of mutual dependence in the formative years, 1921-41, of the Louisiana Bureau to one in 1986 of mutual independence, that is, Extension provides objective information on agriculture and disseminates it through education; Farm Bureau provides not only legislative lobbying on agricultural policies but also marketing,
insurance, safety, commodities, supplies and other vital services to its members.

The evolution of the Extension's relationships with its numerous client organizations and other agricultural services providers could be considered as well but the purpose of this section is not to be comprehensive, only illustrative. Therefore, those desiring information on the Soil Conservation Service and Extension can consult J. C. Headley's article "Soil Conservation Service and Cooperative Extension" which appeared in the journal, Agricultural History, Vol. 59, April 1985. Also, the book by Robert J. Morgan, Governing Soil Conservation (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), is definitely relevant.

With the historical origin of the Federal Extension Service and the LCES firmly established as well as the organizational development of the latter, the next chapter begins an examination of how the LCES carried out its responsibilities in these four major program areas: agriculture, home economics, 4-H Club or youth work and community development. They will be dealt with in Chapters IX through XII, respectively.
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CHAPTER IX
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

Introduction

This chapter and the three which follow it are very similar in that they attempt to outline the developments in the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service's (LCES) four major program areas from the late 1940's until the mid 1980's. The four program areas are (1) agriculture, (2) home economics, (3) 4-H Club or youth work and (4) community development. Before examining the agricultural extension developments in Louisiana, let us look at them from a national perspective.

National Agricultural Extension Developments

Although some people in the United States feel that agriculture is not as important today as it was a few decades ago, authors Prawl, Medlin and Gross in Adult and Continuing Education Through the Cooperative Extension Service believe differently. They quote Orville Freeman, a former USDA secretary, who "... wrote in his 1968 report to President Johnson, 'United States agriculture is growing in importance, not declining.'" In support of this, they point out that agricultural production has outmultiplied the population and they add:

Today, one farmer feeds himself and 77 others. That is
up dramatically from the 25 others he fed 30 years ago. Overall productivity continues to increase, and until very recently, real costs per unit of output steadily declined for nearly a century.²

The results of these developments had these implications they stated.

This rising productivity contributed to economic development in other sectors. The abundant amounts of food and fiber at relatively low costs freed workers from farm labor for employment in other industries, served as a source of capital for nonfarm industries, provided a major market for industrial goods and services and earned large sums of foreign exchange through exports, especially since World War II.³

Thus it can be concluded from this that agriculture is a basic and very important sector of the American economy even if less than two percent of the population is employed only as farmers.

They then turned their attention to how this growth of agriculture influenced the strategy and development of agricultural education which they conceded that it did influence. The authors used the seven eras developed by John Jenkins in his Historical Overview of Extension. Since the eras are so descriptive and the LCES's development tracked them, they are repeated here:

1. 1862 to 1914—Agriculture was recognized to be a profitable and efficient business. Industrialization was emphasized.
2. 1914 to 1920—This was a time of growth. Public awareness and acceptance of agriculture increased as organizational structure strengthened in response to the demands on agriculture caused by World War I.
3. 1921 to 1929—Extension service and agriculture were on their own. Little direction was available from federal and state levels.
4. 1930 to 1941—This was period of retrenchment. Extension service accommodated itself to both the
national program directions and to the new trend toward local citizen advisory committee activity.

5. **1941 to 1946**—Extension service gained wide exposure as the economy was committed to maximum production of food and fiber. The training of local leaders to assume leadership positions took on a major emphasis.

6. **1947 to 1960**—This was a period of adjustment to rapid technological advances. Agricultural programs expanded in scope and focused attention on individuals, the family and small groups.

7. **1961 to Present**—Extension service continued to expand its scope. Societal conditions called for a dual program emphasis that met the concerns of middle-class Americans as well as the disadvantaged.4

While they acknowledged that the Cooperative Extension Service took great pride in being a part of this agricultural revolution, the authors issued these two caveats: "First, the Cooperative Extension Service cannot take all the credit for the achievements in agricultural production. Strong research, teaching, industrial and agribusiness components were and are essential. Second, U.S. agriculture would have progressed without [the] extension service but certainly not as rapidly."5

Significant Congressional Acts affecting the Extension Service following WW II are identified by Prawl, Medlin and Gross as the following ones. Since their effects on the LCES will be important to our consideration of it, the acts are listed with an explanation.

**Bankhead-Flannagan Act, 1945:** When World War II ended, the wartime emergency funds allocated for extension work ceased. In an effort to fill this gap and to expand the scope of extension work, the Bankhead-Flannagan Act was passed. . . .
Agricultural Marketing Act, 1946: This act recognized long after the fact that extension faculty were deeply involved in providing information related to the marketing of agricultural products. Additional and special funds were authorized for extension service's use outside the normal, traditional Smith-Lever formula funding. The act enabled extension service to further expand the scope of its activities into the marketing, transportation and distribution of farm products.

Clarke-McNary Act Amendment of 1949: The Clarke-McNary Act Amendment of 1949 was an extension of the original 1924 act that provided matching funds to states for farm-forestry work. It enabled the Cooperative Extension Service, through the land-grant universities, to slowly expand their education and demonstration programs in establishing, renewing, managing and protecting farm wood lots and in harvesting, marketing and using forest products.

Smith-Lever Act Amendments of 1953, 1955, 1962 and 1972: Nine acts relating to extension service were simplified and consolidated into one act—the Smith-Lever Amendment of 1953. This amendment authorized Congress to increase annual appropriations with special authorization. It instructed that future funds would be based on the decennial census. It also changed the allocation of funds.

The 1955 amendment to the Smith-Lever Act earmarked appropriations for work with farm families in disadvantaged areas. This allocation was outside the traditional funding formula and marked a significant departure from the past.

The 1962 amendment merely changed the allocation of formula funds to: 4 percent for federal administration needs; 20 percent to be divided equally among the states; 40 percent to be distributed according to each state's rural population; and 40 percent to be distributed according to each state's farm population.

For fiscal year 1967 the federal administration requested that Congress redirect in its budget proposals $9.6 million from formula funds to $6.7 million for special work in resource development and $2.9 million for low-income family work. Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) opposed this move because it did not want such large funds to be allocated by the administrative branch. Congress
sided with ECOP. By 1968 only funds provided by the Agricultural Marketing Act (dating from 1946) were distributed outside the funding formula, i.e., Section 3(b) and 3(c).

1971 Annual Budget Message: In its 1971 annual budget message the federal administration proposed that all money for Cooperative Extension Service, as well as several other selected agencies, be placed in a special revenue-sharing fund that would be given to each state's governor for allocation. ECOP also opposed this because it felt this would destroy the federal-state county partnership and jeopardize extension service's freedom from political interference, a principle in operation since 1914. Congress again sided with ECOP.

1972 Rural Development Act, Title V and the Energy Extension Act of 1978: Under these acts, funding grants were allocated to the states for administrative organization and control. In effect, this made it possible for any institution of higher learning or state agency to compete with the land-grant university for such money. Thus, the land-grant institutions are no longer the only institutions in the states conducting extension programs.

1979: Despite confrontations between states (as represented through ECOP) and the federal administration, formula funds lost ground. In 1954 formula funds amounted to 98 percent of federal payments to the states. By fiscal year 1978 this figure dropped to 56 percent.

With this outline in mind, the developments in agricultural Extension in Louisiana will now be reviewed.

Louisiana Agricultural Extension Developments

Since the agricultural segment of Extension's history is so multi-faceted, it is not feasible to record all crops, livestock and other agricultural work of Extension here. Let the following be illustrative and representative of the types of agricultural pursuits of Extension and their changes over time.
It is proposed in Chapter XIV that a detailed history of each of the component divisions of LCES's agricultural program be written. For example, being a former commercial poultry farmer, in 1962, it took 9 1/2 weeks to raise a 4 pound broiler and the feed conversion was 2 1/2 pounds of feed to 1 pound of meat. By 1982, it only took 7 weeks to raise a 4 pound chicken and the feed conversion was slightly less than 2 pounds of feed to one pound of meat. Similar changes could be presented for all farm products and the role which Extension played in them, if any.

This portion the Extension story is told by Mr. Neal Dry, who was born in 1914, graduated from High School in 1932 and began his career with the LCES in Caddo Parish as an Assistant County Agent in 1942. Dry became County Agent in Caddo Parish in 1945 and served in that capacity until 1956 when he was promoted to the State Office in Baton Rouge. He remained there until his retirement in 1974.

World War II

Dry vividly remembers his service in Caddo during World War II. There was a national effort for everyone to grow Victory Gardens. Caddo Parish set an example in this program. In addition to the newsletter, the two daily newspapers and four radio stations in Shreveport cooperated fully to provide ample media coverage. It was amazing to see the efficiency which this program achieved. Dry remembers one Shreveport fireman who utilized every inch of
his city lot to grow foodstuffs year round. For example, he would plant a low growing crop such as cabbage under his corn. As soon as the corn was harvested, he would cut the stalks down in order to permit the cabbage space in which to mature. Through this method of continual utilization of limited space, the fireman was able to achieve an almost unlimited volume of homegrown foods. Well, at least more than he and his wife could eat. The LCES would get a picture of this garden every Spring for publicity since they were responsible for the educational promotion of Victory Gardens. In Dry's opinion, more gardens were grown during WW II than at any time since.

Prisoners of War

Extension had a unique responsibility during WW II—the placement of prisoners of war. This occurred because it was the policy of the American government to bring as many of the captured Axis soldiers to the States in order to reduce the possibility of their escaping and returning to the War. Since there was a shortage of farm laborers, the captured soldiers would be used as agriculture workers. Prisoner of war camps were distributed throughout the agriculture producing areas of the state. One of these camps was in Caddo Parish. About 250 prisoners were housed in it. These prisoners were used by the local plantation owners to produce cotton. Mr. Carl E. Kemmerly, Jr., was the director of this program for Louisiana.
The Caddo Prisoner of War Camp was on a farm owned by a Mr. McCann; so, everyone called it McCann's Camp. Only German prisoners were placed in it. Each farm was assigned a specific number of prisoners to work as laborers depending on the size of the farm and its need for workers. Dry stated that the German prisoners made good cotton field workers as soon as they learned to tell the difference between the cotton plants and the cockleburs while hoeing. All cotton had to be hand chopped at this time.

While in camp, the prisoners were kept in a wired compound but no restrictions, such as handcuffs, were placed on them when they were transported to the fields or while they were working. The prisoners were taken to work each morning by the plantation owners in their own trucks and returned each afternoon. The owners, while responsible for the prisoners, did not have to use armed overseers to prevent them from escaping. Dry pointed out that these were not "criminal" prisoners. In fact, Dry could only recall one prisoner who tried to escape and he was quickly recaptured. This prisoner had served with Rommel and had previously escaped in Africa and also in Italy. Since the prisoners were served good meals and were treated well, discipline was not a problem. Although there was a small isolation building at camp, it was rarely used. When the War ended, many of the prisoners begged the farmers for whom they had worked to let them stay and continue to work for
them. They did not want to go home.

Allocation of POWs

As County Agent, Dry hired Mr. Ben Haygood to handle the prisoners-of-war (POWs). The LCES was responsible for allocating the prisoners to farmers based on their statement of need. A quota system was developed which considered the size of the farm, type of crop, etc. Almost always the stated needs of the farmers were able to be accommodated.

The prisoners of war were paid. Their money, however, was placed in an escrow account to be given to them when they were repatriated. They were not exploited according to Dry.

Haygood, at this time, was chairman of the parish ASC--Agricultural Stabilization Committee. He later became postmaster of the Belcher Post Office.

Allocation of Farm Supplies

It should be noted here that the ASCS (Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service) played an important role in the allocation of farm supplies such as gasoline, tires, etc. Farmers were given ration stamps, which were often called "T-Stamps," meaning "Truck Stamps," and these stamps could be redeemed for supplies. Before being eligible for these stamps, the farmer had to describe his needs to ASCS and then have them verified by ASCS. Considered here were factors such as the amount of land in cultivation and type of crops grown.
Transition from Mules to Tractors

Because of the war, every effort was made to increase production. There were no acreage controls. "Even the fence rows were planted, usually in cotton, because it was the only cash crop," Dry stated. The war effort is given credit by Dry as the principal cause accelerating the change from animal to mechanical power. Dry recalls that one farmer, Clarence Frierson, was growing about 3,000 acres of cotton in south Caddo Parish. When Dry was a boy, they could only plow about two acres of land a day with mules. This restricted the amount of cotton which could be planted to about twelve acres per adult male worker. When the four-row tractor was developed, 50 acres a day could be plowed. Later, eight-row tractors became available.

Examples of an Unanticipated Consequence

The transition from animal power to mechanical power increased agricultural production in two ways. The first, as explained above by Dry, arose from the ability to cultivate more land with tractors than with mules and horses. It is the reason most often focused upon in explaining the increased production. Forbes, in their column entitled "Flashbacks: 'The more things change....,'" summarized a story from their August 1, 1926, issue which gives the other, lesser known reason for the increased production; it follows:
More farm machinery, like this tractor pulling two threshers, was one reason crop surpluses became more common in the 1920's. For another reason, see first item.

The decrease in the horse population has had a decided effect on the farm surplus. It is estimated that it takes the product of 5 acres to support one horse one year. The decrease of 6 million horses and mules, which has taken place during the last eight years, means therefore that the product from 30 million acres has been diverted into the channels of human food.7

The road to mechanization of agriculture not only displaced farm animals, it displaced farm workers as well. Forbes records a crucial step in the development of machine-picking of cotton in this "Flashback" story from September 15, 1936:

On the last day of August a trial opened in the tiny town of Stoneville, Miss., whose final outcome may rock a giant U.S. industry to its foundations. The courtroom was a rich delta cotton field, white with bursted bolls. Judge and jurors were 200 cotton planters, agricultural experts and farm-machinery makers.

On trial was the Rust cotton picker, latest child in a family of hundreds of patents and a score of machines whose single object has been to mechanize the back-breaking, ill-paid anachronism of picking cotton by hand.

In 1936 this Rust mechanical picker marked the end of cotton picking by hand.8

Note that no mention is made of what provisions were being made for the "ill-paid" workers who were about to be displaced from the cotton farms. Dry provides insight to what happened to some in Caddo Parish in the section which follows.
Acreage Control Brings Social Change

During the war, there was not enough cotton; after the war, there was too much cotton. This brought about the imposition of acreage controls. Cotton farmers were restricted to planting 29 percent of their cultivated land in Caddo Parish. Another use for 61 acres out of every 100 had to be found. In Caddo, Dry stated that most farmers turned to cattle. This was before the advent of soybeans as a profitable crop in Louisiana.

Raising cattle, however, required considerably fewer workers than raising cotton. For example, Dry recalled being on the 3,000 acre cotton farm of Clarence Frierson one morning when he assembled the heads of his farm workers and told them that, because of the acreage control, he would not have work for 100 families during the next season! All these families were Black. Frierson assured those workers being let go that they could live rent in his houses as long as they wanted. Dry pointed out that fortunately the economy was growing and many of the workers had acquired skills on the farm which were marketable in town. For instance, many workers who had maintained the farm tractors became service station attendants or mechanics. Nevertheless, Dry acknowledged that Mr. Frierson kept his best workers. Frierson's cotton acreage went from 3,000 acres to about 800 acres after the allotment.

Some farmers like Bruce Lynn, later a State
Representative, rented land in order to compensate for their reduced acreage. Dry said that Representative Lynn had been raising about 3,000 acres of cotton before the controls. Afterwards Representative Lynn stated that he could not survive economically on the reduced acreage because his existing equipment, tractors, etc., were purchased to handle the original capacity. It would not have been economically feasible for him to have operated the existing equipment on the reduced acreage so he increased his acreage by renting because the allotment went with the rented land.

Most of the rented land in Caddo Parish was in the hands of heirs and the heirs were often not farmers. Therefore, they were eager to rent, Dry said. Also, some renters entered farming under the mistaken assumption that they could get rich quick. When this did not occur, they relinquished their leases. Occasionally, the allotment program resulted in a farmers's acreage being reduced to a point where it was not economical for him to farm. The only alternative for such farmers was to rent his farm and to seek "public" work in the city. Because of these dynamic factors, Dry pointed out that land to rent was always available.

**Allotment Causes Increased Production Per Acre**

The government subsidy programs which, in effect, paid farmers not to plant a stipulated amount of acreage served as the catalyst for increasing production per acre. This
was an unanticipated consequence of this program. One farming technique which promoted increased production was the skip-row farming method. Here a farmer may have 200 acres in cultivation but only have a 100 acre allotment. In order to prevent any part of his farm from lying fallow, he would plant two rows and skip two or plant four and skip four, depending on the type of equipment being used.

This was, Dry said, skip-row farming which demonstrated to everyone that cotton needed more space than previously believed in order to grow efficiently. Thus, inadvertently, farmers learned that the yield of cotton could be increased about 25 to 30 percent, even when their acreage was reduced, if they practiced some form of skip-row planting—skip two, plant two; or skip two and plant four. As late as 1977, Dry stated that some farmers were still carrying on skip-row planting because of the increased production—even though no governmental subsidies existed.

Dry acknowledged that there were some drawbacks to skip-row planting. For example, with aerial application of fertilizer or herbicides, sufficient quantities of both would have to be purchased for the actual acreage—not just the amount devoted to crops. Thus, the cost of production was increased by skip-row planting, in this instance.

Another factor which contributed to the increased production was the expanded use of fertilizers. Often 100 pounds of nitrogen was used for cotton. However, the
nitrogen stimulated the growth of cotton so much that a new problem arose. The increased foliage caused the lower cotton bolls to rot; hence, no "bottom" crop was obtained. This problem then brought on a new technique: cross plowing, in order to thin the crop. The cotton would be solidly planted up and down the rows. After it came up, it would be cross plowed, i.e., plowed perpendicular to the rows in order to thin the cotton. This eliminated the need for the cotton to be chopped by hand.

These represent a sample of the numerous technological and social changes which Dry witnessed during his tenure with the LCES. Some of these technological changes also had social consequences and some of the technological changes were initiated and encouraged by the LCES as shall be seen shortly.

Flame Throwing Cultivator

An example of a new farm practice brought about by new technology was the use of a flame thrower to control weeds in cotton. Dry explained that the bark of the cotton plant was sufficiently resistant to heat to permit the use of the flame cultivators to kill the grass, provided that the flame throwing nozzles on either side of the cotton plant were not set exactly opposite each other. That is, one had to precede the other. If they were opposite each other, the flames would meet and go up the cotton plant, thus killing leaves. The nozzles had to be adjusted to issue a flat, not
a round flame, and the tractor had to be operated at approximately four miles per hour for the best application to occur. The LCES was responsible for explaining and educating the farmers on these subtleties in application. However, the flame throwing cultivators were not in use long. According to Dry, they were replaced by herbicides which were more economical and more effective.

**Farm Tenure: Plantation Economy**

Dry believed that the most dominate feature of the plantations in Caddo Parish was the plantation store or commissary. It was a part of each farm and sought to provide for all the needs of the families. Prior to WW II, most workers were tenant farmers who had a designated acreage for which they were responsible for planting and harvesting. This acreage was usually farmed with mules. A book of accounts would be maintained by the plantation owner in his store for each tenant. An account of how much was expended for supplies, food, even medical services and cash for such things as an automobile, was kept. When the crops were harvested, the income from each tenant's acreage was recorded. The difference between the two represented either a profit or a loss.

Should a tenant have earned a profit, most did not withdraw it in cash. They left it "on the book" and drew against it during the coming year. These practices associated with the plantation store gave rise, Dry stated,
to the terms, "Living out of the commissary," and "a cashless society." Dry, while not defending the tenant system of production, did point out that the tenants did have security. All their needs were provided for by the plantation owner, including doctors and hospital care, if needed. Dry quickly added that some would argue that their acquired security did not warrant their total dependency. However, he witnessed no abuse and stated that the owners would have been harming themselves.

Alternative to Growing Cotton:
Raising Cattle

With the implementation of the restrictive cotton allotment program, one of the few farming alternatives was the raising of beef cattle. This transition not only required new farming skills and practices but affected the type of clothing worn by the farmers.

Dress as an Indicator of Farm Product

The owners of the plantations where cotton was grown usually dressed in khaki pants and shirts, work shoes and hats were optional; there were no cowboy hats or boots. Most drove regular pickup trucks which were most often well kept. A few drove automobiles.

New Skills and Attitudes Required for Raising Cattle

Not only did the farmers' clothes change from khakis to western outfits as they changed from cotton farming to cattle raising but also new skills and attitudes were
needed. Here, the LCES was able to assist by making the transition as painless and economically feasible as possible. Even so this transition was not easy for some. Dry recalled one young former cotton farmer whom he had assisted. Two carloads of purebred Herefords were purchased by Dry. Approximately 88 animals with 84 heifers and four bulls. In anticipation of their arrival of the stock, Dry inquired if any of the heifers had freshened. The farmer replied that, yes, he said but it sure was expensive having a graduate veterinarian present each time that a cow brought a calf! Asked by Dry if he was having that many problems parturitions, the farmer acknowledged that he was not. Dry then explained that it was not necessary to have the vet present at each normal delivery—only those where problems were expected or actually encountered. This enabled the farmer to operate more economically and, therefore, more competitively.

**Beneficiaries of the Golden Triangle**

The farmers were not having to turn to cattle raising with not information or advice. This was provided by the LCES. They were the beneficiaries of the "Golden Triangle," Dry explained. The Golden Triangle is the term applied to the interrelated system represented by 1) the Land Grant Colleges like LSU, where theory and abstract research is conducted, 2) Experiment Stations where practical agricultural research is carried out and 3) the LCES which
disseminates the research findings or both to the user. For instance, farmers initially turned to purebred cattle but research indicated that crossbreeds were the most productive beef producers. A great deal of this research was conducted by LSU.

Dry believed that the major event with which he was associated was the conversion from a one-crop agricultural economy to a diversified one. Changing from cotton to other crops represented a major challenge—some use had to be found for approximately 70 percent of the previously farmed acreage. Needless to say, the LCES was active in evaluating and recommending alternatives. Some farmers turned to raising corn which was fed to hogs and they then were marketed. Often the corn field would be fenced and hogs placed in it so that human harvesting was eliminated. These operations were initially very profitable.

Reorganization of the LCES

As farmers, of necessity, turned from cotton to cattle, this change was reflected in the LCES's staffing and personal qualification requirements. More assistant county agents with animal science degrees were hired. Specialization became a way of life.

Originally most parishes just employed a County Agent. There was not even a secretary much less a Home Demonstration Agent! When Dry began work in 1942, the work week was six days. Later, they were permitted to get off at
12 noon on Saturday. Also, agents were expected to travel on their own money—there was no travel allowances. The agents had to purchase their own car and gas. However, Dry said that he did not consider this an imposition since, when he became the Assistant County Agent in Caddo Parish he was making $2,750 per year, he could afford to purchase his own automobile and gasoline. Several years after WW II, the LCES started paying $25 per month for expenses, if it could be justified! Still later, the LCES went to a full expense reimbursement program.

**Result Demonstration**

Farmers were initially skeptical about the LCES. Dry recalled that farmers of his father's generation thought the County Agents had book learning but no practical experience. The County Agent in Dry's home parish was not accepted by his father until the day he came by while his father was plowing with a mule and took a turn plowing. After this, Dry's father told everyone that the Agent was a real farmer because he could plow with a mule!

According to Dry, the best technique for overcoming farmers' skepticism of new, recommended farming practices, that is, whether it was crop varieties or amounts and types of fertilizers, was the Result Demonstration Method. LSU might have done the research but the farmers in the field had not seen it. Dry would identify a farmer who lived near a well traveled road and who was willing to host a
demonstration. The rows had to run perpendicular to the road. One plot, identified by a sign readable from the road, would be prepared according to the old, traditional method. Another plot, also with a descriptive sign, would be prepared according to the method recommended by the LCES. When the farmers saw the differences between the two plots, they believed what the Agent had told them was correct. Results of the demonstrations would be summarized in a circular letter and the local newspaper may also have published an article on them.

**Utilization of Specialists**

Specialists from LSU were often utilized by Dry in presenting new information at important meetings because local farmers accepted them as being "the authorities." The specialist had prestige and could validate the recommendations of the Agent. ¹

**Summary**

Similar descriptive information would, of course, vary from crop to crop, from parish to parish, etc. But, what would be constant would be that they have all changed. Extension is confronted with a multitude of changing variables since local conditions are always affected by national, state and even international policies in addition to local social and physical factors.

What then enabled Extension to respond to all of them effectively? Warner and Christenson answers:
The Cooperative Extension Service is a unique agency in both purpose and structure. It is in the business of education. Extension does not distribute a tangible product or service such as loans or grants. . . .

By 1986, this flexibility had moved the LCES to "new ground," actually to "new water" because the LCES had added yet another type of specialist, the aquaculturist. However, as shown by this history, new challenges are not new to the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service.
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CHAPTER X
HOME ECONOMICS EXTENSION WORK

Introduction

This is the second of four similar and consecutive chapters which outlines the developments in the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service's (LCES) four major program areas. It deals with Home Economics Extension or, as it was formerly known, Home Demonstration Work. A national overview follows.

National Home Extension Developments

The rationale for having a program which focused on the family was provided by Prawl, Medlin and Gross as follows:

The family is society's most basic and viable unit. The socialization process begins within the family, and patterns of behavior and attitudes toward the varied aspects of life are developed there. Role models, morals, ethics and principles are assimilated from parents, siblings and relatives.\(^1\) In their opinion, "One of the Cooperative Extension Service's wisest acts was to recognize and accept the family and the home as a critical element that affects all the socioeconomic aspects of any society." They conclude, "Home economics extension activities are, quite simply, directed at the total family, its individual members and the home environment."\(^2\)
Objectives and Definition

Since the subject matter of home economics is the entire family, which covers such a broad range of topics from food and food preparation to clothing to budgeting, this makes the development of a definition of home economics difficult to formulate. So the objectives of the overall program, as outlined in the special report, A People and A Spirit, are presented first:

— enhance the quality of individual and family decisions and provide the skills to carry them out;
— increase the ability of the individual to interact effectively with others;
— help people learn to use community services and to take part in developing them;
— improve the social, economic and geographic mobility of the individual.3

With these objectives as a basis, Prawl developed this definition of home economics extension:

An informal, educational program designed to reach family members, especially women, for the purpose of enhancing individual knowledge and skill so they can better and more quickly adapt to the demands of today's rapidly changing society.

They added that more and more men were becoming involved in home economics.4

Prawl, Medlin and Gross conceded that "Initially, these programs were directed solely at families in rural America." However, they stated that this was no longer true but that it still remained a major thrust. They stated their philosophical position in this manner:

. . . . Individual and family problems know no geographical, class or ethnic boundary. Thus, home
economics extension information, projects and programs must be available to families from all walks of life and economic levels.5

Historical Development

In Status and Results of Extension Work in the Southern States, 1903-1921 by W. B. Mercier, Assistant Chief Office of Extension Work in the South, States Relations Service, he includes a historical outline of the development of home demonstration work. As an aside, he subsequently became Director of the Louisiana Extension Service--1928-31 and his report was itself historical as this excerpt shows:

The Office of Extension Work in the South and the Office of Extension Work in the North and West were combined into one office on October 1, 1921, by order of the Secretary of Agriculture, to be known thereafter as the Office of Extension Work. Since the two offices operated independently and under different appropriations and somewhat different policies, it seems proper that they make separate final reports covering the 1921 operations and results. It also appears desirable to preface this final report with a historical outline of early conceptions of the demonstration idea and its growth and development in the South up to date. This would complete the records and close an era in two interesting and perhaps far-reaching pieces of contemporary work, and prepare the way for the reception of the new organization covering the whole country.

C. B. Smith, Chief Office of Extension Work6

Mercier reveals that Extension work followed this chronology in its development. First, Dr. S. A. Knapp's work was initially restricted to adult farmers when he began it in 1903. The first county agent whose work was confined to a single county was appointed in 1906. The first boys' club work as a county unit was organized in Holmes County,
Mississippi, in 1907. Knapp embraced the club idea in 1908 and in 1910 extended it to girls in 1910 in this way:

... in 1910 girls clubs were started in one county in South Carolina and two counties in Virginia. In 1911 there were 21 agents and more than 3,000 girls enrolled. This work grew very rapidly, until in 1915 there were in 15 Southern States 387 home demonstration agents with a club enrollment of 45,581. The girls, like beginners in every line of the work, were started off the first year with one crop. The tomato was the first crop chosen and, as experience increased, other crops were added. The girls were also taught how to can and preserve the products of their gardens.7

"Girls' club work was started," according to Mercier, "on the theory that the first fundamental and essential need was to increase the family income." He further stated:

... Greater financial independence must be established before taking up, except in a very general way, plans for improvement of the home and premises. It has been the usual experience that as soon as prosperity begins the first impulse is to make improvements and increase the comforts in the home. The records show hundreds of instances where a club girl's first money was used to help furnish the home and improve the surroundings and buy suitable clothing. Many have actually gone through high school and college on money made in the club work.8

Joseph Cannon Bailey provides us with what the "Father Extension" himself thought about home economics:

And when at last, the organization had been extended to provide corn clubs for boys and canning clubs for girls only one step further was needed—demonstrations in home economics for the farm wife and mother. The question of approach here was a ticklish one. Knapp cautioned his agents not to go to a farmer's house and tell him they had come to teach his wife to cook. The farmer would knock them down and be justified in doing so out of respect for his wife whether she was a good cook or not. But he had worked out his strategy carefully and unerringly for that problem. He coached one of his earliest women agents, "Through the tomato plant you will get into the home garden and by means of canning you will get into the
Because of these qualities of Knapp—his single-minded commitment to improve the entire environment of the farming families, who then constituted the majority of the population, and then logically and systematically designing a program to reach the farmer, his wife, son and daughter—one writer was led "... to refer to him as a combination of Socrates, Benjamin Franklin, and Horace Greeley. Walter Hines Page called him a bucolic Benjamin Franklin. ..."10

Such revelations prompts one to seek Knapp's thoughts on other areas in the development of home economics extension and Bailey provides:

The demonstrations club for boys was an unavoidable deduction from demonstrations projects for their fathers. Several of Knapp's agents, discovering anew that it was easier to teach new tricks to a young dog, had been working with younger men and boys from the beginning. One of them carried the emphasis so far that he had to be reminded in 1906 that the appropriation was for work with adults. But Dr. Knapp had been sympathetic, adding that, "You are exactly right in encouraging in any way in your power any boys who seem interested. If we can get the young fellows interested, it will mean the revolution of the agricultural interests ... after a while." Here was another opportunity afforded by the money of the Board to get at the root of the problem, for if the farmer were caught younger a more enduring solution could be expected than the Government was getting by its concentration on adults. The [General Education] Board welcomed the idea because it tended to bring the work into connection with the schools and to enrich them through a close association with the natural interests and environment of their pupils.11

Again, the trite expression, "the stage was set," for
yet another Knapp landmark development is appropriate here.

Girls' clubs followed [boys' corn clubs] immediately. A young woman teacher in a South Carolina country school, at a teachers' meeting in December, 1909, heard one of Dr. Knapp's assistants describe the boys clubs and make suggestions for a kindred work for girls. The teacher (Miss Cromer) returned home and in the spring organized the first girls' club, to grow and can their own tomatoes.

Again Knapp appropriated an idea, systematized its application as he had done with the boys' clubs, obtained the funds from the General Education Board (who were delighted with the continuing by-products of the fruitful idea they had agreed to back, four years earlier), and looked forward to the consummation of his work for a better rural civilization by bringing aid to the hard pressed mothers and daughters of the farm. Knapp had Miss Cromer made a special agent of the Department, although no woman had ever before been appointed for field work. Because Congressional funds could not be used for such purposes the work with girls was financed wholly by the Board--another instance of the importance of private freedom and prompt action.12

The rest of Knapp's development in the area of home economics is now history!

The idea caught on as the boys' clubs had done. In three years 30,000 girls in 14 states were enrolled. A new profession for women was created--the home demonstration agent. The study of nutrition, dietetics, household management, sanitation was stimulated. So was the invention and improvement of a host of household conveniences, such as home canning equipment, pressure cookers, fireless cookers, kitchen cabinets and the hunt for labor-saving, step-saving, time-saving devices which have since made the American kitchen the envy of housewives all over the world.13

Bailey gives this description of "Knapp's edifice" as it neared completion and he offered his personal assessment of it.

. . . It covered all of the Southern states with agents installed in over half the counties. These agents, white and Negro, male and female, offered projects
useful to the entire rural population. Their work was paid for from private and public sources of every variety. Basic patterns for cooperation had been established. The truth-finding research stations and colleges had been brought, for the first time, into a close and continuing application of their findings to the immediate, practical problems of the farmer and his family. The capstone was home demonstration work—"the great force that readjusts the world originates in the home. Home conditions will ultimately mold the man's life."

That which made the home "the greatest of all universities" was a theme Knapp returned to again and again.

The greatest schools for the human race are our homes and the common schools—not our colleges and universities—greatest in amount and value of the knowledge required. A country home...with a father and mother of sense...is nature's university, and is more richly endowed for the training of youth than Yale or Harvard.

He exhorted his agents, as well as all rural school teachers at every meeting he could reach, to go to the assistance of the rural homemaker. As early as 1882 he was warning the faculty of the agricultural college in Iowa and the principal farm leaders of the State—among them Wilson and Wallace—that the graduates in agriculture were not returning to farm life because the farmers' wives had instilled in their sons a disrelish for the drudgery and bleakness and meager satisfactions they themselves had endured.14

Knapp's search for the cause of the dissatisfaction with farm life was not long. He quickly concluded that its cause was economic—urban workers' annual wage was three to five times greater than farm workers. Even though he often asked his audience rhetorically, "Shall he stay on the farm...or go to the city, where he can earn three to five time as much..." he was not materialistic and the answer which he sought was obviously this.

That this was not the whole of the proposition was
the point which the Doctor organized all his speeches to prove. The Demonstration Work, of course, offered the means to correct not only such a gross disparity of income, but also a method to greatly lighten the physical labors and to heighten psychological satisfactions of the farm women. . . .

The earning capacity of farmers could always be doubled, and Knapp contended that it was possible to increase it five- to tenfold. Even if it was no more than doubled, "our civilization would respond to the influence, as if touched by the prophet's rod." And this was the hope and the vision Knapp held before his agents and their sympathizers.  

The success which the successors of Knapp have had in achieving his dream in the area of home economics extension and the methods and projects they have used will be considered in the remainder of this chapter, first nationally and then in Louisiana.

Organization of Women's Work, 1900 to 1917

According to Prawl, Medlin and Gross, ". . . the first domestic science association was organized in 1898 in several counties in Illinois. . . ." They were originally a section of the farmers' institutes. And, the early-day home demonstration agents realized that the most efficient way of working with rural women was through clubs.  

They summarize:

In the northern and western states work with rural women proceeded much more slowly. Specialists from the state agricultural colleges still conducted their work primarily through institutes. Only four states, using state funds, employed women agents in 1915. New Hampshire employed the first women on cooperative funds in April 1916. Seventeen agents and 97 specialists were employed in the 33 state by June 1917. At the same time 520 agents were active in the southern 14 states.
Emergency Programs, 1917 to 1945

World War I, 1914-1918

World War I caused a rapid acceleration of demonstration work. The federal Food Production Act of August 1917 provided over four million dollars for expanded services and by October 1917 over 1,600 emergency agents had been employed.

Home demonstration agents were placed in urban centers for the first time in 1917. Throughout the country the amount of vegetables and fruits grown and preserved multiplied dramatically. Home gardening during winter and summer and on the city and farm were greatly stimulated. The canning of fish, sea food, wild game and domestic meat was encouraged. Great emphasis was placed on food conservation because America was expected to feed itself and many of its allies, too.18

After WW I, home economics extension work declined drastically. The low point in term of number of women agents employed was July 1921 when only 699 women were working.

The 1920's were relatively quiet. Home demonstration agents continued to organize and work with women's, girls' and 4-H clubs, but rural America kept falling further behind its urban counterparts. . . .

During these years major programs centered on food preparation and preservation, child care and rearing, health and nutrition, home furnishing and care and efficient use of time. Some programs focused on the new household appliances that were introduced as electricity came to rural areas.19

The Depression

The Great Depression shifted programs "back to the basics," food, clothing and shelter, and
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provides:

... Again, the number of agents employed declined. And again, clothing construction and food conservation were back in the limelight. Home gardening and food preservation were promoted. Agents taught women how to make dresses, pillowslips, curtains and shirts from flour sacks. Women and men were shown how to make mattresses from surplus cotton and how to refinish and upholster furniture. Few could afford to purchase such items. One extensive program included soap-making demonstrations using surplus fats.

Although the number of agents did not increase during the Depression, their effectiveness did. Home agents used radio and newspapers to reach more people. They put less emphasis on one-to-one contacts and club meetings. Instead, they conducted general meetings where all women were welcome, not just farmers' wives. Circular letters were used to contact the growing number of women who were or wanted to be actively involved in extension activities. By 1930 the number of volunteer leaders exceeded 200,000. By 1935 these leaders and the home agents assisted 4.9 million families.

NAEHE—National Association of Extension Home Economists

In 1933, the National Home Demonstration Agents Association which later was renamed the National Association of Extension Home Economists (NAEHE) was organized. Its purpose is to promote professionalism in home economics and to bring important issues to the attention of Extension policy makers.

World War II, 1941-45

Another emergency was presented, particularly for women agents who had to fill the shortages created when men agents joined the armed services. Many emergency agents were employed in large numbers and many of the Depression-era programs became relevant because food and clothing scarcity...
"Victory Gardens" were promoted on the farms and in the cities as home food production efforts. Women's and 4-H Clubs required guidance and leadership as they embarked on patriotic activities on a wide front. Programs on nutrition received special emphasis. Family recreation programs were devised to replace purchased entertainment and travel. Method demonstrations remained the primary method, but now most of these were conducted by volunteer leaders who were instructed by an agent.22

Rapid Expansion After World War II

Prawl and his coauthors hold that after WW II the full value of home economics education was recognized. Thanks to the foundation laid by the pioneers and the professionalism promoted by the NAEHE. The quality of the programs improved as additional resources were made available. They included specialists who "... prepared volumes of training materials for agents and many more bulletins to be used by homemakers."23

EFNEP--Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, 1968

According to Prawl et al., "EFNEP was initiated in 1968 on a pilot basis in Alabama." He summarizes:

... Public response was so favorable that a nationwide program was launched in 1969. Its purpose was simply to improve the dietary level and nutrition education of low-income families with young children. Towns and cities with high rations of low-income populations became targets. Paraprofessionals who lived in the neighborhoods to be reached were recruited, trained and employed (some on a part-time basis) to conduct the program, contrary to the traditional procedures of extension Service.24

Present Situation

Prawl states that even though Home Economics is the
second most widely recognized program of Extension, it traditionally received only 20-25 percent of the total staff resources. In fact, it is stated that without EFNEP, there would be no paraprofessionals. 25

What About the Future

These are the areas which were identified by Prawl and his associates where Home Economics would probably concentrate its resources: Food and nutrition; Family resource management; Family life education; Family and community health and safety; Housing; Creative and satisfying leisure time activities; and Textiles and Clothing. 26

Louisiana Home Extension Developments

Early History

The early history was recorded by Nan Tarwater in her masters thesis in Home Economics at LSU. It is titled "History of Home-Demonstration Work in Louisiana, 1903-1939." She states in her summary chapter that "The Extension Service will, no doubt, expand, grow and progress as long as it continues to render the practical service that meets the needs and desires of farm people. Unlike the executive, judicial and legislative branches of the Government, the success of this organization depends upon the voluntary acceptance of its services by the people."

Disaster Work

Fortunately, deadly hurricanes are rare but when one
strikes Louisiana, Extension is always there, including its women agents, as this one example shows.

On June 26, 1957, at 8:02 a.m. Hurricane Audrey destroyed Cameron, Pecan Island, damaged Lake Charles, Jennings, Crowley, and other towns in the coastal area. By noon, the Home Demonstration Agent of Cameron Parish, Mrs. Iva Free, had visited her young neighbors in Grand Lake and offered them the use of her refrigerator for storing baby formulas.

At 1:30 p.m., after many attempts, she succeeded in flagging a helicopter, convincing the men aboard that she was needed at the Courthouse in Cameron. "I am the Home Demonstration Agent; I can help them. I have handled food preparation for hundreds; I am a welder." The men had no doubt that there would be a job for her. Thereafter, Mrs. Free was on 24-hour duty in supervising feeding of refugees, returning families and workers, and helping with clean-up operations.

**Developments of the 1970's**

One of the most publicized events was a consent decree which the Louisiana Service signed with the federal government. It came as a result of a suit filed in which the plaintiffs accused the Service of discriminating in employment on the basis of race and sex. The article, "LSU Extension Service Agrees To Hire More Blacks, Women," carried by the *Morning Advocate*, May 31, 1978, contained these details:

More women and more blacks may be hired by LSU's Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, according to a consent decree filed in U.S. District Court.

... The agreement specifies that the defendants [the Service] do not admit nor does the court rule that they have violated provisions of the Civil Rights Act.

... LSU System President Martin D. Woodin said LSU has employed blacks in the extension service, but few are in the administration or top professional
ranks. While women and blacks are employed in the service's administration, their numbers are not in proportion to the rest of the service, he said.

... The agreement says hiring, assignment, promotion, transfer, classification, training and compensation of employees is to be done without regard to sex or race.

Certain reports and records must be made in connection with the agreement and they are available for public inspection.

The court retains jurisdiction over the suit and may issue further orders to enforce and insure equal employment opportunity, the agreement says.

The suit may not be dismissed for five years.28

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service made sincere and genuine efforts to right any perceived wrongs. This is evident in the number of women and Blacks employed in 1986.

Developments of the 1980's

With the Civil Rights and Equal Opportunities movement of the 1960's and '70's behind, the LCES tried to recapture a less turbulent period when the Louisiana Extension Homemakers Council celebrated their 50th Anniversary in 1981. They published a history titled The First Fifty Years, 1931-1981. It is very well done and informative and should be consulted for details.

Director Loupe contributed the foreword which serves as a very good summary of the Louisiana Extension Homemakers Council:

June 1, 1981

The fact that the Louisiana Extension Homemakers Council, after 50 years, is still an active and viable organization with a membership of about 16,000
homemakers, affirms that it has been a factor in broadening and enriching the cultural, social and economic position of Louisiana families.

The impact you have made is remarkable. Your history is filled with reports of how you helped get libraries established; helped get Extension facilities provided—both through influencing local governing bodies and working for special bond issues; worked to obtain recreation facilities and other community improvements. One of the most far-reaching projects of all involved your untiring efforts toward getting electricity into rural areas through the rural electrification program. You worked to get electricity, and now you are working to keep from using too much of it. Your "ENERJEAN" program to teach energy conservation reached 125,000 persons during 1980, and your RECEP program of the year before reached 75,000 families.

One of the major projects of all your clubs and councils through the years has been support of 4-H and Youth programs. You maintain scholarships for 4-H members, you provide trophies and other awards, you raise money for local 4-H activities, you put in untold hours of your time at 4-H Achievement Days and Fairs.

You may have come full circle in some areas of program emphasis, but the path of your progress as an organization and as individuals has been straight as an arrow. Your organization has grown in numbers, purpose and scope. And as individuals, have never stopped growing in self-confidence, leadership ability and your sense of responsibility toward your fellow man.

Historically, when a need has existed, Extension homemakers (Home Demonstration Club members) have always been there. And you still are.

This is the spirit that has made your organization a moving force in Louisiana. This is the true spirit of the people with whom we--the Extension Service--have had the great good fortune of walking hand in hand through the past half-century and, God willing, will walk and work with through many more years to come.

Denver T. Loupe, Ph.D.
Vice-Chancellor and Director
LSU Cooperative Extension Service
Summary

In summary, it is difficult to improve on the preceding description by Director Loupe of the important role which women have played in Extension's history and continue to play. The only way to improve would possibly be through the use of the old adage, "a picture is worth a thousand words." By this it is meant that the reader would have to see the slide program, "Our Golden Years." It shows, through slides and a narrative script, the pictorial development of "Home Demonstration Work" in Louisiana. The Division Leader for Home Economics, Dr. Bobbie B. McFatter, showed this slide program to me in September 1983.
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A HISTORY OF 4-H CLUB WORK IN LOUISIANA

Franklin M. Reck prefaces the first chapter of his book, The 4-H Story, with these words:

4-H Club Work is too great a movement to be claimed by any one man.

Club work is one of the most unique educational programs of our time. It is voluntary. It dignifies the homely, practical arts of living, holding that scholarship can be applied to cooking, and creative intelligence to tilling the soil.

Based on everyday farm living, club work today engages the enthusiastic attention of two million farm boys and girls and two hundred thousand voluntary adult leaders. It is guided throughout the United States and its territories jointly by the Cooperative Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges.

Some identify the beginning of club work with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, which made Cooperative Extension Work nationwide. Yet the activities out of which club work grew antedated any federal legislation.1

The rationale for youth work can be seen from this experience in Texas with adult farmers which was related by Reck.

In 1907, in collaboration with W. D. Bentley, one of Knapp's men, and Captain F. S. White, horticultural commissioner of the Rock Island and Frisco railroad Lines, [special agent in charge of adult demonstration work in four counties, Thomas Meriwether] Marks promoted a corn show for adults. In spite of considerable publicity in his Jacksboro News, only three exhibitors sent in corn, while only a score of indifferent spectators came in to see the show and listen to the speeches.
At the hotel, later, Marks and his collaborators held a post mortem over the remains of their hopes. Captain White mentioned the success of boys' corn clubs in Mississippi. Another ventured that "you can't teach an old dog new tricks."

Marks put two and two together. "Then," he said, "next year we'll try the pups."

Marks had reached the same conclusions as Otwell, in Illinois. If grown-ups wouldn't take readily to new methods of corn culture, he'd forget them and go after the boys.2

Later, the same philosophy would be applied to involving farm girls in improvement projects in order to reach their mothers.

Reck explained Louisiana's contribution to the development of Corn Clubs as follows:

Louisiana also got under way in 1908. In January of that year, Victor L. Roy, superintendent of schools in Avoyelles parish, told the teachers assembled at the county teacher's institute to canvass their students and find out how many would like to grow corn if given free seed. There would be a meeting of volunteers in Moreauville, he said, in February.

Roy took no chances on a poor attendance at this first meeting. His parish (county) was traversed by a railroad that ran U-shaped through the region, covering most of it. Roy went to his good friend, Pearsall, local manager of the railroad, and asked him if he would bring the boys to Moreauville.

Pearsall replied that he'd haul them in a special, free of charge. He'd send the special train around the county in the morning, collect the students, and deposit them in Moreauville. At night, he'd return them home.

The free train ride put a gala touch on the event. For many country boys this was their first train ride. On February 8, some 300 eager volunteers crowded the coaches for the ride to Moreauville.

There they listened to Professor W. R. Dodson, head of the Louisiana Experiment Station [and later
first Director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, 1914-17], and his assistants tell them how to plow, plant, and cultivate corn according to the latest and best practices. They stuffed leaflets in their pockets, to study when they got home. They were told that if they would plant a measured half acre, the state commissioner of agriculture would give them free a peck of Shaw's Improved seed, a big-eared white corn.

That summer, Roy traveled his parish in a horse and buggy, taking with him a number of ten-ear samples in order to show his contestants how to select corn for the fall fair.

"My horse, Tom, knew the route so well that he'd turn into farmyards without any guidance from me," Roy recalls. "And, of course, all the farm folks knew Tom. In fact, they used to call him the assistant superintendent of schools."

While Roy was getting his contest under way, some fifteen other parishes in the state were doing the same, all of them guided by the college and the state department of agriculture.

The Avoyelles fair, held that fall in the parish seat of Marksville, was by far the most successful of the parish fairs. Some seventy-five boys brought in corn to be judged. The big ears of Shaw's Improved, a new variety to most farmers of that region, made an impressive sight. Farmers picked them up, ran their hands over them, compared them to the nubbins that they had grown themselves, and drew their own silent conclusions as to the merit of new seeds and new methods.

After the Marksville fair, Superintendent Roy personally wrapped every ear, boxed the samples, and shipped the best of them to the state fair at Shreveport. Other parish also sent samples, and state fair visitors for the first time in Louisiana saw exhibits of boys' club corn. In that same year, Mississippi boys were also exhibiting at their state fair.

Louisiana's first state winner was Stephen D. Henry, who later was to become an Army general.

The following year, thirty-three Louisiana parishes organized corn clubs. The energetic Roy, small, dynamic and persuasive, once again induced the railroad to give him a free trip and took some four
hundred of his club boys to the Louisiana State University campus. One of the boys to make this trip was Arman J. Laborde of Marksville, who later was to become a highly successful farmer. After Laborde began raising a family, his children for some thirty years regularly won prizes at the annual state short course. There was never a year but a Laborde was there, winning a ribbon for excellence in club work.³

In concluding his treatment of corn clubs, Reck gave this national perspective.

By the end of 1908, corn club work in the South was spreading so rapidly that it became apparent that some sort of over-all direction would be needed. Agents of Cooperative Demonstration Work had enough on their hands supervising adult demonstrators. Colleges, experiment stations, and state departments of agriculture were cooperating with school superintendents on an unofficial basis, but without adequate authority or financing. Someone was needed in Washington whose sole duty was to supervise boys' corn clubs. There also needed to be leadership in the states charged specifically with the promotion of club work.

The man Knapp selected to head up the work in Washington was Oscar B. Martin, state superintendent of education in South Carolina. A big, genial, inspired man, Martin had first met Knapp at a Conference for Education in the South, held at Lexington, Kentucky, in 1906. Knapp's discussion of what demonstration work could do for agriculture captured his imagination.

There was, at the time, considerable doubt as to the part colleges should play in the demonstration work developed by Knapp. Knapp himself preferred to work with practical farmers.

As for club work, he wanted to conduct it entirely with county school superintendents rather than the colleges of agriculture. Yet the colleges had wholeheartedly backed Louisiana and Mississippi school superintendents in developing agricultural clubs, as they had done in Ohio, Illinois, Iowa and Georgia.

Martin became Knapp's disciple in South Carolina, preaching demonstration work wherever he went. He was appointed special agent in the Bureau of Plant Industry on March 5, 1909, with specific duty of developing club work.
As corn clubs continued to spread in the spring of 1909, Knapp's hesitation to deal with the colleges seems to have disappeared. Perhaps the success of college-backed clubs in Mississippi and Louisiana had convinced him.

At any rate, in the spring of 1909 he told Martin to go ahead and arrange for the appointment of state club leaders in several states, these leaders to work under the joint direction of the state college and the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Today, all Extension work, both adult and youth, is conducted as a cooperative enterprise of the college, county and local community, and the Federal Extension Service, and this is the accepted order of things. Few realize that the boys' corn clubs paved the way for this cooperation.4

The appointments of the first State Club Agents are described by Reck. Excerpts on Louisiana and North Carolina follow. North Carolina is included because the appointed State Club Agent there, I. O. Schaub, was later to influence the Louisiana Extension Director, H. C. Sanders (1940-61), on the importance of establishing a formal program on Extension Education.

In North Carolina, I. O. Schaub was a graduate of North Carolina A & M and Johns Hopkins who had served his apprenticeship analyzing soils at the University of Illinois. At the St. Louis Exposition in 1904 Schaub ran a corn oil extractor for the University and incidentally had charge of Otwell's sensational exhibit of 1,250 ten-ear samples of corn grown by Illinois boys.

In 1905, he went to Iowa State College where he did soil and crop research and Extension work, became acquainted with Holden, and learned firsthand of the work of Cap Miller, and later of Jessie Field, Benson and others.

In the spring of 1909 he was called back to Raleigh to conduct research in the college of agriculture, but had barely made a start when he was informed by the president of the college that he had
been selected to promote corn club work.

Schaub continued as state club leader until 1913, after which he served for a time as agricultural agent for the Frisco Lines, then served in the Department at Washington as Field Agent for Southern States, returning to Raleigh in 1924 to become Extension director.5

The appointment of the State Club Agent for Louisiana will now be considered.

Victor L. Roy became Louisiana's first state leader on November 1, 1909, serving until 1911, when he accepted the presidency of Louisiana State Normal School. He was succeeded by E. S. Richardson, a parish school superintendent.6

Importance of 4-H to Depression-Era Youths

Mr. Neal R. Dry who was born in 1914, recalled his 4-H experience at the Oak Grove High School (which was located between Mansfield and Logansport) in DeSoto Parish. Fairs in which 4-H youths displayed their projects were the highlight of the year. Needless to say, the prize money given for first, second and third place was of primary importance. Amounts of the prizes, Day believed, were $1.00, .75 and .50 for 1st, 2nd and 3rd places, respectively. In DeSoto, 4-H members would compete in the Logansport and Mansfield fairs and then in the State Fair at Shreveport.

In order to be able to take maximum advantage of the fairs, Dry stressed the need for careful planning and organization. At the beginning of the school year, the 4-H leader and members would study the prize catalogue of each
fair. A member or members would be assigned to show or participate in each prize category. No category was left unentered. For example, if three prizes were being given, three members would enter the competition. The purpose of this, Dry stated, was simple: "We wanted to make sure that if no one else entered we would take all the prize money. We almost always succeeded because we spent so much time preparing our exhibits." The preparation was worth it because Dry explained that cotton was selling for only $25 to $30 a bale during the Depression. One year, Dry won $80 in cash prize money from the fairs he entered. That year, his father only produced three or four bales of cotton on their farm.

Although okra was not eaten by the Dry family when Mr. Dry was a 4-H member, he volunteered to raise it so he could show it in all three fairs because it was an established category in their catalogues. He recalled this particular year vividly since he had to keep it watered all summer. To make this task simpler, Dry put holes in the bottom of buckets and then placed them in the ground between the okra stalks. With this method, it was not necessary to water the okra everyday. The extra effort was worth it Dry said because he took first place at all three fairs.

At this time, the teacher and 4-H Local leader was Carl E. Kemmerly, Jr., who later became a County Agent, District Agent and State Agent. During his tenure, he had
various assignments. Kemmerly once served as Acting Director when the Director was on a foreign assignment. In WW II, he was the Farm Labor Leader.

When Dry himself became 4-H Leader and later County Agent in Caddo during WW II, he said those were interesting times. Over 3,000 students were members of the Caddo Parish 4-H Club. As their contribution to the War effort, the Extension Service published a monthly newsletter promoting Victory Gardens among 4-H members. Practically all members participated in this activity whose goal was to grow fruits and vegetables for home consumption. Instructions on the appropriate method of preservation were also provided.7

John A Cox 4-H Development

When Director Cox retired in 1978, this fund was inaugurated in his honor. At the retirement recognition program, David L. Perkins of Hamburg, master of ceremonies, announced that Mr. and Mrs. Hays Staring of Baton Rouge had donated a 7-acre tract of land conservatively valued at $100,000, with the income from the property going into the endowment fund.

The article about this fund in Sunday Advocate included the remarks made by the following speakers at the ceremony:

LSU President Martin D. Woodin said Cox developed one of the outstanding Extension Service organizations in the South. He noted that Cox has elevated the requirements for employment, has provided a high degree of professional improvement among the staff and has been successful in obtaining better salaries.
Dr. J. Norman Efferson, chancellor of LSU's Center for Agricultural Sciences and Rural Development, commented that Cox is among those rare individuals who have the objective of leaving the world a little better every day. He noted the advancements in Louisiana agriculture during the time of Cox's leadership, pointing out that agriculture supplies more jobs in the state than any other industry, except oil and gas. He also cited Extension's contributions to rural development, nutrition education and youth development under Cox.

Summary

For a concise summary of the continuing importance of 4-H, the most recognized of Extension's Programs, the remarks made by Dr. C. J. Naquin, State 4-H Leader, at the preceding event are appropriate. He said, "... 113,000 Louisiana young people are involved in 4-H programs. These young people, he added, are Louisiana's greatest natural resource, and 4-H is helping to develop them into contributing, self-directed members of society."
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CHAPTER XII
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EXTENSION WORK

Introduction

Beginning about 1970, community resource development (CRD) began to be recognized as one of the four major extension program areas, "... but only from an administrative and financial viewpoint." However, the antecedents harken back to the beginning of the Extension Movement as these quotes show. Seaman A. Knapp was concerned with all aspects of community life. The youths were served through organizations such as corn and pig clubs for boys and tomato and poultry clubs for girls; women, by the home demonstration agent and men, by the agricultural county agent. The objective of this multifaceted approach was the improvement of the total community. He stated:

The farmer must be made independent. You must keep a man's nose away from the grindstone, for if it is constantly at the grindstone he can't see anything else.2

A National Historical Overview of Community Development

Seaman A. Knapp

Bailey elaborates on this aspect of Knapp's contribution by providing this interpretation.

Putting first things first, Knapp hammered away at the inescapable necessity of increasing farm income and
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providing the rural population with a greater earning capacity. He hammered, too, at the faith that reformers placed hopefully in religion, or in universal education, or in science, which led the people to expect "relief by some miracle of finance, a relief without toil, the bounty of the nation or the gift of God." Knapp told listeners bluntly "that permanent help could only come by human effort, that they must work out their own salvation, just as prosperity, liberty, and civilization can never be donated to anyone, but must be wrought out, fought out and lived out, till they are part of the being of the people who possess them." [Emphasis added.]

Knapp labored to help the farmer help himself—nothing more... He adjured his agents to remember, first that they must aid the farmer to raise his nose from the grindstone, but that alone was not enough. The true goal was to create a better people... high-minded, stalwart, courageous and brave. ...3

Knapp summarized his philosophy into this mission statement for Extension. "Your mission is to make a great common people and thus readjust the map of the world."4 Bailey concludes his examination of Knapp's philosophy with this excerpt from A. J. Klein's Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 1930, which Bailey stated was "the most comprehensive and thoroughgoing inquiry yet made into the nature and accomplishments, as well as the shortcomings and unrealized potentialities, of the agricultural extension system founded by Knapp. ..."5 However, for Bailey, it "... makes its most emphatic judgments on precisely the intangibles which were Knapp's ultimate concern—as in his exordium 'to make greatness common.'"6

The ultimate objective was not more and better food, clothing and housing. These were merely means and conditions prerequisite to the improvement of human
relationships, of intellectual and spiritual outlook. Apparent preoccupation with economic interests must be interpreted in terms of the purposes that material welfare is intended to serve. The fundamental function of extension education is the development of rural people themselves. Unless economic attainment and independence are regarded chiefly as means for advancing the social and cultural life of those living in the open country [read community], the most important purpose of extension education will not be achieved.7

A State Historical Overview of Community Development

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service accepted this philosophical mandate long before the Congress formally established in 1961 the new Office of Rural Areas Development within USDA or passed the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 which authorized Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) projects or the Rural Development Act of 1972 which provided funds for water and sewer system loans, community facility loans, waste disposal loans and business and industry loans.8 Williamson provides this documentation:

An important phase of Extension service is what has come to be known as "Community Organization Work," under the direction of the Extension Sociologist. This work originated March 3, 1925, following a conference between Col. Thos. D. Boyd, president of the University, the director of Extension, the dean of the College of Agriculture, and the secretary-manager of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation. Miss Mary Mims, then assistant State home demonstration agent, was present at the conference, which was devoted largely to a discussion of "the Ringgold idea," a community cooperation program which had been introduced by Miss Mims during the time she was serving as a public school teacher in Bienville parish. At the conference Miss Mims was asked to undertake a state-wide program under the auspices of the Extension service and the Farm Bureau to enlist the various elements of each rural
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community in an organized endeavor for betterment in agriculture, civics and health, and recreation.9

Williamson continues by describing the purpose of the Community Organization Work.

The objectives as proposed during the conference included a planned program to promote the economic, intellectual, health, and recreational life of the community. This involved an organization in each community, composed of a chairman, co-chairman, and secretary, with committees set up for each field of endeavor. The program itself was to originate with the people it was intended to serve. This naturally became a matter of gradual unfoldment, since rural communities would not be expected to recognize their needs all at once. First of all it was necessary that each community study its own situation, which it could do with the aid of the parish Extension workers. The purpose of these community organizations was to work out a solution of their needs as they were recognized by bringing together the farmers, home demonstration clubs, 4-H clubs, Farm Bureau, the state department of health, conservation department, schools, churches, libraries, representative industries, as well as the various agencies established by the government for the aid of agriculture.10

First Organized Community in Louisiana Started at Calhoun

The success of the new community program is revealed in this excerpt from Williamson:

Within a week after the plan was broached the first organized community was started March 10, 1925. This was at Calhoun, site of the North Louisiana Experiment station. Following the procedures set up as a basis of operation, the little community adopted a unified program for better living. It was begun at the site of the University-sponsored Experiment station, but this had little to do with the community as such. The organized group decided that the Experiment station grounds and buildings should be made more attractive and impressive to the people who passed by on the highway—a transcontinental road from Atlanta to Los Angeles. The community decided to organize a church—one that would be ample in its accommodations and attractive in its appearance. The community needed a better school—a high school, because Calhoun is in the
midst of an extensive agricultural area. Another thing the organized community set as an objective was the beautification of the village--flowers and shrubbery about every house, shade trees along the streets. The program involved a clean-up campaign, cleaning yards and ditches of unsightly refuse, as well as the refurbishing of homes and outbuildings. The plans could not be realized all at once--nor in a year or two. But in due time every one of the objectives was accomplished. The evidence was apparent to visitors and passers-by in the years that followed, and set the pattern for similar activities in other rural towns of the state.11

Hungarian Colony, Albany
Livingston Parish

This unique community, which is the largest rural Hungarian community in the U.S., participated in the Community Cooperation Program.

One notable demonstration in practical application of the plan was the Hungarian colony, near Albany, in Livingston parish. There a group of Middle Europeans, brought into the region at the beginning of the century to work in timber-cutting operations, lent themselves to the organization program at the instigation of the Extension community worker and the Rev. Alex Bartus, a Hungarian who entered the Presbyterian ministry to serve his fellow-nationals. The community organization sponsored the building of a church and a community house and the adoption of agricultural practices taught by the Extension service. The place became famed in later years as the scene of an annual Hungarian festival which keeps the traditions and customs of the homeland.12

Biographical information of the first Louisiana Cooperative Extension Sociologist follows.

Mary Williams Mims

Dr. Garnie William McGinty's biography is titled Mary Williams Mims: Teacher, Humanitarian and First Agricultural Extension Sociologist. In his preface, he states, "The short biography presented here is not only a work of love
and appreciation for a former teacher, but in addition, it
is an attempt to preserve the life story of an unusual
woman." He records her extraordinary record: the second or
third woman principal of a Louisiana tax-supported high
school, one of the first women to head the Louisiana
Teacher's Association, and a community leader and builder as
Louisiana's first Extension Sociologist with the LSU
Cooperative Extension Service.

The book has to be read with the realization that
Dr. McGinty was a former secondary school student of "Miss
Mary" and remained a lifelong friend of hers. As such, the
book contains much autobiographical material on his life.
Those interested in Louisiana's educational history will
find it particularly useful. Dr. McGinty is a past
president of Louisiana Tech. The book was privately printed
With these facts in mind, it is not unanticipated that
McGinty posed only one critical question. However, it has
potential significance for our study of the Louisiana
Extension Service. His questions follow:

Another thing about the data in the reports (Annual
Reports prepared by Dr. Mims) that surprises this
writer, is the almost total absence of mention of
organized communities and fairs in the French speaking
section of the state. Practically all the parishes
commended for community work and fairs are the so-
called Anglo-Saxon populated parishes. Most of these
are upland, or hill parishes, but not entirely. Could
it be that these people were poorer than the
inhabitants of the French section of the state? Or was
it an indication that the rural Anglo-Saxons had more
problems, or that they were more keenly aware of their
needs . . ? These questions raise intriguing possibilities. Was Miss Mims aware of the situation that her communities that received her approbation were mostly in the hill, or Anglo-Saxon section? If so, how did she account for it? How did she attempt to rectify it?13

Representative accomplishments of Miss Mary include her organizing "Jordan Day" in honor of Mr. T. J. Jordan, Director of Agricultural Extension for Negroes of Louisiana, who retired in 1948 after 35 years of service; receiving the "Woman of the Year" award in 1941 from Progressive Farmer magazine; coauthoring The Awakening Community in 1932; and being asked by Governor Sam H. Jones to run on his ticket in 1940 for State Superintendent of Education. When she retired in 1952, she wrote, "When I had to stop work, my office was filled by two of the most capable young men in the state--Mr. J. H. Jones, Jr., extension sociologist, and Mr. Wayne Robichaux, extension recreational specialist."

Louisiana College gave her its Distinguished Service Award upon her retirement. According to Dr. McGinty, "Miss Mims" was the first woman to receive the award, thereby adding another to her long list of 'firsts.'

In summarizing her career and retirement, Dr. McGinty states:

In a quiet way, the first Extension Sociologist of the LSU Agricultural Extension Service, the organizer and promoter of organized communities, Folk Schools, parish libraries, better living, and a dozen other deeds of service to her fellowman, reached the end of her formal public working days, closed her desk, and retired. LSU gave her a service award and Emeritus status, but the person responsible for "Jordan Day" did not have the opportunity of experiencing a "Mims
Miss Mims died on November 24, 1967. She was the daughter of David Samuel and Mary Eleanora Stewart Mims who were from South Carolina and Georgia, respectively, and she was born on August 30, 1882, in the Mims community of Webster Parish. Miss Mary was educated at Louisiana Tech and Sophie Newcombe School for Girls in New Orleans and first taught school at Gibsland in Bienville Parish.

Dr. J. H. Jones, Jr.

Jones continued and expanded the previously described community development activities as the following examples will show. He was born in Deweyville, Texas, and spent his younger years in DeQuincy, Louisiana, from where he received his public school education. He attended LSU briefly before WW II, then enlisted in the Armed Forces. After four years in the service, including about two years in Africa and European theaters of operation, he returned to LSU.

In 1948, he received the B.S. degree and in 1950 he was awarded a M.S. degree from LSU. His graduate major was Sociology and his minor, Education.

Continuing his education, Jones received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Kentucky. His doctorate includes a major in Sociology and a minor in Political Science.

Jones joined the staff of the LSU Agricultural Extension Service as Assistant Sociologist in 1953. He has
had responsibility for the research program of the Extension Service as well as the programs evaluation analyst. He taught courses in the Sociology Department and the former Department of Extension Education where his specialty was Research and Evaluation Methods.

**EFNEP: Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program**

In the book, *Heritage Horizons: Extension's Commitment to People*, Dr. Jones and Dr. Satish Verma, both employees of the Louisiana Service, were coauthors, along with Betty S. Mifflin, of the chapter titled "New Dimensions in Programming: EFNEP." This chapter provides information on yet another thrust of Extension—service to both rural and urban families who were living in poverty and suffering from inadequate nutrition, often caused by insufficiently balanced diets.

EFNEP was initially funded with $10 million in 1968 and by 1972 funding had reached $50 million. Congress' charge to EFNEP was as follows:

To help families living in poverty or near poverty—especially those with young children—acquire knowledge, skills and changes in behavior to achieve adequate diets providing normal nutrition.15

EFNEP used a new approach to reach its targeted clients—paraprofessional program aides were employed.

The program aides were employed to work in the rural communities or urban areas where they lived. They came to the job with experiences similar to the families with whom they'd work. They began working with families on a one-to-one basis, under the supervision and training of the Extension home
economists.

Fairs will now be considered as another example of special projects handled by Extension as a Community Development activity. This activity is actually older than the Cooperative Extension Service and was a method of accomplishing its objective prior to its establishment as the "Fairs" section will show.

Extension's Relationship With Community Fairs

Williamson, as always the thorough recorder of the various activities of the Louisiana Extension Service, describes the involvement of Extension with fairs as follows:

An agricultural improvement project that must be considered in pursuing the development of the Extension service is that the Louisiana State Fair, which like Extension, grew partly out of the disrupted economic situation brought about by the devastation of the boll weevil. While the State Fair is a distinct organization resting on its own merits, it came to be closely identified with Extension as a means for promoting better farming practices.

To understand the place the Fair occupies in the Extension picture it is necessary to go back to the days when Dr. Knapp was inaugurating his historic program. Dr. W. R. Dodson, who succeeded Dr. Stubbs as head of the Agricultural College in 1905, was concerned about the conditions which had befallen the farming population of the state. He had devoted considerable attention to the Farmers' Institute movement and the agricultural fairs which were a feature of that program. It was Dr. Dodson's conviction that the principle underlying agricultural fairs could be applied on a state-wide basis, giving farmers an opportunity to learn what others were accomplishing in producing better livestock as well as in the improvement and diversification of farming methods. Location of a site was naturally important, but much depended on local support for the consummation of such
a project. Baton Rouge, Alexandria, and Monroe showed considerable interest, business men indicating a readiness to contribute to the project, but it remained for a group of farm leaders in the Shreveport area to develop a concrete plan by organizing a joint stock company on a nonprofit basis.16

The first State Fair of Louisiana was held in Shreveport on November 17-25, 1906.17

Malvin Henry Steven in his thesis on "Problems of Fair Management," LSU, 1956, supports Williamson and brings the developments of fairs in Louisiana up to 1956. He stated that "Since 1906 there has been a substantial increase in the number of fairs in Louisiana. A reported seventy seven fairs were held in the State in 1954-55."18 His research lead him to this finding: "The fairs and festivals of Louisiana have been called 'the most unique and the greatest in number of any state.'"19

Helping Louisiana achieve this distinction was the Extension Service. Steven found from his survey of Louisiana fairs that sixty-five percent used as judges County and State Extension workers. By doing so, these fairs obtained from Extension not only their expertise but also free labor. Since "fair work" was considered part of their responsibility, they received their full pay as well as travel expense while engaged in it.20

By 1984 Louisiana had over 200 fairs and festivals which spanned the alphabet from the Abbeville Tarpon Rodeo to the Zwolle Tamale Fiesta. However, agricultural themes were still prevalent as these examples show: Claiborne
Parish Fair and Northwest Louisiana Dairy Festival; Lafourche Parish Agricultural Fair and Livestock Show; Plaquemines Parish Fair and Orange Festival; Terrebonne Livestock and Agricultural Fair and the Washington Parish "Free Fair." Other more exotic ones included: Amite Oyster Day, Crawfish Festival in St. Bernard, Polk Salad Festival, Ponchatoula Strawberry Festival, St. Charles Parish Sugar Festival and the Tomato Festival at Chalmette.21

Washington Parish Fair

To show in more detail the involvement of Extension with fairs, the Washington Parish Fair will be taken as an example. It is billed as the "Largest Free Fair in the South." Another reason for selecting this fair is that Washington Parish was the home of J. W. Bateman, the fourth Director of Extension, 1931-40. Note his involvement in the development of this fair as well as that of the early leaders of Extension from LSU.

The following excerpts are taken from The Story of the Washington Parish Fair, 1911-1973 by Emma Burris and Elizabeth Watts:

As early as 1910, under the direction of Mr. J. Wesley Bateman, Superintendent of Public Schools of the Parish, and with the help of Mr. J. O. Bethea, Professor of Agriculture of Franklinton High School, rallies and festival days were organized and arranged so that the farmers of the area and their sons who were members of the Corn and Cotton Club could bring their harvested crops and display them on the grounds of the courthouse in Franklinton. The exhibits and school rally days could be called the forerunners of the Fair. This points up vividly that the very foundation upon which the Fair was organized from the beginning was an
educational program—a program to enlighten the local farmers as to new agricultural methods and to demonstrate how these methods could be used to their advantage.

During this time the parish was passing through a time of great financial crisis. The boll weevil had practically destroyed the main cash crop of cotton, and there was a great need for farmers to be schooled in diversification...22

"The more things change, the more they stay the same!"

Some 75 years later, in 1986, Louisiana was in the throes of an economic crisis. Its economy had become over dependent on oil and gas which had fallen in price on the world market causing layoffs which resulted in the State having the highest unemployment in the nation. Compare the situation in 1911 as described by The Era Leader:

"WHY NOT A PARISH FAIR"

Professor V. L. Roy of LSU faculty will be here on Tuesday, May 6th, to meet and discuss with the people of this parish, regarding the viability of organizing a Parish Fair. There is no doubt about the good that would come from a movement of this kind. Our farmers need just such an education as they will get from a parish fair. The corn club has done much good, but the farmer needs to branch out into other lines. Our sister parish, Tangipahoa, has a money crop in strawberries alone that brings her more money than our cotton crop... We need to learn how we can make other crops pay. We need to learn more about stock raising, chicken raising, etc. All of these things will be encouraged by a fair of this kind. It is of vital importance for the banks and other business enterprises to become interested in this movement. We are passing through a crisis and if we act wisely, the boll weevil will prove to be of great benefit to us."

In 1986, Extension was still involved in the economic well being of the State. Now it was called "Community Development." At a meeting with the Office of Commerce &
Industry in which Director Loupe and District Agent Al Fugler of the Extension Service participated on October 31, diversification of the State's economy was again being urged--this time into (1) increased agricultural production of such crops as vegetables, (2) production of such seafood as crawfish and catfish, and (3) value-added processing of timber. Dr. Loupe stated that he recognized the importance of long-range research and education but that the problem existed today and something had to be done immediately. He therefore was making the current farm crisis his number one priority and committing Extension to finding a solution.

**Telephone Hot Line**

One tangible example of Director Loupe's commitment is the establishment of a statewide telephone hot line. Details are:

"Talking It Over With All Sides"

1-800-225-3160 is the number farmers can dial if they need legal, financial or emotional advice. This hotline phone service, furnished by the coalition [Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry and the Interchurch Council] and the LSU Agricultural Center [Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service], will also provide farmers with a computer financial analysis prepared by LSU economists.

..."This crisis is a threat to the fabric of rural communities. We want to help locals develop the capacity to deal with the problem," Quentin A. L. Jenkins, an LSU rural sociologist and coalition participant, noted. ... 23

Thus, community development remains a viable component program of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. The next chapter describes the Black experience in the Service.
NOTES
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CHAPTER XIII
THE BLACK EXPERIENCE IN THE
LOUISIANA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Introduction

Prior to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 there were two societies—one Black, the other White. The Black agents worked with the Black Extension clientele; the Whites with White Extension clientele. In 1986, Extension is integrated. Blacks are assigned jobs based on what they do best without regard to the color of their clients. That is, if a Black agent is good with youth work, he is assigned to 4-H, etc.¹

The transition from a segregated to an integrated organization will be considered in this chapter including descriptions of this experience from both the White and Black perspectives along with an assessment of the success and extent of the integration process.

Early History

The dean of agricultural history in the United States, Alfred Charles True, recognizes the work of Extension with Blacks and acknowledges that J. A. Evans had wrote the definite work on this subject at the time True's book, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785-1923, was published in 1928, as the following excerpts
will show. Prior to the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute in Alabama was in the process of utilizing the "Jesup wagon," which was "in effect a traveling school of agriculture equipped with illustrative material and lecturers, to go out to the plantations, farms, and other points wherever a few people can be gotten together to hold meetings for the discussion of subjects along all lines of farm activity." Professor True elaborated on this when he explained its development in this manner.

(The following excerpts are reproduced exactly as they appeared in the original; note specifically the terms and capitalization rules used with regard to references to Blacks. This pattern will emerge: colored, Colored, negro, Negro, Black. No disrespect is intended when these terms are repeated; however, it was felt that adherence to historical accuracy required such a repetition.)

Early in the demonstration work agents had attempted to interest and instruct negro farmers, and a considerable number of these farmers profited by observing the demonstrations and changed their farm practices for the better. There was soon a growing demand for negro agents, who could work more closely and sympathetically with people of their own race and adapt the demonstrations to the special needs of their people. This feeling was voice by the institutes for negroes at Hampton, Va., and Tuskegee, Ala., which were giving special agricultural instruction to some of their students. With the cooperation of these schools and with money furnished by the General Education Board [This 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." two negro agents were employed near the close
of 1906. These men, J. B. Pierce and T. M. Campbell, are still in extension work as field agents of the Office of Cooperative Extension Work. About two years later South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi were added to the States having negro agents, and in 1911-12, 33 negro agents were employed. These agents supervised demonstrations in the growing of cotton and corn, and encouraged the planting of home gardens, the keeping of hogs, cows, and poultry, the use of improved machinery, the whitewashing of buildings, the cleaning up and embellishment of houses and yards, the taking of farm papers, and other practices valuable to farmers.5

True turned his attention to the Black contribution to Extension's performance in World War I, specifically the years 1917-18, in his section on "Conservation and Utilization of Food."

The burden of promoting the conservation and utilization of food under war conditions fell largely on the women extension agents, though the men did considerable work in these lines. In the 15 Southern States, during 1918, there were 883 white county home-demonstration agents, 175 negro home demonstration agents, 83 white urban agents, and 19 negro urban agents. There were also 13 home-economics specialists and a supervisory force of 15 State agents and 57 assistant State and district agents. These agents worked with clubs of women and girls, usually on a community basis. There were 6,391 clubs of rural women, with a regular enrollment of 325,229 and an emergency enrollment of 1,518,746; 9,028 girls' clubs, with a regular enrollment of 146,102 and an emergency enrollment of 759,373; 1,593 clubs for negro women, with a membership of 37,913; and 1,962 clubs for negro girls, with a membership of 50,995. The emergency enrollment of negro women and girls in the rural clubs was 247,143, two-thirds of whom were women. In the urban work there were 1,179 clubs, with a regular membership of 119,218 white women and 224 clubs with 1,035 negro women. In addition, there were 2,751 poultry clubs, with a membership of 63,481 white women and girls, and poultry work was done by 13,434 negro women and girls. In all, there were 23,096 clubs of women and girls, with an aggregate enrollment of 3,283,669, of whom more than 2,000,000 were women. Many people not enrolled in clubs attended the extension meetings, demonstrations, and exhibits.
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While much of the work of the women agents in clubs concerned the production of food in gardens and on farms and enterprises connected with health and a more attractive home and community life, a large part of their war activities aimed at the conservation and utilization of food. The great campaign of 1918 almost doubled the results of the previous year. . . .

In regard to the need to increase farm workers who had been depleted because of the draft, True stated:

. . . An interesting feature of the negro extension work was the organization of the "United States Saturday Service League," intended to influence members of that race to render six full days of service each week during the war. Members signed pledges and had badges and certificates of award. This organization was formed by the Alabama negro agents, but spread into several other Southern States.

Thus, it can be seen that both Black and White men and women made invaluable contributions to the winning of WW I by the United States. Without realizing it, Extension was positioned by its experience in WW I to play an even greater role in the next global conflict--WW II.

True concludes his attention to Blacks in Extension with his section on "Extension Work Among Negroes," from which this quote is taken:

A force of negro men and women agents carry on extension work among people of their own race in the Southern States and supplement the considerable amount of work white agents have done and are doing which benefits the negro farming people. J. A. Evans, assistant chief of the Office of Cooperative Extension Work, who has a thorough knowledge of negro extension work from the time it began, recently described this work in United States Department of Agriculture Circular 355, from with the following summary has been prepared.

Since the purpose and perspective of True was to write a national history of Agricultural Extension Work, Evans'
article will be consulted directly so that only those items dealing with the Louisiana Extension Service may be considered.

J. A. Evans prefaced his article "Extension Work Among Negroes" with this information. In 1923, Evans was the Assistant Chief for the Office of Cooperative Extension Work.

Practically all the negro farm operators in the United States are located in the 16 Southern States. The census of 1920 enumerated more than 920,000 negro farmers operating approximately 27,000,000 acres of improved land in farms. In an effort to do more effective demonstration work among this large racial group of farmers, there has been slowly developed in most of these States an auxiliary extension force composed of negro men and women agents, working exclusively among people of their own race. From this, the need for Extension work with the Black farm population was demonstrated.

Reck gives a more readable account of the origin of Extension work with Blacks than Evans. In compiling the chapter on "Club Work With Negroes Expands," he found that it was "... necessary to trace the growth of the entire Negro Extension program."

Negro Extension work in the South got an early start because such men as Booker T. Washington, head of Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, and Hollis B. Frissell, head of Hampton Institute in Virginia, had the vision to see that it was needed.

These leaders--Washington, a Negro, and Frissel, a white man--had watched the progress of Seaman A. Knapp's beginning work in Texas and other boll-weevil-threatened states, beginning in 1903. Knapp's early agents had enrolled many demonstrators among the Negro farmers of Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The reports of their success created a demand for
demonstration work in other southern states, and this in turn called for the appointment of Negro demonstration agents.

The pioneer Negro agent was Thomas Campbell, a Georgia farm boy who ran away from home to seek an education at Tuskegee Institute, rather than face a life of "hiring out" to other farmers for meager wages.

Campbell's appointment as the first agent in Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work came in his final year at Tuskegee. He was out in a field breaking ground with a steel-beam turning plow when Dr. George W. Carver, the agricultural wizard who headed Tuskegee's experiment work, brought a large man out to see him. This man said, "I want to employ you to travel about and show the Negroes how to prepare land just as you are doing now."

The man was Seaman A. Knapp. The date was November 12, 1906, about three years after the beginning of Demonstration Work in Texas. 10

Reck continued with a description of the Campbell's work experience which served him well in his new assignment.

The tall young student had already done Extension work of a kind. With Carver, he had traveled about the country showing farmers how to improve poor land by working in barnyard manure, then planting legumes and plowing them under. He had noted how Negro farmers planted cotton up to the cabin doorstep, leaving no room for a garden. He had listened to Carver preach the gospel of the farm garden, and had lent a helping hand as the scientist, standing at a stove, showed housewives how to turn cowpeas, tomatoes, and turnips into palatable dishes.

Earlier that year, Tuskegee had sent out its first "movable school," called the Jesup Agricultural Wagon after the donor, Morris K. Jesup of New York. This wagon, fitted out with cream separator, milk tester, hand churn, two-horse steel-beam plow, cultivator, harrow and garden tools, went around the countryside putting on better-farming demonstrations, with all the neighbors in to help. Campbell had driven the Jesup Wagon, and the experience had well fitted him for his role as the first of all Negro demonstration agents.

... A month later, on December 14, 1906, Knapp appointed the quiet and precise John B. Pierce of
Virginia as the second Negro demonstration agent, working from Hampton Institute.11

With this historical perspective in mind, the origin of Extension work with Blacks in Louisiana can now be considered.

Interest on the part of leaders among Negro farmers asserted itself as early as the days of the Farmers Cooperative Demonstration movement. Among these leaders were T. J. Jordan, a graduate of Tuskegee Institute, and the late O. L. Coleman, president of Coleman College, Gibsland, Louisiana. A Farmers League, sponsored by Coleman College, was already functioning among Negro farmers of Bienville and Claiborne parishes. After Jordan's graduation from Tuskegee in 1912 he accepted a post as agricultural instructor in Boggy Institute, Waskom, Texas, where he conducted instruction courses based on Dr. Seaman A. Knapp's philosophy of "teaching by demonstration." A Negro teacher from Caddo parish, Louisiana, who heard him expound the method, urged that he come to Louisiana and carry on a similar work.

Following this, President Coleman made a formal proposal, on behalf of the Farmers League of Bienville and Claiborne parishes, that Jordan undertake demonstration work in those parishes, provided the plan was approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Coleman took up the matter with J. A. Evans, at that time assistant chief of the Farmers Cooperative Demonstration Work, at Washington, who referred him to Mason Snowden, recognizing the need for affording Negroes the same opportunities of demonstration teaching as those given white farmers, agreed to appoint a leader for the work, provided the people would defray part of the salary. The Farmers League accepted the proposition and entered into an agreement to that effect with State Agent Snowden. T. J. Jordan was named as the demonstration.*

*From an "Historical Appraisal of Negro Agricultural Extension Work in Louisiana," written by T. J. Jordan in 1939.12 [The original of Mr. Jordan's one page "Appraisal" is in the archives of Southern University's John B. Cade Library where Mrs. Ledell Smith, Archivist, located it on 5 December 1986 in the his "Annual Narrative Report" dated October 31, 1942.]

The thorough yet sympathetic treatment of the
development of Black Extension work in Louisiana was continued by Williamson.

The appointment of Jordan was made in August, 1913. He began his activities September 16, his first duties including attendance at the agents' short course held at the Louisiana State University. His service followed the same lines as those pursued by such pioneers as L. E. Perrin and J. A. Redhead, white agents, except that it was devoted entirely to Negro farmers in Bienville and Claiborne parishes where he was employed under the agreement with the Farmers League at the time the Smith-Lever Act came into force in 1914, when the Negro work became part of the Agricultural Extension program. On December 1, 1916, Jordan was transferred to Caddo parish, succeeding Henry W. Toler, who had been parish Negro agent since October 1, 1915.

In the meantime, under the Agricultural Extension program, other colored agents were named for different parishes of the state. Besides Henry W. Toler in Caddo, A. J. Jones was appointed in East Baton Rouge and J. M. Burr in St. Martin, on October 1, 1915.

On January 1, 1918, T. J. Jordan was appointed state club agent for work with Negro 4-H groups, with headquarters at Southern University, Scotlandville, a position he held for more than four years, when he was made district agent for Negro work in Louisiana. By this time local agents were serving in Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, Concordia, Claiborne, DeSoto, East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberia, Lincoln, Madison, Rapides, Sabine, St. Landry, St. Martin, Webster, and West Feliciana. The first local (that is, Negro) home demonstration agent was appointed to serve in Caddo parish, and later others in Orleans and Lafayette parishes. During the period between 1918-28 the work continued to grow slowly but steadily, with the appointment of local Negroes who had acquired qualification and experience to assist in the work among colored farmers and their families. Local agents were named to serve under county agents in Avoyelles, Concordia, East Carroll, and Washington parishes, and later in Ascension. Local home demonstration agents were named in Concordia, DeSoto, East Baton Rouge, East Carroll, East Feliciana, Jefferson Davis, LaSalle, Pointe Coupee, Sabine, Tensas, and Washington parishes.13

Williamson states that "In 1937 T. J. Jordan was made
state agent in charge of Negro work, under the supervision of the state director of Extension.”¹⁴ He concludes as follows:

Credit belongs to the late Dr. J. S. Clark, president of Southern University, for substantial encouragement and cooperation he freely gave to Extension service among the colored people of the state. Dr. Clark proved to be one of the great leaders of his race in the South, and his influence and helpfulness in promoting the program which he recognized as undeniably significant in the betterment of conditions in Negro farm and home life, served as a powerful stimulation in expanding the movement throughout Louisiana. When in January, 1918, the state office for Negro work was transferred to Southern University at Scotlandville, it was given space in the science-agricultural building of the institution. . . . Short courses for instruction of local agents were held at the University. Dr. Clark, who was recognized as an eloquent and thoughtful speaker, was always one of the inspirational figures at these gatherings.¹⁵

. . . Helping Negro farm families plan for the production of enough food for home use was an intensified endeavor by Extension workers. The agents cooperated with home demonstration club women and community organizations in the use of surplus commodities for the preparation and serving of food for school children. In this way protective foods new to many farm people were introduced. Many women who formerly had shunned whole-wheat flour had become educated to its value and were serving whole-wheat dishes for their families and were liking it.¹⁶

Now that this historical overview has been presented, attention can be turned to developments in Extension work with Blacks following WW II to 1986.

History from World War II to 1986

This era will be described by interviews with Extension workers, some of whom will be current employees as well as retirees, and a review of articles and reports.

The movement from separate Louisiana Extension Services
for work with Whites and Blacks to the present unified Service can be seen by following the Extension career of Dr. Phillip Abram Lewis, Jr., who joined the LCES in 1958 with the title of Assistant County Agent for Work with Negroes and who rose through the ranks to become the first Black Subject Matter Extension Specialist to be housed on the LSU campus in Knapp Hall. Additionally, Lewis has served on the staff of Director Loupe as Assistant State Agent for EEO and Civil Rights since 1981. He obtained his doctorate from LSU in 1975.17

To make these statements so matter of factually does not convey the dramatic changes which they represent and, in fact, belies the personal anguish and racial tension which existed in the South, particularly during the era referred to as the struggle for Civil Rights and racial equality. Briefly, the Supreme Court ruled in 1954 in the now classic case of "Brown vs. the Board of Education" that "separate but equal" was not constitutional. Prior to this, segregation in the South was considered to be legally sanctioned. However, the struggle by Blacks for such things as equal employment and voting rights had only begun in 1954. The institution of segregation yielded slowly and the LCES which was a product of this institution and its time yielded slowly likewise.

Although this is not a history of the struggle for Civil Rights in the South, a few examples will serve to
create the proper setting for this chapter on the Black Experience in the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. In the search for equal education, Black agents were not permitted to enroll as graduate students in LSU until 1964. They could not vote with certainty until Congress passed the Civil Right Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Instead of promoting harmony, these acts led to protest marches and riots. In 1965 and 1966, U.S. Representatives Morrison, Boggs and Willis were burned in effigy in Livingston Parish by the Ku Klux Klan for their part in the passage of the Civil Rights Acts in 1964 and 1965. In the summer of 1967, the Rev. A. Z. Young led Civil Rights activists on a march from Bogalusa to Baton Rouge. After the group was attacked near Satsuma in Livingston Parish, over 600 National Guardsmen and State Troopers escorted them on the last leg of their march through Denham Springs to Baton Rouge. The violence led ultimately to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1968.

In this environment Dr. Lewis, embarked on his career with Extension in 1958. This he was prepared for because he had received a B.S. degree in Vocational Agriculture from Southern University in 1955. Following graduation, he taught at Ringgold Colored High School in Acadia Parish. His Southern agricultural training was most positive and designed to prepare the students to return to their home
parishes in order "to raise the standard of living of the people." Lewis recalled fondly one of his teacher/trainer, Mr. C. H. Chapman, who was a graduate of Michigan State and a former Vocational Agricultural teacher in Caldwell Parish, who gave his students vivid examples and told convincing stories. Chapman instilled in his students that because they were college-trained, they would be looked up to by the local people as examples; therefore, they must always conduct themselves professionally. Lewis also became acquainted, while at Southern, with the work of the pioneer Black Extension Agent, Mr. T. J. Jordan.

When Lewis joined the Extension Service in 1958 as an Assistant Agent for Work with Negroes, he was hired by D. L. Bornman, Jr., to do 4-H youth and adult work in Ascension Parish. He was housed separately in Prairieville from the white Extension staff which was headquartered in the parish seat of Donaldsonville. In fact, he occupied an office in the Fair Building located in Prairieville. He embarked on his educational advancement in the summer of 1959 but not at LSU—he had to go out of state, to Prairie View A & M in Prairie View, Texas, where a USDA employee, Sherman Briscoe, lectured on Communications and an Extension person from Virginia taught Program Development. Although the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service paid for his training at Prairie View, he was not encouraged to attend LSU in 1959 or 1960 because it was not acceptable at this period of time.
However, the times were changing; by 1962-63, Dr. Lynn Pesson was actively encouraging Lewis to attend LSU and that he would be provided with time off from his Extension duties to do so. When asked to explain this change in policy and attitude, Lewis responded that, although he respected Director Sanders for placing the Extension staff on an equal footing with the academic faculty at LSU, he did not agree with all his actions. Lewis acknowledged that Director H. C. Sanders was nationally known as a scholar and a gentleman and as one who took his Extension work with deadly seriousness. He was, nevertheless, a product of his time. The new times called for new leaders with new and different ideas and attitudes. Director Sanders retired in 1961 and Director John A. Cox assumed leadership of the Extension Service.

Even with new leadership, changes occurred slowly. After receiving his masters degree from LSU in Extension Education in 1968, Lewis' District Agent, Mr. Victor Murray, asked him in 1972 to do Community Resource Development work in the parishes of Ascension, St. James and St. John. This involved training community leaders and working with organizations and groups to obtain community improvements in such areas as housing, recreation, roads, drainage, etc. Around 1966, USDA policies made it illegal to house Extension staff separately based on race. Consequently Lewis was moved to Donaldsonville with the white staff of
Ascension Parish. Here he found that attitudes were stiff. When asked to contrast them with those in 1986 at Knapp Hall, he simply said, "In Donaldsonville, it was sometime before I received a key to my office; now I have one to the whole building."

Other more serious attitudes involved the difficulty with which some clients and colleagues found it to reframe from using derogatory terms, such as "Boy," when referring to a Black male and adopting the acceptable racial name, "Black," rather than "Colored" or "Negra." Lewis said that many Whites found it difficult to say "Negro" Agent but they could pronounce the name of the north Louisiana town of Monroe and even President Monroe's name!

Helping to make the transition to a more equitable society and working organization was the fact that many Black and White agents enrolled in the LSU Graduate School attended the same classes. This fostered respect for ability. However, familiarity was often restricted to the classroom in the early days of desegregation. Now Lewis points out that your classmates still remember your name when you get back to your hometown.

Dr. Lewis concluded by explaining that the unified Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service of 1986 took the efforts of both the 1862, LSU, and the 1890, Southern, institutions. At Southern, he credits Mr. Ashford O. Williams, the predecessor of the current administrator of
the 1890 Extension Program, and Dr. Leodrey Williams, the present administrator, for having the foresight and initiative to pave the way for today's successes. He pointed out that Dr. Leodrey Williams receives the same reports as Dr. Loupe.

At LSU, Lewis credits former Director Cox and his staff, particularly Norvel E. Thames, who was in charge of Field Operations, with grasping the new challenge and taking the time to do the necessary advance work so that the changes implemented were in everyone's best interest. After the Alabama Court decision in 1973 which held that all Extension Services had to either eliminate discrimination in employment and program delivery or face the withholding of Federal funds, the pace of desegregation accelerated as well as the potential for conflict. However, because of Director Cox's desire and willingness to accept and require change and Mr. Thames' extensive field work, constructive change was achieved. They simply told the field staff, "It's a new day and a new time, get your business in order." Lewis concedes that Director Cox was particularly suited for this assignment by training, experience, disposition and personality. He was the new leader with new ideas and approaches for the new times.

In 1986, Director Denver L. Loupe is faced with different problems. He no longer faces race relation ones; he can build on the past accomplishments in this area.
Lewis further explained this by stating that Black agents are now serving as Parish Chairmen, the chief administrative position within a parish, and that female agents are assigned to do agricultural work and that both field agents and State Office staff work across racial lines. Lewis sees a bright future for Extension because of Director Loupe's administrative and leadership abilities. Dr. Loupe has established a good working relationship in Extension and his goal is to make the Louisiana Extension Service, the best in the Nation. With staff as dedicated as Dr. Lewis, Director Loupe's dream is surely achievable.

As one would expect, Lewis enjoys his work and has found self fulfillment in it. This is because he has seen tangible evidence of his efforts in the achievements of his clients whether those achievements were in terms of their being recipients of State Awards for Better Living or their having attended the World Fair in New York or in their community having the opportunity to apply for a possible grant as a result of the Federal Assistance Program Retrieval System (FAPRS) which he operates. Thus, from chronologizing the professional development of this one Black Extension Agent, it can be concluded that the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service has changed both qualitatively and quantitatively for the better in terms of race relationship from WW II to 1986.
Former Black Leaders Of Extension Education

Mr. Robert J. Courtney

Prior to the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, Mr. Courtney served as the "Assistant State Agent for Work with Negroes." He received his high school education through the O. W. Dillon High School in Tangipahoa Parish and his undergraduate degree from Southern University in 1939, a B.S. in Agricultural Education. Mr. Courtney was awarded a Carnegie Foundation Fellowship to study at Harvard University's School of Public Administration, in 1951 and he received his Master Degree in Public Administration, MPA, in 1952.20

From 1939 to 1942, Courtney taught Vocational Agriculture at Morehouse Parish High School in Bastrop. In 1942, he began his career with the Extension Service when he became a Trainee in Tensas Parish. Later during that year, he was assigned as a Local County Agent for Work with Negroes in Franklin Parish. He held this title until 1945 when he was promoted to an Assistant County Agent for Work With Negroes in Franklin Parish. He served in this capacity until 1948 when he was promoted to the State Extension Office at Southern University as program leader in agriculture for work with Negroes. With the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, he was transferred to the LSU campus as an Assistant State Agent for Small Farmer Programs in 1965 and was promoted later during the year to an
Associate State Agent for Small Farmer Programs. He held this title from 1965 to 1971. In 1971, his responsibilities were extended to include State Coordinator for Equal Employment Opportunity and Civil Rights. In 1975, he was promoted to State Agent with the same title and held this position until his death in June 1976.21

T. J. Jordan (31 July 1885-1 April 1967)

The biographer of Miss Mary Mims, Garnie William McGinty, provides this information on her role in the retirement celebration of the first Negro parish agent in Louisiana, Mr. T. J. Jordan. According to Williamson, Jordan was a 1912 graduate of Tuskegee Institute and was appointed agent for Bienville and Claiborne Parishes in August 1913.22

... Mr. T. J. Jordan, Director of Agricultural Extension for Negroes of Louisiana, came into Miss Mims' office and in the course of the conversation casually stated that he was retiring after 35 years of extension work—You are a pioneer in Agricultural Extension in Louisiana!" She suggested a "Jordan Day," and wrote the President of the Negro County Agents' Association [another subject for study] expressing the thought that Jordan should be so honored for his distinguished service. The suggestion took root and grew. Jordan was born at Mount Lebanon and joined the Baptist church there during his youth. He chose this church as the place for the occasion of being honored. Miss Mims wrote, "I wish that the people of the North, East and West could have seen the happy relationship between white and colored that day." The church could not seat all of the 300 people who were present. Mr. Richard, Assistant Director of Extension, and Miss Ellen Lenoir ... were present.23

As noted earlier, the report by James A. Evans, the first State Agent in Louisiana who left in 1911 to join the
Federal Service, titled *Extension Work Among Negroes* was published by USDA as Department Circular 355 in September 1925. (Evans' *Recollections of Extension History* was published by Dr. I. O. Schaub, Director of the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, as North Carolina Extension Circular Number 224, August 1938.) An earlier report with the same title, was written by W. B. Mercier while he was with the Federal Service. It was published by USDA as Department Circular 190 in 1921.

In summary, Blacks have been involved with Extension work in Louisiana even before Smith-Lever was passed in 1914. Blacks have continued to be involved and now can make even greater contributions because they are serving in leadership positions at all levels of the Extension organization—from the State Office to the Parish Offices.

The next chapter contains an overall evaluation and conclusion.
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CHAPTER XIV
EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service has changed both quantitatively and qualitatively since the foundations were laid 1905. The former change is easier to show than the latter. The Extension-type endeavors were begun in Louisiana by the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Program in 1905. This program had a narrow educational scope since it was restricted to areas infested by the boll weevil. It was, however, the predecessor program of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 which provided for broad-based educational assistance to farm people. Smith-Lever, although amended many times, still governs the Extension Service in 1986.

At its fundamental level, Extension work is an educational effort designed for anyone not regularly attending a land-grant university. Extension's purpose is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness with which its recipients conduct their activities. Once the fact is grasped or accepted that Extension is neither more nor less than an educational program carried on outside a traditional classroom, then it becomes easier to analyze and study. Since Extension is an educational pursuit, the content of its subject matter may change over time, as do its methods for transmitting its body of knowledge and, most
importantly, the composition of its recipients.

The basic philosophy of Extension holds that what is important is what the learner does, not what the teacher does. This was expressed by the Father of Extension Education, Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, as, "What a man hears he may doubt, what he sees he may possibly doubt, but what he does himself he cannot doubt." Knapp left Iowa and moved his family to Lake Charles in 1885 to head a land-development project of Jabez B. Watkins. He was "... to help colonize and bring into cultivation a region in Louisiana as large as the State of Delaware."

That Knapp faced an economic challenge in Louisiana can be seen from this one farm income comparison:

The economy of the South in 1900 was almost completely agricultural. ... The average earnings of those engaged in agriculture in the Southern states ranged from $150 to $300 per year. In Iowa this figure stood at $1,000 and upwards.

That Knapp was successful in Louisiana is shown by this information:

Within five years after Knapp's arrival, the uninhabited prairies were "transformed from a vast cattle range to a region thickly populated and dotted with the best aspects of a well-settled Western Prairie State ... the most distinctive Anglo-Saxon migration ever known to the South since the settlement of Jamestown, Virginia."

What methods contributed to his success and enabled him to achieve the above accomplishment? They were surprisingly straightforward.

So many farmers [from the North] got back on the [railroad] cars again, their greenbacks for deposit
payments still pinned in their wallets, that the colonization scheme, Knapp says, faced failure. He planned a sales demonstration—farms dotted throughout the territory, usually one to each township, where the farmer could see with his own eyes livestock grazing, field crops ripening, fruit trees and berry bushes in leafage.

He selected energetic and thrifty Western farmers who, in return for large concessions on the price of land, seed, and stock, agreed to manage their farms so as to display the wide diversification possible to the soil and climate. A visit to one of these farms did more to convince the farmer buyers than endless hours of talk. The immediate effectiveness of this simple, common-sense object lesson was an eye-opener to Knapp who saw possibilities in this "show me" method that he remembered for years.4

In the years following, Knapp continued to refine on this "demonstration" idea until he perfected it in an experiment at Terrell, Kaufman County, Texas, on the Porter Farm in 1903. On February 25, the Porter Demonstration Farm agreement, which was written on Texas Midland Railroad letterhead, was signed.5

Several features in these agreements were new to demonstration work as it had been conducted, but the one of paramount importance, present only in the Terrell plan, was the pledge of indemnification against loss to the experimenting farmer. Here for the first time responsibility for success or failure, for profit or loss was concentrated on the only man who mattered, the farmer who had agreed to find out for himself whether new methods would make a noticeable improvement in his crops. . . . 6

Indemnification of the farmer by the local community removed the last hurdle on the road to eliminating government distortion of the lessons of demonstration. Bailey said, "The complete elimination of government money and direct control removed the last excuse for the ingrained
skepticism and suspicion of the farmer."7

The discovery of the "Demonstration Method" at Terrell, which would eventually lead to creation the U.S. Extension Service was fortuitous, according to Bailey.

The educational and social devices employed in connection with the Terrell farm demonstration were discovered, as in the manipulative fumbling that attends all invention, virtually by accident. Dr. Knapp, lacking time or money to set going another demonstration on the pattern of the North Galveston farm, helped the citizens of Terrell organize a make-shift substitute that obliged them to provide their own leadership and to assume the financial risks involved in teaching themselves better methods of farming. The result—in terms of pedagogical effectiveness even more than in terms of agricultural efficiency—startled everyone connected with the venture, Dr. Knapp not least of all. After a lifetime of farming and teaching, he had stumbled onto the right way to alter and improve the outmoded practices of farmers everywhere. This was especially true of the South. . . .8

The age-old problem of how to get people to adopt new and improved practices had finally been achieved.

The Louisiana Extension Service became the inheritor of Knapp's new Demonstration Method. It grew quantitatively from a total staff of 3 in 1905, 51 in 1910 and to 83 in 1914. By 1928, the total was 181 and by 1948 it was 481. For 1968, 1982 and 1986, the total staff was 582, 766 and 723, respectively. See Table 9 for additional information. Funding likewise grew from $86,390 in 1914 to $1,783,693 in 1948. In 1968, 1982 and 1986, the funding amounts were $6,191,607, $22,708,187, and $24,446,056. See Table 8 for details.

Another indicator that Extension moved from the general
to the specific is evident when subject matter specialists are considered. Prior to 1914, there were none on the staff. By 1918, fifteen were employed in these fields: 1) Swine, 2) Cotton, 3) Poultry, 4) Gardens, 5) Home Demonstration Work, 6) Horticulture, 7) Editorial, 8) Beef Cattle, 9) Bees and 10) Dairying. (Note that the fields do not total fifteen because some of them had more than one specialist or an assistant was employed in them.)

By 1986, there were 90 subject matter specialists employed in these six subject areas: 1) AGRICULTURE, 2) NATURAL RESOURCES, 3) HOME ECONOMICS, 4) COMMUNICATIONS, 5) 4-H AND 6) COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT. The subject areas were grouped into seven Divisions: 1) Division of Animal Science—Animal Nutrition, Animal Science, Dairying, Poultry, and Veterinary Science; 2) Division of Communications—Graphic Design, News, Photography, Publications, Radio/Television, and Video Production & Television; 3) Division of Economics and Resource Development—Agricultural Economics and Resource Development; 4) Division of Environmental Science—Engineering and Energy, Entomology, Pesticide Safety and Aquaculture, Wildlife and Sea Grant (Marine Advisory Programs); 5) Division of 4-H and Youth Development; 6) Division of Home Economics—Expanded Foods & Nutrition Education Program, Family Development and Management, and Food/Nutrition, Health/Safety; 7) Division of Plant
Science—Agronomy, Forestry, Horticulture and Plant Pathology. For further details, see Appendix F.

Lest it be forgotten that farming was not always complex enough to need this specialized assistance review this from Director Bateman's Memoirs.

The years, 1919, 1920, 1921, and 1922 were very wet and rainy during the summer. In the winter of 1923, Mr. Day and Mr. Raub [Secretary and President, respectively, of the Union Land and Timber Company at St. Joseph] came down [to Tensas Parish]. In 1922, a man named Dr. Code who was with the Bureau of Entomology at the Tallulah Station found that arsenic delivered as a dust on cotton would help control the weevil. The weevil had been ruining the cotton crop during wet years. Mr. Day and Mr. Raub told me to go ahead and risk the poison. I tried it on two plantations [the company owned 17]. The tenants who used the arsenic doubled those who did not. This was the beginning of using poison on cotton. Ben Young and the Goldman brothers used some that year also.9

Bateman also reminds us that a simple cultural practice as using commercial fertilizer was not always the accepted way to farm.

Mr. J. L. Lee came to Tensas as County Agent and he introduced the use of nitrate of soda by giving many farmers a couple of sacks to try. It was a Godsend. It did the trick on all crops. None had ever been tried before 1923. No kind of fertilizer had ever been used in the parish and no poison had ever been used for weevil control.10

While Bateman does not reveal the particular reason for the farmers of Tensas not using fertilizer, it is known that certain other Louisiana farmers refused to do so for fear that it would poison their soil.

Williamson supplies a final example—the attempt to eradicate the fever tick in cattle by dipping them. A
procedure which seems now to be so simple and acceptable was not so in 1916 as this excerpt shows:

Owners of livestock were by no means united in opposition to the fever tick. Verbal—and sometimes physical—battles were waged between those who favored the practice of dipping and those against it. Vats, constructed by funds supplied by the U.S. Government, often were blasted into dust by dynamite supplied by the non-dippers. . . .

By 1936 . . . the entire state, with the exception of a small locality in Allen Parish, was officially declared free of the cattle tick, and the federal quarantine was lifted. The struggle, which had continued for more than 40 years, was at last brought to a successful termination. From this time forth the story of livestock in Louisiana became one of continual growth and accomplishment.

These examples point out an added need to develop a historical data base. It could serve as a benchmark by which future development in all subject matter areas of the Louisiana Extension Service could be measured.

The year 1936 was also significant for the Louisiana Service for another reason—it marked the first time that a minimum staff consisting of a County Agent and Home Demonstration Agent was employed in every parish of the State on a permanent basis. It is interesting to speculate that this event was more than just a coincidental factor in the elimination of the fever tick in the State in the same year.

A final quantitative measure further shows the improvement of the Extension Service. A review of Appendix F reveals that the early Extension workers rarely possessed more than a bachelors degree. In fact, it was
1931 before the University adopted a policy which required
the Director of LCES to possess a masters degree at the time
of employment. Later, this requirement was extended to all
new professional employees—have a masters degree or agree
to begin work on one when employed. By 1982, of the 97
State Office staff, 50 held doctoral degrees, 45 masters and
only 2 the bachelors.\textsuperscript{14}

Qualitative factors will now be considered. The
Louisiana Extension Service will be examined to determine
whether it has received any type of criticisms and, if so,
what type and from whom. This will serve as an indirect
measure of the acceptance of the Louisiana Service by its
clients in the absence of a Warner and Christenson type
assessment. Such an assessment is, however, strongly
recommended. In summary, Warner and Christenson found in
their national random survey of public attitudes toward the
national Extension Service: SUPPORT\textsuperscript{—}39\% of the people
wanted more, 43\% wanted the same and 18\% less; SATISFACTION\textsuperscript{—}95\% of the users; USE\textsuperscript{—}27\% over one’s lifetime and 14\%
yearly; and finally AWARENESS\textsuperscript{—}87\% overall, 77\% 4-H, 52\%
agriculture, 46\% community development and 45\% home
economics.\textsuperscript{15}

Since the Louisiana Service’s distribution of staff
time by program area in 1982 (Agriculture, 40\%, Home
Economics 20\%, 4-H, 34\% and Community Development 6\%) was so
similar to the national allocation where approximately one-
third of the staff effort is devoted to agriculture, one-third to home economics, and one-fourth to 4-H, and one-ninth to community development, the national results can reasonably be extrapolated to Louisiana.\textsuperscript{16}

The major criticism of Extension and its sister organizations was written by Jim Hightower in \textit{Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times: The Failure of the Land Grant College Complex,} 1972, a summary of which follows:

The message of the report is that the tax-paid, land grant complex has come to serve an elite of private, corporate interests in rural America, while ignoring those who have the most urgent needs and the most legitimate claims for assistance.\textsuperscript{17}

Hightower concludes his treatment of the Extension Service under the heading "Strike Three" in which he states:

Extension largely is irrelevant in today's rural America. The little good that it does manage to extend certainly does not warrant an investment of 332 million tax dollars. Most rural Americans get little real help from that money and, even though agribusiness is able to use Extension for its own profit needs, the Service is hardly a keystone in the plans of agribusiness. The fact is that Extension has deteriorated to the point that it is not much good to anybody, except maybe 15,000 extension agents who otherwise would have to look for work.

But Extension could be useful. It has a clientele that badly needs attention—indeed family farmers, farm workers, small town businesses, small town government, non-farm rural people and others. Structurally, Extension is designed to reach these folks, reaching right down into the communities and homes of rural people. But that will mean getting out of the traveling salesmen's sample kit. It will mean a change in attitude at the top, and probably a change in personnel at the bottom. Such changes will not come from within.\textsuperscript{18}

Although there were some elements of truth in some of
Hightower's accusations, he erred in not recognizing that change was already underway in the Extension Service, particularly in Louisiana, and that the Service was already shifting its focus from the rural to the urban. For example, in 1966 former Director Cox had signaled the transition when he changed the name of the Louisiana Service from the LSU Agricultural Extension Service to the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES). He also changed the structure of the Field Office staffs by adding a position of Parish Chairman at the local level. This gave leadership opportunities to women, Blacks and younger men employees since leadership was no longer automatically assigned to the County Agent who was usually a white male. At the same time, he extended to the 4-H staff the same promotional ranks which existed for the agricultural and home economist staff, namely the ranks of Assistant, Associate and Agent. This gave a more realistic salary spread and promotional opportunities, particularly for Blacks and women, since a parish could now have more than one "Agent" just like a college could have more than one "Professor."

Warner and Christenson dispelled for all time that Extension's clients were all rural. They found that two-thirds of the clients resided in urban areas, which is not too strange since many urban users have rural roots. However, they acknowledged that there was a higher proportion of rural and farm resident users.
To apply the urban/rural criticism to Louisiana, it is often voiced that the farm population of Louisiana, as well as the U.S., has declined dramatically since 1914. For Louisiana, the rural population in 1910 represented 70 percent of the State's total population; by 1980, this percentage had declined to 31.4 percent. The number of farms also declined—from 120,546 in 1910 to 31,628 in 1982.

Why did the Louisiana Extension Service not suffer a similar decline? There are several reasons which help to explain why a decline has not occurred. First, from strictly an agricultural perspective, the average size of farms in Louisiana has increased—from 86.6 acres in 1910 to 282.0 acres. This means that, although there are fewer farms, those which remain are larger and could be expected to be more complex. A related argument which is often given is that since less than two percent of the population are farmers, only a small Extension Service is needed. This reasoning neglects the fact that this two percent is the most basic and important component of the population. Without productive agriculture, urban society is not possible.

Also, the scope of Extension has broadened to include aquaculture, special nutrition education for the disadvantaged, energy education, etc. The percentage of the population in farming does not include the agribusiness segment or forestry, which is the second largest industry in
the state! Extension serves both of these.

The complexity issue can be summarized by recalling that it has been estimated that the total knowledge base doubles every seven years. Since the prime responsibility of Extension is education, the previous statement requires that Extension be an ongoing activity. Those advocating the abolition or reduction of Extension are reminiscent of a former head of the U.S. Patent Office who recommended that his job be abolished since all the inventions had been patented!

(It has been recommended for future researchers by some LSU rural sociologists that they consider questions such as these: Were there any latent, negative or unanticipated consequences of actions taken or recommended by the Louisiana Service? For example, when the Service recommended the adoption of "scientific" agricultural practices, did this cause overproduction which in turn caused a reduction in the number of farmers? Simply, to be a devil's advocate, was the Extension Service involved in any complicity?)

The preceding remarks are made to emphasize the importance of an ongoing educational program for agriculture. In the book The Future World of Agriculture written to complement the agricultural exhibit "The Land" at Walt Disney World's EPCOT Center, the authors provide reasons for the need of "The Educated Farmer."
The success of these [scientific] advances, some of which were a far cry from traditional farming practices, depended on the ability of farmers to keep up with new developments. . . .

The authors continue by listing the developments which occurred to enable farmers "to keep up."

It [the Morrill Act of 1862] was followed in 1887 by the Hatch Act, which provided for the establishment of experimental farms and county extension agents in every state. [sic] The agents traveled around each state, providing farmers with the latest agricultural information. These laws set up a network of resources that made it possible for even the smallest farmer in the most distant part of the country to gain knowledge and help in the latest farming techniques.

The Hatch Act did establish the Experiment Stations, but it did not establish the system of County Extension Agents. This error points up the importance of history and the fact that it now seems so logical to have the Extension Service complement the Experiment Stations by disseminating their findings that the Extension Service has become linked in the public press (at least in this publication) with the Hatch Act which created the Experiment Stations in 1887. Some 27 years of agricultural history was ignored because Extension was not established until 1914.

Since a national overview has now been given, attention can return to Louisiana. The only written criticism of the Louisiana Extension Service originating from within the state which this writer found was that based on Governor Sam Jones' dismissal of Director Bateman when he became governor in 1940—"too many county agents standing around on corners." Since there was an absence of in-state written
criticism, out-of-state publications will serve as an indirect measure of perhaps, as yet, unarticulated criticism of the LCES. So these selections from the national press follow. Extension made the July 1986 issue of Reader's Digest. In the article entitled, "Uncle Sam's Ten Worst Taxpayer Rip-Offs," it was number eight:

8. County Cooperative Extension Service Offices. These Department of Agriculture outposts were set up in 1914, when nearly 35 percent of the nation's population were farmers. Today, 2.2 percent farm. Yet these offices still operate in virtually every county in the country. Increasingly, they dispense information about how to eliminate crabgrass and give courses in sewing, cooking, upholstery and quilting. "It's crazy," admits a Department of Agriculture official, "but Congress insists on funding all of these offices."

Federal taxpayers pay one-third of the costs ($338 million), with states and localities kicking in two-thirds. Yet only two of every five federal dollars finance legitimate farmer-education services. The President wants federal extension-service funding concentrated on farm activities. Savings: over $1 billion.

The Progressive Farmer summarized their Opinion Poll of selected readers on the subject of Extension in the article entitled "Extension: Vital Service or Tax Drain?" which appeared in their issue of September 1986. Progressive Farmer gave this explanation for conducting their survey: "... the Reagan Administration wants major cuts in the funding of Extension Service operations and staff under the 1987 federal budget. We wanted to know what you thought of the possible drastic cuts in county services and how these cuts might affect you. So we asked." In response to the question, "Should Extension Service funding be cut back by
35%?," 35.3% said "Yes," 56.9 "No" and 7.8% had no answer.

The only derogatory reference to Extension occurs in the article by Ben C. Toledano in the National Review, August 15, 1986, titled "Laissez Les Bons Temps Rouler: Louisiana in Its Pre-Modern Era."

Early on, Louisianans learn that lesson which doesn't have to be learned in school: "It's not what you know, it's who you know." Weave that thread from the top to the bottom and you produce the unique, twisted fabric. If the humblest man wants to plant a vegetable garden behind his house, does he buy seeds, pick up his shovel, and go to work? No. He calls his brother-in-law who knows someone at the Agricultural Extension Service and gets him to send over free seeds and an employee to plant them. . . . This is a complete figment of his imagination. Unfortunately, it has a ring of truth like most canards. Extension did in the past provide free seed samples in order to promote the adoption of better varieties, but it never planted them for the recipient.

At the risk of appearing apologetic and certainly not intending to diminish the preceding 13 chapters, this work just scratches the surface of the agricultural history of the State of Louisiana, in general, and of that of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, in particular. In support of this contention, this lament of John A. Heitmann is offered. In his article titled, "Organization as Power: The Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association and the Creation of Scientific and Technical Institutions, 1877-1910," which appeared in the Summer 1986 issue of Louisiana History, he states:
While there are many areas of Louisiana history that remain to be explored, it is remarkable that historians of science and technology have virtually neglected this area. With the exception of a few studies by economic historians and historians of medicine, this field is virtually unexplored. See Light Townsend Cummins and Glen Jeansonne, *A Guide to the History of Louisiana* (Westport, Conn., 1982.)

This statement, unfortunately, is applicable to almost all Louisiana agricultural eras and disciplines.

Heitmann makes what at first appears to be a contradictory contention—he credits the Agricultural School at LSU with being the reason and genesis for the State's leadership in the field of petroleum development! He makes his case as follows:

In 1897, [William Carter] Stubbs [first Director of the Louisiana Experiment Station] persuaded President Boyd of Louisiana State University to establish the sugar course as a five-year program. All course work was taught in Baton Rouge. However, fourth- and fifth-year students spent ten weeks each year at the experiment station, where they applied what they had learned in the classroom. Initially, Stubbs remained in control of the program, but the shift in the school's primary location ultimately altered the curriculum. Stubbs, who was dependent upon declining LSPA [Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association] political and economic support for the continuance of his position within the university, now found his educational philosophy under attack by President Boyd, who stressed the value of theoretical rather than practical knowledge. Additional courses in carbohydrate chemistry and mechanical engineering were added at the expense of agricultural studies, and the controversy between Boyd and Stubbs contributed to the latter's resignation in 1905.

Initially the sugar course was a reflection of a technologically dynamic industry and the needs of its planter patrons. With the discovery of oil at Spindletop, Texas, in 1901, and the emergence of new organic extractive industries, the university changed the structure of its curriculum to meet not only
Louisiana's current requirement of sugar engineers, but also the perceived future demand for chemical engineers capable of working in other industries. Indeed, LSU's emphasis upon chemical process engineering during the mid-1920s was merely an extension of the sugar engineering program which had its origin in the New Orleans Audubon Sugar School of the 1890s.24

A Modest Proposal

Because events such as the preceding need to be documented, it is suggested that these areas be considered for future research and study:

1) Since the Louisiana Experiment Station will celebrate its centennial in 1987, a Centennial History would be appropriate;

2) In 1989, the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service will celebrate its 75th anniversary. It would be desirable to publish a traditional history of the Service in the style of Williamson.

If the Director were to appoint a Planning Committee in 1987, it would allow for ample time to develop an appropriate history and celebration.

The difficulty, as this writer experienced, will not be a scarcity of material but an abundance. The material of the Extension Service offers a veritable historian's paradise.

3) Because Extension and the Experiment Stations represent only two parts of the "Magic Triangle," the third, classroom instruction in agriculture must be included in any history plans. Hence, the history should be a trilozy of the LSU Agricultural Center and College of Agriculture.

An example of the range of uses to which the records of the Louisiana Cooperative Service can be put is shown by John V. Baiamonte, Jr., when he used the early records of the Tangipahoa Parish County Agent to reconstruct the
development of truck farming in that parish by Italian immigrants. His Ph.D. dissertation at Mississippi State University, 1972, is titled "Immigrants in Rural America: A Study of the Italians of Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana."

The foresight exhibited by former Director Cox in transferring all of the old Extension records to the care of the LSU Library's Louisiana Collection is commendable. It certainly facilitated the work of this writer and will prove even more valuable in the future. The inventory of the Extension collection is over 50 pages in length. Extension is encouraged to continue to supplement this collection whenever any of its records become obsolete and are no longer needed for current operations.

This concludes the sections on the past, "what was," and the present, "what is," and attention can now be turned to the final chapter on Extension's future, "what should or could be." In the words of Warner and Christenson, "... The widely accepted singular purpose of its early history is a thing of the past. ... Such substantial changes in program thrusts have brought adjustments in the structure and function of the organization. It doesn't do the same things it used to do, and they aren't done in the same way."
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CHAPTER XV

THE FUTURE OF THE LOUISIANA
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

This study began with a history of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES); it ends appropriately with some observation on its future. But, why study the future? The World Future Society, an association for the study of alternative futures, answered this question as follows in the booklet prepared for their fifth general assembly and exposition, *World View '84: A Global Assessment of Problems and Opportunities*.

By studying the future, people can better prepare themselves to live in the years ahead. More importantly, they can actively decide how they will live in the future, by making choices today and realizing the consequences of their decisions.¹

One of the themes of the 1984 assembly was "Food and Agriculture." This should by now be no surprise. However, since the World Future Society had as one of its directors this year Orville Freeman, former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, its selection was, no doubt, strengthened. Another well-known director was Robert S. McNamara, former Secretary of Defense and President of the World Bank.

The Food and Agriculture theme was described this way:

Despite aid from the industrialized countries, many Third World peoples continue to starve. The adequacy of food supplies is influenced by
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international political forces but can be improved by better management of world food supplies, more food production in the Third World, information on climate, new technology, and coherent national food policies.

A Sample of Scheduled Sessions:

Reverse Technology Transfer: Agrotechnology and Biotechnology
Microalgae: Farming Systems of the Future
The Politics of Food

Here is what John Naisbitt, author of the bestselling book *Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives*, has to say about agriculture in general and the World Future Society in particular:

The restructuring of America from an industrial to an information society will easily be as profound as the shift from an agricultural society to an industrial society.

But there is one important difference. While the shift from an agricultural to an industrial society took 100 years, the present restructuring from an industrial to an information society took only two decades. Change is occurring so rapidly that there is no time to react; instead we must anticipate the future. With the new information society, then, there is a change in time orientation as well.

In our agricultural period, the time orientation was to the past. Farmers learned from the past how to plant, how to harvest, and how to store. The time orientation in an industrial society is now. Get it out, get it done, ad hoc, the bottom line, and all that.

We must learn from the future in precisely the ways we have learned from the past.

In our new information society, the time orientation is to the future. This is one of the reasons we are so interested in it. We must now learn from the present how to anticipate the future. When we can do that, we will understand that a trend is not destiny; we will be able to learn from the future the way we have been learning from the past.
This change in time orientation accounts for the growing popular and professional interest in the future during the 1970s. For example, the number of universities offering some type of futures-oriented degree has increased from 2 in 1969 to over 45 in 1978. Membership in the World Future Society grew from 200 in 1967 to well over 30,000 in 1982, and the number of popular and professional periodicals devoted to understanding or studying the future has dramatically increased from 12 in 1965 to more than 122 in 1978.

It is quite possible for a single country to be in various states of agricultural, industrial, and information societies simultaneously. Yet, the object of life is different in all three, as Daniel Bell has said. During our agricultural period, the game was man against nature. An industrial society pits man against fabricated nature. In an information society—for the first time in civilization—the game is people interacting with other people. This increases personal transactions geometrically, that is, all forms of interactive communication: telephone calls, checks written, memos, messages, letters, and more. . . .

Before dismissing Naisbitt’s Megatrend theory, an examination his intellectual heritage is in order.

The years 1956 and 1957 were a turning point, the end of the industrial era.4 (In 1956, for the first time in American history, white-collar workers in technical, managerial, and clerical positions outnumbered blue-collar workers. The following year—1957—marked the beginning of the globalization of the information revolution: The Russians launched Sputnik, the missing technological catalyst in a growing information society. The real importance of Sputnik is not that it began the space age, but that it introduced the era of global satellite communications.5) Confused, unwilling to give up the past, even our best thinkers were at a loss to describe the coming epoch. Harvard sociologist Daniel Bell termed it the post-industrial society and the name stuck. We always name eras and movements "post" or "neo" when we don't know what to call them.

It is now clear that the post-industrial society is the information society, and that is what I call it throughout this book. (In any case, Daniel Bell was one of the earliest, and perhaps the best, thinkers on the subject, and much of what I have to say builds on his work.)6
Does this mean the end of farming? No, but it means the end of farming as we know it today. Naisbitt explains:

Finally, the transition from an industrial to an information society does not mean manufacturing will cease to exist or become unimportant. Did farming end with the industrial era? Ninety percent of us produced 100 percent of the food in the agricultural era; now 3 percent of us produce 120 percent.\(^7\)

Simply stated the future of the Extension Service and of agriculture in particular can be viewed from two perspectives, technologically and sociologically. The technological summary which follows is taken from *The Future World of Agriculture: Walt Disney World, EPCOT Center Book*.

The agricultural revolution that began in the nineteenth century and led to the vast mechanized farms of today is far from over. In think tanks and laboratories, on experimental farms and in research greenhouses such as those in The Land at EPCOT Center, scientists and farmers are now perfecting ideas and techniques that promise to conquer one of the world's most serious problems: The need to feed a constantly increasing population.

Among the agricultural advances we can expect are:

*Giant space farms, housed in wheel-shaped space colonies, where astronaut farmers will grow ten times as much food per acre as today's farmers on earth.*

*Soilless farms blooming in desert biospheres and city greenhouse-skyscrapers, where climate, wind, light, and air will be controlled to provide perfect growing environments.*

*Electronic farms--on which computers will receive news of trouble spots on the farm from superbird satellites, figure out solutions to the problems, and order robots to correct them.*

*An astonishing array of new foods, including delicious, nutritious artificial foods made in factories from such unlikely materials as
newsprint, thistles, and maple leaves.

The story of man's long journey from earliest days of farming in the Paleolithic Age to the superproductive farms of today and on to the farming marvels of tomorrow is told in words and illustrations in The Future World of Agriculture, inspired by The Land at Walt Disney World's EPCOT Center.

Warner and Christenson provides the sociological perspective with these remarks:

Extension is involved in hundreds of different programs and activities that compete for staff time and resources. The present distribution of effort is known, but what are the future priorities? What program areas or subject matter topics ought to receive greater or lesser attention one year or five years from now? Extension seldom abruptly alters major program directions. Rather, change generally comes gradually and in small increments. The motivations for change are often staff vacancies, increases or declines in funds for designated purposes, and changes in the nature of clientele demands.

They conclude their book with this statement which is apropos for this work:

This book has been written with the deep conviction that major changes are occurring in the United States as it moves from an industrial to an information society, changes unlike any that have been experienced before. Extension is vastly different than it was seventy years ago and, yet, we can expect the organization to undergo even greater transformations in the years ahead. The question is, "What will be Extension's response to these changes?" Extension has been and continues to be an important information agency and stands at a crossroads in the evolving age. Either Extension can anticipate such changes and be an important agent of change, or it can ignore them and be dragged "kicking and screaming" into the information age. Extension can shape its own destiny, or it can allow its future to be molded by others.

Just as the Federal Extension Service can shape its own destiny, the LCES can shape its destiny, too! The LCES has proven to be resourceful in the past as shown by the history...
section of this work. However, the future will be more complex than the past; thus, the LCES will be faced with a multitude of changing conditions described in this section to which it will have to respond by either adapting or doing nothing. Additionally, the response time will probably not permit the LCES the luxury of pondering and debating. It must be prepared to respond immediately.

If the LCES is to act and thereby shape its own destiny rather than react and thereby have its destiny shaped by others, it must be ever more vigilant of the changing societal conditions or it will become prematurely obsolete. Many of the skills and techniques necessary to avoid this fate are already in place and practiced by LCES personnel, such as the Program Development process. This process, however, needs to be expanded and supplemented by the addition of at least two activities: First, some type of futures-oriented studies such as those advocated by the World Future Society and John Naisbitt in *Megatrends* are needed. These studies would address both social and technological factors and be specifically tailored to Louisiana since its trends, at times, often run counter to the national ones. Second, a sociological data base of the type compiled nationally by Warner and Christenson is needed just on Louisiana for the previously stated reason. This information base, which would have to be periodically updated, would provide the LCES with the benchmark to
measure changes within the State; it would, therefore, be able to promptly and more accurately anticipate change.

With over a 70-year history, there is no reason to suspect that the LCES will not adapt to the new "information" society just as it adapted to the demands of World Wars, the Depression, recessions, integration, etc. It will choose to shape its own destiny and not have it shaped by others!
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INTERVIEW GUIDE

My name is Clark Forrest and I am doing a study on the history and development of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. Dr. J. H. Jones, my major professor, recently sent you a letter requesting your assistance and briefly outlining the study. As you may recall, the study is divided into two parts—the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service before World War II and the LCES after the War. Because of your knowledge of the LCES, we are interested in having your thoughts on the following areas. Please feel free to make any comments you like. The interview is strictly informal and unstructured.

1. Date _______________________

2. Name of Interviewee __________________________

3. Address ____________________________________

4. Phone Number ________________________________

5. Race _______________________________________

6. Positions (s) held with LCES ___________________

7. Years with LCES ______________________________

8. Employment Status Employed ___ Retired ___

QUESTIONS: (Answers to be tape recorded and notes written)

I. Would you briefly describe your various job duties while with the LCES?

II. What do you feel was your most important accomplishment while employed by the LCES?

III. In regard to social factors, what were the changes which you witnessed?

IV. What economic differences were there between the rural and urban economies that stand out in your mind?

V. How would you describe the response of the administrative structure of the LCES to these changes?
VI. Are there any other items which we should discuss?

VIII. If not, I have one final request. Who else would you recommend that I talk with to obtain similar information as requested here on the LCES?

Thank you very much for your assistance!
Appendix B

Smith-Lever Act
Cooperative Extension work between the land-grant colleges and the USDA is authorized by the Smith-Lever Act. The provisions of the act, in effect as of Oct. 5, 1962, are shown below.

SECTION 1. In order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be continued or inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State, Territory, or possession, now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, the benefits of the Act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, entitled "An Act donating public lands to several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts." and of the Act of Congress approved August thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety, agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture: Provided. That in any State, Territory, or possession in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established, the appropriations hereinafter made to such State, Territory, or possession shall be administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State, Territory, or possession may direct.

SECTION 2. Cooperative agricultural extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics and subjects relating thereto to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in several communities, and imparting information on said subjects through demonstrations, publications, and otherwise for the necessary printing and distribution of information in connection with the foregoing; and this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agricultural college or colleges or Territory or possession receiving the benefits of this Act.

SECTION 3. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

(b) Out of such sums, each State and the Federal Extension shall be entitled to receive annually a sum of money equal to the sums available from Federal cooperative extension funds for the fiscal year 1962 and subject to the same requirements as to furnishing of equivalent sums by the State except that amounts heretofore made available to the Secretary for allotment on the basis of special needs shall continue available for use on the same basis.

(c) Any sums made available by the Congress for further development of cooperative extension work in addition to those referred to in subsection (b) hereof shall be distributed as follows:

1. Four per centum of the sum so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be allotted to the Federal Extension Service for administrative, technical, and other services, and for coordinating the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and possessions.

2. Of the remainder so appropriated for each fiscal year, twenty per centum shall be paid to the several States in equal proportions, forty per centum shall be paid to the several States in the proportion that the rural population of each bears to the total rural population of the several States as determined by the census, and the balance shall be paid to the several States in the proportion that the farm population of each bears to the total farm population of the several States as determined by the census: Provided. That payments out of the additional appropriations for further development of extension work authorized herein may be made subject to the making available of such sums of public funds by the States from non-Federal funds for the maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension work provided for in this Act, as may be provided by the Congress at the time such additional appropriations are made; Provided further. That any appropriation made hereunder shall be allotted in the first and succeeding years on the basis of the decennial census current at the time such appropriation is first made, and as to any increase, on the basis of decennial census current at the time such increase is first appropriated.

(d) The Federal Extension Service shall receive such additional amounts as Congress shall determine for administration, technical and other services and for coordinating the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and possessions.

SECTION 4. On or about the first day of July in each year after the passage of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain as to each State whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for cooperative agricultural extension work under this Act and the amount which it is entitled to receive. Before the funds herein provided shall become available to

*As amended in 1962.
any college for any fiscal year, plans for the work to be carried on under this Act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such sums shall be paid in equal quarterly payments in or about July, October, January, and April of each year to the treasurer or other officer of the State duly authorized by the laws of the State to receive the same, and such officer shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture on or about the first day of January of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year and its disbursement, on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SECTION 5. If any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State for the support and maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension work, as provided in this Act, shall by any action or contingency be diminished or lost or be misapplied, it shall be replaced by said State and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to said State. No portion of said moneys shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or the purchase or rental of land, or in college-course teaching, lectures in college, or any other purpose not specified in this Act. It shall be the duty of said colleges, annually, on or about the first day of January, to make the Governor of the State in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in extension work as defined in this Act, including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures from all sources for this purpose, a copy of which report shall be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture.

SECTION 6. If the Secretary of Agriculture finds that a State is not entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the expiration of the Congress next succeeding a session of the legislature of the State from which funds have been withheld in order that the State may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury.

SECTION 7. Repealed. (Dealt with an annual report to Congress.)

SECTION 8. (a) The Congress finds that there exists special circumstances in certain agricultural areas which cause such areas to be at a disadvantage insofar as agricultural development is concerned, which circumstances include the following: (1) There is concentration of farm families on farms either too small or too unproductive or both; (2) such farm operators because of limited productivity are unable to make adjustments and investments required to establish profitable operations; (3) the productive capacity of the existing farm unit does not permit profitable employment of available labor; (4) because of limited resources, many of the farm families are not able to make full use of current extension programs designed for families operating economic units nor are extension facilities adequate to provide the assistance needed to produce desirable results.

(b) In order to further the purposes of section 2 in such areas and to encourage complementary development essential to the welfare of such areas, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress from time to time shall determine to be necessary, for payments to the States on the basis of special needs in such areas as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) In determining that the area has such special need, the Secretary shall find that it has substantial number of disadvantaged farms or farm families for one or more of the reasons heretofore enumerated. The Secretary shall make provisions for the assistance to be extended to include one or more of the following: (1) Intensive on-the-farm educational assistance to the farm family in appraising and resolving its problems; (2) assistance and counseling to local groups in appraising resources for capability of improvements in agriculture or introduction of industry designed to supplement farm income; (3) cooperation with other agencies and groups in furnishing all possible information as the existing employment opportunities, particularly to farm families having underemployed workers; and (4) in cases where the farm family, after analysis of its opportunities and existing resources, finds it advisable to seek a new farming venture, the providing of information, advice, and counsel in connection with making such change.

(d) No more than 10 per centum of the sums available under this section shall be allotted to any one State. The Secretary shall use project proposals and plans of work submitted by the State Extension directors as a basis for determining the allocation of funds appropriated pursuant to this section.

(e) Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, appropriations otherwise available under this Act. The amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section shall not exceed a sum in any year equal to 10 per centum of sums otherwise appropriated pursuant to this Act.

SECTION 9. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SECTION 10. The term "State" means the States of the Union and Puerto Rico.

Appendix C

State Legislative Acts
LOUISIANA'S FIRST LEGISLATIVE ACT
ENABLING POLICE JURIES TO PARTICIPATE IN
FARMERS' COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION WORK

ACT NO. 69

AN ACT

To authorize the police juries of the several parishes under such regulations as they may prescribe to annually appropriate and use from parish funds limited sums of money in aid of the Farmers' Co-operative Demonstration Work in their respective parishes as is now or hereafter may be conducted by the U. S. Department of Agriculture and to conduct such work in their respective parishes, jointly with the agents and representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture upon certain terms and conditions.

Section 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana, That the police juries of the several parishes of the State, under such regulations as they may prescribe be and are hereby authorized to appropriate and use from parish funds any sum or sums of money not exceeding altogether one thousand dollars per year in aid of the Farmers' Co-operative Demonstration Work in their respective parishes jointly with the agents and representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the several police juries and said agents and representatives.

Section 2. Be it further enacted, etc., That all laws or parts of laws in conflict herewith be and the same are hereby repealed.

L. E. THOMAS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives
THOMAS C. BARRET,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate
Approved: July 5, 1912
L. E. HALL,
Governor of the State of Louisiana
A true copy:
ALVIN E. HEBERT,
Secretary of State
House Concurrent Resolution No. 15

By Mr. Roy of St. Bernard

A resolution giving the State's assent to the Act of Congress of May 8, 1914, entitled "An Act to provide for co-operative agricultural extension work between agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," and authorizing and empowering the Board of Administrators of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to receive the grants of money appropriated under said Act.

Whereas, the Congress of the United States has passed an Act approved by the President, May 8, 1914, entitled "An Act to provide for co-operative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of the Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," and

Whereas, it is provided in Section 3 of the Act aforesaid, that the grants of money authorized by this act shall be paid annually "to each state which shall by action of its Legislature assent to the provisions of this Act;" therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, the Senate concurring, that the assent of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana be and is hereby given to the provisions and requirements of said act, and that the Administrators of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College be and they are hereby authorized and empowered to receive the grants of money appropriated under said act, and to organize and conduct agricultural and extension work which shall be carried on in connection with the college of agriculture of said Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, in accordance with the terms and conditions expressed in the Act of Congress aforesaid.
L. E. THOMAS,
Speaker of the House of Representative
THOMAS C. BARRET,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate
   Approved: June 11, 1914
L. E. HALL,
Governor of the State of Louisiana
   A true copy:
ALVIN E. HEBERT,
Secretary of State.
ACT NO. 15

House Bill No. 13

By Mr. Parent

AN ACT

To amend and re-enact Act No. 69 of the regular Session of the General Assembly of 1912, entitled, "An Act to authorize the police juries of the several parishes under such regulations as they may prescribe to annually appropriate and use from parish funds limited sums of money in aid of the Farmers' Co-operative Demonstration Work in their respective parishes as is now or hereafter may be conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and to conduct such work in their respective parishes, jointly with the agents and representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture upon certain terms and conditions."

Section 1. Be it enacted by the Legislature of Louisiana that the police juries of the several parishes of the State, under such regulations as they may prescribe be and they are hereby authorized to appropriate and use from parish funds any sum or sums of money in aid of the Farmers' Co-operative Demonstration Work in their respective parishes, jointly with the agents and representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the several police juries and said agents and representatives; provided that the appropriation herein above provided for shall not exceed in any year the sum of fifteen hundred dollars.

Section 2. That all laws or parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Approved by the Governor:
July 10, 1922, 11:10 a.m.

A true copy:
JAMES J. BAILEY

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Senate Bill No. 36  By Mr. Johnson

To amend and re-enact Section 25 and 59 of Act No. 100 of the Legislature passed at regular session of year 1922, entitled "An Act to provide a State Board of Education and parish school boards, defining their duties and powers and provided for the administration and supervision of the public schools of Louisiana."

Section 1. Be it enacted by the Legislature of Louisiana, that Sections 25 and 59 of Act 100 of the Legislature of Louisiana passed at regular session of year 1922, entitled "An act to provide a State Board of Education and Parish School Boards, defining their duties and powers and providing for the administration and supervision of the public schools of Louisiana" be and they are hereby amended and re-enacted so as to read as follows:

"Section 25 . . . A parish school board shall have authority to pay all or part of the expenses of special sessions of schools organized and maintained for the benefit of teachers and it may pay all or a part of the salaries and expenses of persons employed in the Extension Service to promote agriculture and other industrial instructions of the benefit of children. . . ."

Approved by the Governor:
June 27, 1924
ACT NO. 246

House Bill No. 317  By Mr. Parent

To amend and re-enact Act No. 69 of the Regular Session of the Legislature of Louisiana of 1912, as amended and re-enacted by Act No. 15 of 1922, entitled "An act to authorize the police juries of the several parishes under such regulations as they may prescribe to annually appropriate and use from parish funds limited sums of money in aid of the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work in their respective parishes as is now or hereafter may be conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture upon certain terms and conditions.

Section 1. Be it enacted by the Legislature of Louisiana, that on a two-thirds vote of its members the police juries of the several parishes of the State, under such regulations as they may prescribe be and they are hereby authorized to appropriate and use from parish funds any sum or sums of money not exceeding twenty-five hundred dollars per year in aid of the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration work in their respective parishes, jointly with the agents and representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the several police juries and said agents and representatives.

Section 2. That all or parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Approved by the Governor:
July 17, 1924

A true copy:
JAMES J. BAILEY
Appendix D

Memorandum of Understanding
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DIVISION OF
THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND

__________________________

THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DIVISION OF THE LOUISIANA
STATE UNIVERSITY AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE and
the (Police Jury or School Board) of ____________ Parish
desire to make available to the people of ________ Parish
the services which are rendered by the Agricultural
Extension Division.

It is desirable to have a definite understanding of the
contributions of each to such a program in ________ Parish
and to agree upon the manner in which such contributions
shall be made. It is, therefore, deemed desirable that the
Memorandum of Understanding be adopted.

IT IS AGREED on the part of the Agricultural Extension
Division of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural
and Mechanical College that they will (Provided suitable
personnel is available):

1. Assign to ________ Parish personnel as follows:

2. Supply this personnel with stationery, mimeograph
paper, envelopes, mimeograph ink, rubber bands,
staples, etc.

3. Supply the parish personnel with bulletins,
circulars and other printed and mimeograph
educational material in such quantities as may be
needed by said personnel insofar as funds will
permit.

4. Maintain at the University an administrative and
specialists staff, primarily for the benefit of the
parish personnel to keep them informed on the latest
research information and to assist them in
developing and carrying forward an agricultural educational program in the parishes.

5. Through the parish personnel and district agents consult with local committees in determining the program (based on local needs) which will be conducted in ________ Parish.

6. Give reports of the progress which is being made to ________________ as often as they may desire.

7. Consult with the ________________ on discharging the personnel assigned to ________ Parish and when making appointments of new personnel.

8. In case of a reduction in State or Federal funds to consult with ________________ before making any reduction in personnel assigned to ________ Parish.

IT IS AGREED on the part of ________________ of ________ Parish:

1. That they will appropriate for the conduct of Extension work a sum agreed upon by the ________ and a representative of the Agricultural Extension Service and pay such appropriation to the personnel assigned to ________ Parish as agreed upon by the ________________ and the Agricultural Extension Service.

2. That they will not increase or decrease this appropriation without conferring with the District Agents or other designated representatives of the State Agricultural Extension office.

3. That they will equip and maintain reasonable office space; furnish parish personnel with a telephone and certain items of equipment for demonstrational purposes as may be agreed upon by the ________ and the District Agents or other official representative of the Agricultural Extension Division.

IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED THAT questions concerning the work which may arise on the part of either party will be mutually agreed upon in conference.
THIS MEMORANDUM EXECUTED THIS THE __________ DAY OF __________ 19.

SIGNED:

DIRECTOR OF EXTENSION       PRESIDENT

Louisiana State University
and
Agricultural and Mechanical College

Division of Agricultural Extension
John A. Cox, Director

In cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture; Distributed in Furtherance of the Acts of Congress of May 8 and June 30, 1914.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
between
THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND 
AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE
and
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
ON COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND 
HOME ECONOMICS

Whereas the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College has under its control Federal and State funds for extension work in agriculture and home economics which are and may be supplemented by funds contributed for similar purposes by counties and other organizations and individuals within said State, and the United States Department of Agriculture has funds appropriated directly to it by Congress which can be spent for extension work in the State of Louisiana.

Therefore, with a view to securing economy and efficiency in the conduct of extension work in the State of Louisiana the president of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, acting subject to the approval of the Board of Supervisors of the said Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, hereby execute the following memorandum of understanding with reference to cooperative relations between said Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College and the United States Department of Agriculture for the organization and conduct of extension work in agriculture and home economics in the State of
I. The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College agrees:

(a) To organize and maintain at said institution a definite and distinct administrative division for the management and conduct of all cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics, with a director selected by the institution and satisfactory to the Department;

(b) To administer through such division thus organized, known as the Agricultural Extension Service, any and all funds it has or may hereafter receive for such work from appropriations made by Congress or the State Legislature, by allotment from its Board of Supervisors or from any other sources;

(c) To accept the responsibility for conducting all educational work in the fields of agriculture and home economics and subjects related thereto as authorized by the Smith-Lever Act as amended and other Acts supporting cooperative extension work, and such phases of other programs of the Department as are primarily educational, which the Department has been authorized to carry on within the State.

II. The United State Department of Agriculture agrees:

(a) To maintain in the Department a Federal Extension Service which under the direction of the Secretary, (1) shall be charged with the administration of the Smith-Lever Act as amended and other Acts supporting cooperative extension work insofar as such administration is vested in the Department; (2) shall have primary responsibility for and leadership in all educational programs under the jurisdiction of the Department (except the graduate school); (3) shall be responsible for coordination of all educational phases of other programs of the Department, except the graduate school; and (4) shall act as the liaison between the Department and officials of the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities on all matters relating to cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics and educational activities relating thereto.

(b) To conduct through the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College all extension work in Agriculture and home economics
and subjects relating thereto authorized by Congress to be carried on within the State except those activities which by mutual agreement it is determined can most appropriately and effectively be carried out directly by the Department.

III. The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College and the United States Department of Agriculture mutually agree:

(a) That, subject to the approval of the President of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College and the Secretary of Agriculture, or their duly appointed representatives, all cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics in the State of Louisiana involving the use of Federal funds shall be planned under the joint supervision of the director of the Agricultural Extension Service of Louisiana and the administrator of the Federal Extension Service; and that approved plans for such cooperative extension work in the State of Louisiana shall be carried out through the Agricultural Extension Service of Louisiana in accordance with the terms of individual project agreements.

(b) That all State and county personnel appointed by the Department as cooperative agents for extension work in agriculture and home economics in the State of Louisiana shall be joint representatives of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College and the United States Department of Agriculture, unless otherwise expressly provided in the project agreement. Such personnel shall be deemed governed by the requirements of Federal Civil Service Rule No. IV relating to political activity.

(c) That the cooperation between the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College and the United States Department of Agriculture shall be plainly set forth in all publications or other printed matter issued and used in connection with said cooperative extension work by either the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College or the United States Department of Agriculture.

(d) That annual plans of work for the use of
Smith-Lever and other funds in support of cooperative extension work shall be made by the Agricultural Extension Service of the State of Louisiana and shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the terms of the Smith-Lever Act as amended or other applicable laws, and when so approved shall be carried out by the Agricultural Extension Service of the said State of Louisiana.

IV. The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College and the United States Department of Agriculture further mutually agree:

(a) That the Department of Agriculture shall make final determination on any proposed supplementary memoranda of understanding or similar documents, including those with other agencies, affecting the conduct of cooperative extension work only after consultation with appropriate designated representatives of the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

(b) That the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College will make arrangements affecting the conduct of cooperative extension work with agencies of the Department, or with other Federal agencies, only through the administrator of the Federal Extension Service, or in accordance with an existing general agreement which has been approved by him.

(c) That all memoranda and similar documents hereafter executed affecting cooperative extension work, whether between agencies of the Department or between State Agricultural Extension Services and agencies of the Department, shall be within the framework of, and consistent with the intent and purpose of, this memorandum of understanding.

(d) That all memoranda and agreements affecting policies in cooperative extension work shall be within the framework of, and consistent with the intent and purposed of, this memorandum of understanding.

V. This memorandum shall take effect when it is approved by the President of the Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and shall remain in force until it is expressly abrogated in writing by either one of the signers or his successor in office. The agreement executed August 3, 1914, shall be deemed abrogated upon the effective date hereof.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE

Date ___________________________  By ______________________________
                      President

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Date ___________________________  By ______________________________
                      Secretary
Appendix E
Chronology
Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service
## Preliminary Chronology
for the
Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>LSU began in Pineville as the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy. [Williamson, p. 3.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>U.S. Congress passed first Morrill Act which established one land-grant college in each state. [Vines and Anderson, p. 3.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>The Bureau of Agriculture of Louisiana, created in 1874, and the Bureau of Immigration in 1866, were superseded in 1880 by the Bureau of Agriculture and Immigration. In 1898 the name became the State Board of Agriculture and Immigration which continued until the Constitution of 1921 when it became the Department of Agriculture and Immigration. In 1966 the name changed to Department of Agriculture. [LSU Library, Card Catalog.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>The Agricultural and Mechanical College was made a part of LSU. [Williamson, pp. 8-24.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898 Summer</td>
<td>Knapp appointed by USDA to be America's first official plant explorer. In Japan, careful inquiry led Knapp to select Kiushu rice as the best suited to needs in Louisiana. [Bailey, pp. 133-134.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Knapp returns to the Orient. [Bailey, pp. 134-135.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902 Summer</td>
<td>Knapp appointed Special Agent for the Promotion of Agriculture in the South. [Bailey, p. 137.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903-04</td>
<td>Funds were tripled for the second year when $7,500 was allocated to what was coming to be known as the Demonstration Farms in the South. [Bailey, p. 140.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903 January</td>
<td>Knapp makes first visit to Terrell, Texas. [Bailey, pp. 150-151.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1903 February  Knapp makes second visit to Terrell. [Bailey, p. 152.]

1903 Feb. 25  The Porter Demonstration Farm agreement was written on the letterhead of the Texas Midland Railroad. [Bailey, p. 152.]

1903 Summer  The Mexican cotton boll weevil caused panic and mass hysteria to spread over Texas. [Bailey, p. 169.]

1904 January  Congress made emergency appropriation available to fight the boll weevil. [Bailey, p. 140.]

1905  Crowley was established as a permanent rice station. [Bailey, p. 142.]

1909  The LSU College of Agriculture was organized. [LSU Catalogue, 1914, pp. 93-98.]

1910  LSU received a special appropriation to do some extension work in agriculture and home economics. [LSU Catalogue, 1918-19, pp. 19-21 and 83-87.]

1912  Louisiana Legislature passed the State's first Act enabling police juries to appropriate funds for the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work--Act No. 69.

1914  Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act which established the Cooperative Extension Service and Louisiana became a participating state via LSU as authorized by Act No. 8, approved June 11, 1914.

1950 June  The LSU Agriculture, Forestry and Extension Building was named for Seaman A. Knapp. [Reveille, June 20, 1950, p. 1.]

1953 Dec. 9  The Knapp Plaque, now in Knapp Hall, was unveiled at the 50th Anniversary of Extension luncheon. [The Daily Reveille, December 10, 1953, p. 1.]

1957 June 14  The present Knapp Hall on Highland Goad was dedicated. [Vertical File, Louisiana Collection, LSU Library.]

1981  The LSU Agricultural Center's Administration Building was occupied.
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Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service:

Roster of State Office Staff
1914

LSU DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

William R. Dodson, AB, BS
Dean, College of Agriculture and
Director of Experiment Station

Edward S. Richardson, BS
Director, Agricultural Extension

W. H. Balis
Assistant, Director

Miss Elizabeth Kelly
Organizer of Girls' Clubs

Miss Ola Powell
Assistant Organizer of Girls' Clubs

This department of the College of Agriculture was organized September 1, 1909. Its purpose was to convey agricultural information to persons not regularly enrolled as students at the University.

1918

LSU EXTENSION DEPARTMENT IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS

W. R. Perkins, Director

While the University had always done some extension work in agriculture and home economics, especially since 1910, when a special appropriation was secured for that purpose, the passage of the Smith-Lever Act of the Federal Congress in 1914 made it possible to organize the department on a much more substantial basis.

The work was organized under the following headings:

FARM DEMONSTRATION WORK

The work of this division was primarily concerned with the adult farmers of the state and in part with the supervision of boys' clubs. There were sixty demonstration agents working in sixty parishes. The supervision of this entire line of work was directly under a State Agent.

J. A. Redhead
C. E. Woolman
L. E. Perrin
W. C. Abbott
Homer E. Case
Miss Elsie F. Link

State Agent
District Agent, North La.
District Agent, South La.
District Agent, West La.
Accountant
Secretary

JUNIOR EXTENSION WORK

This division dealt wholly with the work in agriculture and home economics being carried on by the boys and girls of the state. A superintendent of junior extension had general charge of the work, which was divided into several branches as follows:

A. Boys' Corn Clubs
B. Boys' Pig Clubs
C. Poultry Clubs

had a special agent in charge.
had a state agent and an assistant agent.
had an agent in charge who gave all of his time to the organization and supervision of the work of the poultry clubs.

E. S. Richardson
T. A. Green
W. H. Balis
Floyd W. Spencer
Miss Nina L. Schoonmaker
Miss Lucille L. Gesell

State Agent*
Poultry Club Agent
Specialist in Swine Work
Corn and Cotton Club Agent
Stenographer
Stenographer

*Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
*In the LSU Catalogue for 1917-18, Richardson's title was superintendent.

**HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK**

Girls' clubs had a State agent, an assistant State agent, and two district agent in charge, who devoted their time to the organization and supervision of the girls' work and of the women's work in canning, preserving, etc. There were forty-seven agents, each of whom devoted her time to the work for girls and women in one parish.

- Miss Alice Hickman  
  State Home Demonstration Agent
- Mrs. Laura L. Ihrie  
  Southern District Agent
- Miss Mary Sue Maddock  
  Northern District Agent
- Miss Clyde Mobley  
  Specialist in Home Dem. Work
- Mrs. Virginia Eaton  
  Specialist in Dairy Work
- Miss Margaret M. Park  
  Specialist in Poultry Work
- Miss Norma Overbey  
  Garden Specialist
- Miss Ola Overbey  
  Assistant Garden Specialist
- Miss Nathalie Poirriere  
  Secretary

**HORTICULTURAL DEMONSTRATIONS**

This division was in charge of a superintendent, who devoted one-half of his time to extension work.

- George L. Tiebout  
  Horticulturist
- Boleslaus Szymoniak  
  Associate Horticulturist
- Montfort Hull  
  Assistant Horticulturist
- Miss Norma Overbey  
  Garden Specialist
- Miss Ola Overbey  
  Assistant Garden Specialist
- Miss Adele Escat  
  Stenographer

**PUBLICATIONS AND FARMERS' HOME STUDY CLUB**

A. This division had a specialist in charge as editor, who edited the extension bulletins and directing those who were engaged in the pursuit of a definitely outlined course of reading on topics pertaining to agriculture and home economics.

B. The newspaper service, with one man in charge who devoted his time to the publication of the University Press Bulletin, issued twice a month and distributed primarily among the newspapers of the State. The preparation of material for the newspaper plate service was also in charge of this division. This work comprised the editing of timely articles on agriculture and home economics which was furnished in typed plate form to the newspapers of the state.
LIVESTOCK EXTENSION SERVICE

This division had a superintendent* and five specialists as follows: forage crop,* beef cattle, poultry,* swine and dairy.

All of the agricultural extension workers took a very active part in the parish fairs and in the State Fair. In fact, the demonstration agents and the junior extension workers are responsible for a very large percentage of the exhibits.

J. B. Francioni  
Agent in Swine Husbandry

J. A. Simms  
Beef Cattle Specialist

E. C. Davis  
Specialist in Bee Culture

G. P. Williams  
Sheep Husbandman

Miss Josephine A. Levigne  
Stenography

Dairy Extension Division

C. H. Staples  
Specialist in Dairying

L. P. McCann  
Agent in Dairying

Miss Elise Booth  
Stenographer

*According to the LSU Catalogue for 1917-18, G. E. Nesom was the superintendent prior to his resignation on January 1, 1918 and A. F. Rolf was the poultry husbandman. W. R. Perkins served as the Grain and Forage Crops Specialist from 1915 to 1917 when he became Director of Extension. See Williamson, page 140, for additional information.

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURAL AND HOME ECONOMICS EXTENSION

W. B. Mercier, Director

By agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture all agricultural extension work in the state was conducted by the College of Agriculture, and was organized under the following heads:

Supervisory Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. B. Mercier, BS</td>
<td>Director of Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. W. Spencer, BS</td>
<td>Assistant Director and State Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Ellen LeNoir, BA</td>
<td>State Home Demonstration Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. E. Perrin</td>
<td>Assistant State Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. M. Babin, BS</td>
<td>District Agent, Southeast La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Julia Bowden</td>
<td>District Agent, Southeast La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. W. Davis, BS</td>
<td>District Agent, Northeast La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mary Johnson</td>
<td>District Agent, Northeast La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. Voorhies, BS</td>
<td>District Agent, Southwest La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Gladys Tappan, BS</td>
<td>District Agent, Southwest La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. C. Sanders, BS</td>
<td>District Agent, Northwest La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Tom Bourg, BS</td>
<td>District Agent, Northwest La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. C. Abbott, BS</td>
<td>State Agent in Club Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. L. Burleson, BS</td>
<td>Asst. State Agent in Club Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. W. Wilkinson, MS</td>
<td>State Agent in Negro Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. J. Jordan</td>
<td>Asst. State Agt. in Negro Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer E. Case</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Laura L. Redden</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. K. McHugh</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Alice Hebert, BA</td>
<td>Stenographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Bessie Christy</td>
<td>Stenographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Mae Nesom</td>
<td>Stenographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Mamie Weiners</td>
<td>Stenographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Sue Elissalde</td>
<td>Stenographer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNTY AGENT WORK

There were sixty parish agents employed in Louisiana. They devoted from one-fourth to one-half of their time to club work. The parish agent conducted the farm demonstration work under two general divisions:

First, among farmers who agreed to cultivate a stipulated area in some staple crop and pursue the work
until final results were obtained, according to plans and suggestions of the agent.

Second, personal instruction to farmers with whom he came into contact, through community and field demonstrations, at meetings, and by correspondence. The agent, however, did not render personal service, that is, he did not perform tasks which the farmer is able to do himself. [Emphasis added.]

There were four district agents, each had supervision of the farm demonstration work in approximately one-fourth of the state.

BOYS' CLUB WORK IN CHARGE OF STATE AGENT

Agricultural instruction was given to boys in the rural districts through organized clubs, each of which had a leader and was visited every month by the agent or his assistant. Club charters were issued to clubs that meet certain requirements. The members of the boys' clubs engaged in the raising of corn, cotton, pigs, calves, poultry, and forage crops and in dairying and the production of honey.

HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK

This division had a state agent and four district agents in charge, who devoted their time to supervision of the work of thirty-nine white and eight colored home demonstration agents in as many parishes, and to coordinating the work of these agents with the work of the other members of the Extension Service.

The plan of the work was as follows:

(1) Girls' club work was carried on through a period of four years and consisted of six main lines of activity: poultry work, gardening, dairy work, clothing, household decoration, and food preservation. There were specialists in charge of each of these phases of work. They outlined the work to be presented to the various clubs and planned in a general way the demonstration and exhibits that are given by the field agents.

(2) Women's work consisted of demonstrations and assistance given in the homes or to groups of women on various subjects, such as food conservation, dairy and poultry work, home interiors, food for children, etc. This work was presented by the field agent and was directed by the supervisors and specialists in charge of home demonstration work.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
PUBLICATIONS

This division conducted the following lines of work:

(a) Editorial—all publications and circulars were edited by this office.

(b) Press Service—this work comprised the preparation and editing of timely articles on agriculture and home economics for publication in the newspapers and farm magazines.

Bentley B. Mackay  Agricultural Editor
Miss Marjorie B. Arbour, MA  Asst. Agricultural Editor

SPECIALISTS

Men and women with special training were employed to plan and help the parish agents and home demonstration agents carry on certain lines of work in agriculture and livestock raising and home economics, and in giving demonstrations to groups of farmers and farm women.

Specialists were employed in the following lines of work: swine, dairying, bee culture, poultry, horticulture, field work with sugar cane, foods and nutrition, forestry, clothing, community organization and entomology.

C. B. Gouaux, MS  Sugar Cane Work
E. C. Davis  Bee Culture
W. E. Hinds, PhD  Entomology
G. L. Tiebout, BS  Horticulture
M. Hull  Horticultural Assistant
M. M. LaCroix, BS  Swine
E. W. Neasham, BS  Dairy
Clyde Ingram, MS  Poultry
C. L. Hill, MS  Assistant Poultry
H. S. Moles, BS  Marketing and Inspection
Robert Moore, BS  Forestry
Miss Mary Mims  Organization
Miss Iris Davenport, BS, MA  Clothing

LOCAL AGENTS--FARM DEMONSTRATION WORK WITH NEGROES

The organization for extension work among negroes was similar to that of the whites. It was in charge of the Director of Extension and supervised by a white State Agent and a negro District Agent. Nine negro, or local, parish agents were employed.
HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK WITH NEGROES

Eight negro home demonstration agents were employed, whose duties were similar to those of the white demonstration agents, that is, conducting club work among negro girls and home demonstration work among negro women in the state. Assistance in supervision of this work was given by the white agents.

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURAL AND HOME ECONOMICS EXTENSION

J. W. Bateman, Director

The Agricultural and Home Extension Division was designed to give instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and homemaking to men, women, boys, and girls in all of the sixty-four parishes of Louisiana. Specialists, farm and home demonstration agents, and other members of the Extension Division imparted information to the farm population of the state through field demonstrations, community meetings, and publications.

Supervisory Force

J. W. Bateman, BS, MS  Director of Extension
W. B. Mercier, BS  Director Emeritus and Adviser
F. W. Spencer,* BS, MS  Assistant Director
H. C. Sanders, BS, AM  State Agent
Ellen LeNoir, AB, MS  State Home Demonstration Agent
W. M. Babin, BS, MS  District Agent, Southeast La.
(Miss) Tom Bourg, AB, AM  District Agent, Southeast La.
R. V. St. Dizier, BS, MS  District Agent, South Central
Mary Johnson, AB, AM  District Agent, South Central
F. A. Swann, BS  District Agent, Southwest La.
Margaret Firnberg, BS  District Agent, Southwest La.
S. B. Thornton, BS  District Agent, Northwest La.
Cleo Brasher, AB  District Agent, Northwest La.
C. W. Davis, BS, MS  District Agent, Northeast La.
Nan Tarwater, BS  District Agent, Northeast La.
W. C. Abbott, BS, MS  State Agent in Club Work
W. M. LaCroix, BS, MS  Asst. State Agent in Club Work
Hortense Shearer
McMulian, AB, BS  Librarian, Reference Library
Ella Haden Meyer, AB  Librarian, Bulletin Library
J. K. McHugh  Librarian (Retired)
Laura Redden Reymond  Secretary to the Director
R. B. Howell  Auditor
J. E. Knight  Business Manager

*On leave serving as Administrative Officer in Charge of AAA.

By agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture, all agricultural extension work in the state was conducted by the College of Agriculture, and was organized under the following heads: County Agent work, Boys' and Girls' Club work, and Home Demonstration work.
The county agents were in charge of the boys' work; the girls' club work was part of the home demonstration program.

COUNTY AGENT WORK

There were sixty-four parish agents, twenty-four assistant agents, and twelve Negro men agents employed in Louisiana. They devoted from one-fourth to one-half of their time to club work. The parish agent conducted the farm demonstration work under two general divisions:

1. Among farmers who agreed to adopt a farm program that would (a) insure an adequate supply of food and feed for the farm; (b) supply the necessary cash income to meet the needs of the farm; (c) maintain the fertility of the farm and protect the soil from depletion through erosion and improper cropping systems.

2. Personal instruction to farmers with whom the agent came in contact through community and field demonstrations, at meetings, and by correspondence. The agent was not expected to perform tasks which the farmer was able to do himself. [Emphasis added.]

There were five district agents, each having supervision of the farm demonstration work in approximately thirteen parishes.

BOYS' CLUB WORK

Agricultural instruction was given to boys in the rural districts through organized clubs, each of which had a leader and was visited every month by the agent or his assistant. Club charters were issued to clubs that met certain requirements. The members of the boys' clubs engaged in the raising of corn, cotton, pigs calves, poultry, potatoes, and forage crops, and in dairying and the production of honey.

HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK

The Home Demonstration division maintained a state agent and five district agents who devoted their time to supervising the work of sixty-three white agents, eight assistant home agents, and seven Negro home demonstration agents, and to coordinating the work of these agents with the work of the other members of the Extension Division.

The plan of work was as follows:

1. Girls' club work was carried on through a period of four years and consisted of six main lines of activity:
poultry work, gardening, dairy work, clothing, room improvement, and food preservation. The supervisors outlined the work to be presented to the various clubs and planned in a general way the demonstrations and exhibits given by the field agents.

2. Women's work consisted of demonstrations and assistance given in the homes or to groups of women, on various subjects including food conservation, gardening, dairy and poultry work, home interiors, and food for children. This work was presented by the field agent and directed by the supervisors in charge of home demonstration work.

EDITORIAL WORK AND PUBLICATIONS

The work of the agricultural editors, who have charge of the editorial office of the Agricultural and Home Economics Extension Division, were broadly classified under the following heads:

1. Editorial--the editing and printing of all publications were supervised in this office.

2. Press Service--this work comprised the preparation and editing of timely articles on agriculture and home economics for publication in the daily and weekly newspapers and the farm magazines. Agricultural copy which appeared in the Louisiana Leader was written by the agricultural editors. They also furnished information and trained field agents in preparing and getting out publicity in regard to the results of their work.

B. B. Mackay Agricultural Editor
Marjorie B. Arbour,* AB, AM Associate Agricultural Editor

*Part time

SPECIALISTS

Men and women with special training were employed to plan and furnish subject matter, to help the parish and home demonstration agents in carrying on certain lines of work, and to give demonstrations to groups of farmers and farm women.

Specialists were employed in the following lines of work: swine, dairying, bee culture, poultry, horticulture, forestry, marketing and inspection, agronomy, rural engineering, livestock, rural economics, food preservation, nutrition, home management, visual education, rural sociology, farm management, home gardening and canning,
editorial work, cotton gin work, soil conservation, and farm organization.

Estelle Fournet, BS  Food Preservation
E. C. Davis  Bee Culture
Hazel Bratley, BS, MS  Nutrition
G. L. Tiebout, BS  Horticulture
J. G. Richard, BS, MS  Assistant Horticulturist
Mary Louise Collings, AB, AM  Home Management
E. W. Neasham, BS, MS  Dairying
Bertha Lee Ferguson, BS, MS  Home Gardening
C. L. Hill, BS, MS  Animal Husbandry
H. S. Moles, BS, MS  Supervisor, Marketing and Inspection
A. S. McKean, BS  Forestry
Jordan G. Lee, Sr., BS  Extension Lecturer in Forestry (Retired)
C. J. Hutchinson, BS, MS  Farm Engineering
G. A. Gerdes  Cotton Gin Specialist
R. A. Wasson, BS, MS  Agronomy
M. J. Voorhies, BS, MS  Agricultural Economics
W. T. Cobb, BS, MS  Animal Husbandry
Mary Mims, LLD  Rural Sociology
J. L. Lee, BS  Farm Management
C. B. Roark, BS  Assistant Farm Mgt. Specialist
F. S. Edmiston, BS  Soil Conservation Specialist
Clyde Ingram, BS, MS  Poultry
C. E. Kemmerly, Jr., BS  Farm Organization Specialist
James F. Percy, BS  Assistant Agronomist

FARM AND HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK WITH NEGROES—LOCAL AGENTS

Farm and Home Demonstration work with Negroes was carried on by workers assigned to areas formed by the grouping of parishes. In parishes sparsely settled with Negroes, the work was done by the white agents. The Negro workers, known as local agents, work through local organizations which select project leaders and demonstrators. The responsibility for carrying on work in each community rested with the selected leaders. The local agents visited each community at stated intervals and attended group demonstrations. In this way thirty-two parishes were reached by nineteen local agents. The 4-H club work was carried on through community organizations under the direction of the State Club Leader (Negro), T. J. Jordan, who assisted with the general activities of the local agents. All of the workers were under the immediate supervision of the district agents (white).

Local community leaders were frequently brought
together at convenient places where the specialists of the Agricultural Extension Division held training schools. In this way the services of the Extension Division was not only extended to several hundred local leaders, but local leaders in turn gave this information to the organizations in their respective communities.

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURAL AND HOME ECONOMICS EXTENSION

H. C. Sanders, Director

The Agricultural and Home Economics Extension Service was designed to give to farm people the best information available on agriculture and homemaking. The work was carried on throughout the state with county and home demonstration agents, associates and assistants located in the parishes, supported by a force of specialists and supervisors with headquarters at the College.

By agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, all agricultural and home economics extension work in the state was conducted through the College of Agriculture. The agents developed in the parishes a united extension program; but, for convenience of discussion, the work was divided into county agent work, home demonstration work, and 4-H Club work.

The basis of all agricultural and home economics extension work was teaching by demonstrations; that is, farm men and women were led to use improved practices as demonstrations for themselves and their neighbors. The results of these demonstrations, the results of research, and the experiences of food farmers and homemakers were the sources of the information that agricultural and home economics extension workers dispensed through meetings, the press, the radio, and other media.

The University sponsored Farm and Home Week on its campus each summer.

Administration and Supervisory Staff

H. C. Sanders, BS, MS  Director of Extension
J. G. Richard, BS, MS  Assistant Director and State Agent
Ellen LeNoir, BS, MS  State Home Demonstration Agent
W. M. Babin, BS, MS  Assistant State Agent and Manager of University Livestock Shows
C. E. Kemmerly, BS, MS  District Agent, Southeast La.
Mary Johnson, BS, MA  District Agent, Southeast La.
F. A. Swann, BS  District Agent, Southwest La.
Miss Tom Bourg, BA, MA  District Agent, Southwest La.
Claude W. Davis, BS, MS  District Agent, Northwest La.
Nan Tarwater, BS, MS  District Agent, Northwest La.
J. L. Lee, BS  District Agent, Northeast La.
Gladys Tappan, BS, MS  District Agent, Northeast La.
COUNTY AGENT WORK

There were 64 county agents and 57 assistant and associate county agents in Louisiana. These agents worked primarily with farm men and boys and were supervised by four men district agents. Thirty-two subject-matter specialists kept the agents up-to-date on subject-matter information and assisted them in organizing and executing their programs. The programs developed by the agents varied from parish to parish but in all cases were designed to meet local needs.

Specialists

W. C. Abbott, BS, MS State Club Agent
Marjorie B. Arbour, BS, MA Editor
Margaret Brumby, BS, MA Clothing Specialist
G. L. Burleson, BS, MS Program Analyst
Mary D. Bridges, BA, BSLS Librarian
W. T. Cobb, BS, MS Animal Husbandman
Esther Cooley, BA, MS Marketing Specialist in Consumer Education
John A. Cox, BS, MS Horticulturist
Bertha Lee Ferguson, BS, MS Home Gardening Specialist
Estelle Fournet, BS, MS Food Preservation Specialist
J. B. Garrett, BS Entomologist (Retired)
C. L. Hill, BS, MS Animal Husbandman
C. J. Hutchinson, BS, MS Agricultural Engineer
Clyde Ingram, BS, MS Poultry Specialist
A. S. McKean, BS, MS Forester
Bentley Mackay Information Specialist for Livestock Shows
Mary Mims, LLD Rural Sociologist
E. W. Neasham, BS, MS Dairy Specialist
J. W. O'Quin, BS, MS Organization Specialist for Older Youth
G. L. Tiebout, BS Horticulturist (Retired)
R. A. Wasson, BS, MS Agronomist
HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK

There were 64 home demonstration agents and 41 assistant and associate agents employed to work primarily with farm women. These agents were supervised by a state home demonstration agent and four women district agents. Twelve subject-matter specialists kept the agents up-to-date on subject-matter information and assisted them in organizing and executing their programs. The programs developed by the agents varied from parish to parish, but in
all cases were designed to meet local needs.

The work with farm women was organized by communities through home demonstration clubs. These clubs met regularly for ten months of the year with a definite program for each meeting. There was a membership of 27,497 in these clubs at the end of 1948.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' WORK

Work with farm boys and girls was done through 4-H Clubs, usually organized in and around a public school. The clubs met monthly during the school year according to a prearranged schedule. In 1948 there was 1,211 organized clubs with a membership of 60,932.

An effort was made to have for each organized club a local leader, who assists the boys and girls in the absence of agents. In 1948, 3,330 adult local leaders assisted with 4-H Club work in Louisiana.

In parishes with assistant agents, the assistants carried on most of the work with the boys and girls under the supervision of the agents. In all other parishes, the county and home demonstration agents carried on 4-H Club work as a part of their regular program.

Summer camps were held for the further training of these young people and for recreation. Parish achievement days were held in most of the parishes, at which boys and girls competed as individuals and teams for the privilege of representing the parish in state contests. A junior short course or state contest was held at the University each summer. At this state contest boys and girls were selected to represent the state at all functions held outside the state for their benefit, including the National 4-H Camp, the National Club Congress, and other events sponsored by co-operating organizations.

THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

H. C. Sanders, Director

Other than shortening the name from Agricultural and Home Economics Extension Service to the Agricultural Extension Service, the introductory information for 1958 was the same as in 1948.

Administration and Supervisory Staff

H. C. Sanders, MA  Director of Extension
J. G. Richard, MS  Assistant Director and State Agent
Ellen LeNoir, MA  State Home Demonstration Agent
W. M. Babin, MS  Assistant State Agent and Manager of University Livestock Shows
Claude W. Davis, MS  Assistant State Agent and Professor of Agricultural Extension Education (Retired)
J. M. O'Quin, MS  Assistant State Agent and Professor of Agricultural Extension Education
G. L. Burleson, MS  Program Analyst (Retired)
Edgar J. Boone, MS  Assistant Program Analyst
C. E. Kemmerly, MS  Assistant State Agent
R. V. St. Dizier, MS  District Agent, Southwest La. (Retired)
Mrs. Rogenia Trotter, MS  District Agent, Southwest La.
E. R. McCrory, MS  District Agent, Southwest La.
Mrs. Valmae Robertson, BA  District Agent, Southeast La.
Joseph Lamendola, MS  District Agent, Southeast La.
Nan Tarwater, MS  District Agent, Northwest La.
J. L. Lee, BS  District Agent, Northwest La.
Gladys Tappan, MS  District Agent, Northeast La. (Retired)
Mrs. Ada Hanchey, BS  District Agent, Northeast La.
Norvel E. Thames, MS  District Agent, Northeast La. (On leave)
D. L. Bornman, Jr., BS  Acting District Agent, Northeast, La.
J. E. Knight  Assistant to the Director
Neal Dry, BS  Assistant to the Director
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Negro Extension Work

R. J. Courtney, MPA  Assistant State Agent for Work with Negroes
M. A. Edmond, BS  Assistant State Club Agent for Work with Negroes
T. J. Jordan, BS  Assistant State Agent for Work with Negroes
Mrs. Amelia J. Lewis, MEd  Assistant State Home Demonstration Agent for Work with Negroes
Ashford O. Williams, MEd  Assistant State Club Agent for Work with Negroes

COUNTY AGENT WORK

There were sixty-four county agents and ninety-three associate and assistant county agents employed in Louisiana. These agents worked primarily with farm men and boys and were supervised by four men district agents. Forty subject-matter specialists kept the agents up-to-date on subject-matter information and assisted them in organizing and executing their programs. The programs developed by the agents varied from parish to parish but in all cases were designed to meet local needs.

Specialists

W. C. Abbott, MS  State Club Agent (Retired)
Mrs. Florence S. Abington, MA  Specialist in Family Life and Health
Marjorie B. Arbour, MA  Editor
Claude M. Brooks, BA  Librarian
Margaret Brumby, MA  Clothing Specialist
Kirby L. Cockerham, MS  Extension Entomologist
Esther Cooley, MS  Consumer Education Specialist
John A. Cox, MS  Horticulturist
W. D. Curtis, MS  Extension Economist
Bertha Lee Ferguson, MS  Home Gardening Specialist (Retired)
Estelle Fournet, MS  Food Preservation Specialist
J. B. Garrett, BS  Entomologist (Retired)
Reid M. Grisby, DPA  Marketing Specialist
C. L. Hill, MS  Animal Husbandman
Mrs. Jessie Mae Hill, MS  Specialist in House Furnishings
Clyde Ingram, MS  Poultry Specialist
M. M. LaCroix, MS  Training Specialist
A. S. McKean, MS  Forester
Bentley Mackay  Information Specialist for Livestock Shows
Mary Mims, LLD  Extension Sociologist Emeritus
William E. Monroe, MS  Agronomist, Pastures
E. W. Neasham, MS  Dairy Specialist (Marketing and Manufacturing)
A. P. Parham, MS  Animal Husbandman
W. J. Peevy, PhD  Agronomist (Part-time)
Rupert Perry, MA  Home Management
R. A. Wasson, MS  Agronomist

Associate Specialists

Howard W. Anderson, MS  Assoc. Extension Dairyman
Tom Bourg, MA  Assoc. Extension Editor
Mrs. Bertha Bryson, MS  Assoc. Housing Specialist
R. C. Calloway, BS  Assoc. Dairy Specialist
I. W. Carson, BS  Assoc. Agronomist in Cotton
A. D. Fitzgerald, MS  Assoc. Animal Husbandman
Mrs. Celia Hissong, MS  Assoc. Home Management Specialist
Stella Jones  Assoc. Poultry Specialist
Allen G. Killgore, MS  Assoc. Agronomist
Gordon Loudon, BA  Assoc. Extension Editor (Radio)
H. E. McFatter, BS  Assoc. Animal Husbandman
Nolan Matherne, MS  Assoc. Extension Dairyman
T. H. Milliken, BS  Assoc. Agronomist
Joseph Montelaro, MS  Assoc. Horticulturist
A. C. Moreau, BS  Assoc. Extension Horticulturist (Part-time)
A. V. Patterson, Jr., BS  Assoc. Editor (Visual Aids)
Lynn Pesson, MED  Assoc. State Club Agent
Charles W. Price, BA  Assoc. Editor
Fae Roark, MS  Assoc. Clothing Specialist
Wayne Robichaux, MS  Assoc. Extension Sociologist (Recreation)
Charles E. Severance, BS  Assoc. Agricultural Engineer (On leave)
Donald H. Spurlock, MS  Assoc. Extension Horticulturist

Assistant Specialist

Charles W. Alsbrooks, BS  Asst. Marketing Specialist in Livestock Marketing
Lorraine Boss, BA  Asst. Extension Editor
L. A. Carville, BS  Asst. Farm Management Specialist
Winona Chauffe, BS  Asst. Home Garden Specialist
Woody Dry, BS  Asst. Extension Entomologist
E. W. Gassie, BS  Asst. State Club Agent
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HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK

There were sixty-four home demonstration agents and fifty-six associate and assistant agents employed to work primarily with farm women and girls. These agents were supervised by a state home demonstration agent and four women district agents. Thirteen subject-matter specialists kept the agents up-to-date on subject-matter information and assisted them in organizing and executing their programs. The programs developed by the agents varied from parish to parish, but in all cases were designed to meet local needs.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' WORK

Work with farm boys and girls was done through 4-H Clubs, usually organized in and around a public school. The clubs meet monthly during the school year according to a prearranged schedule. In 1955 there were 1,466 organized clubs with a membership of 79,978.

An effort was made to have for each organized club a local leader, who assisted the boys and girls in the absence of agents. In 1955, 5,416 adult local leaders assisted with 4-H Club work in Louisiana.

In parishes with assistant agents, the assistants carry on most of the work with the boys and girls under the supervision of the agents. In all other parishes, the county and home demonstration agents carried on 4-H Club work as a part of their regular program.

Summer camps were held for the further training of these young people and for recreation. Parish achievement days were held in most of the parishes, at which time boys and girls competed as individuals and teams for the privilege of representing the parish in state contests. A junior short course or state contest is held at the university each summer. At this state contest boys and girls were selected to represent the state at all functions held outside the state for their benefit, including the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
National 4-H Camp, the National Club Congress, and other events sponsored by cooperating organizations.

THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

John A. Cox, Director

The Cooperative Extension Service provides the people of Louisiana with current and useful information on the latest findings of agricultural research, on the federal farm programs, on consumer sciences, and on a great variety of related topics. As part of this activity, the Cooperative Extension Service conducts a broadly based, informal educational program which has the state as its campus and as potential students all adults and young people, both rural and urban [Emphasis added.], who can profit by use of Extension information. The goals of this work include encouragement of more efficient farming, better living for rural and urban people, extension of University services and assistance to all parts of the state, growth of local leadership, and development of local resources for improved standards of living and greater employment and educational opportunities.

The Cooperative Extension Service state office staff ranks of extension assistant, assistant specialist, associate specialist, specialist, and project leader correspond to the academic faculty ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor and department head. The parish office ranks of assistant agent, associate agent, agent and parish chairman correspond, in turn, to the ranks of extension assistant, assistant specialist, associate specialist, and specialist.

STATE OFFICE STAFF

John A. Cox, MS
C. E. Kemmerly, Jr., MS
N. E. Thames, MS
R. J. Courtney, MPA
A. G. Killgore, MS
Rupert Perry, MA
C. S. Shirley, MS
Stella Jones
Kellett Hathorn, MS
Ashford O. Williams, MEd

Director of Extension
Associate Director
Assistant Director, Programs
Associate State Agent, Programs
State Agent, Agriculture
State Agent, Home Economics
State Club Agent
Associate State Club Agent
Associate State Club Agent
Assistant State Club Agent
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SPECIALISTS

The subject matter staff, which helps the agents keep up-to-date in their information and assists them in organizing and executing their programs, includes specialists in the fields of agronomy, animal husbandry, clothing, consumer education, dairying, economics, agricultural engineering, entomology, family life, farm management, forestry, home management, horticulture, house furnishings, housing, marketing and utilization, nutrition, pesticide safety, plant pathology, poultry, recreation, resource development, and rural sociology.

State

Howard W. Anderson, PhD
Jack L. Bagent, PhD
Diane S. Beatty, MS
Claude M. Brooks, BLS
Bertha Bryson, MS
Thomas A. Burch, MS
Emile A. Cancienne, BS
L. A. Carville, MS
Olen D. Curtis, MS
W. D. Curtis, MS
Douglas W. Darden, BA
Rebecca M. Doughty, BS
Neal R. Dry, MS

Specialist, Dairying
Extension Assistant, Agriculture, Entomology
Assistant Specialist
Librarian, Main Library
Specialist, Housing
Associate Specialist, Agronomy
Associate Specialist, Entomology
Associate Specialist, Farm Management
Associate Specialist, Agronomy
Specialist, Economics
Assistant Specialist, Editorial
Assistant Home Demonstration Agent
Specialist, Resource Development
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title (Degree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Flint, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Specialist, Training and Associate Professor of Cooperative Extension Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. Fitzgerald, MS</td>
<td>Specialist, Animal Husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Rodney Foil, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Specialist, Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward W. Gassie, PhD</td>
<td>Specialist, Training, and Associate Professor of Cooperative Extension Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy D. Goodwin, PhD</td>
<td>Associate specialist Specialist, Dairying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck Green, PhD</td>
<td>Specialist, Marketing Assistant Specialist, Home Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid M. Grigsby, DPA</td>
<td>Assistant Specialist, Agricultural Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verna A. Guillory, BS</td>
<td>Associate Specialist, Clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William A Hadden, BS</td>
<td>Extension Assistant, Agriculture, Entomology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry E. Hathaway, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Home Demonstration Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis C. Hill, MS</td>
<td>Program Analyst and Professor of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celia Hissong, MS</td>
<td>Associate Specialist, Dairying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Jane Hodgkins, MS</td>
<td>Associate Specialist, Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Impson, MS</td>
<td>Assistant Specialist Specialist, Agronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley B. Johnson, BS</td>
<td>Associate Specialist, Agronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Jones, Jr., PhD</td>
<td>Specialist, Family Life and Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby L. Kilpatrick, MS</td>
<td>Specialist, Agronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth A. Koch, MS</td>
<td>Specialist, Livestock Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John L. Leinhardt, BA</td>
<td>Specialist, Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver T. Loupe, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Specialist, Animal Husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganata N. Lovell, MS</td>
<td>Assistant Specialist, Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell L. McCormick, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Specialist, Civil Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. E. McFatter, MS</td>
<td>Specialist, Dairying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. S. McRean, MF</td>
<td>Specialization, Assistant Specialist,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin O. McKerley, MS</td>
<td>Animal Husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddythe A. McLean, BS</td>
<td>Assistant Specialist, Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip H. Massey, BA</td>
<td>Assistant Specialist, Agronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan Matherne, PhD</td>
<td>Specialist, Agronomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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W. A. Meadows, PhD
William E. Monroe, MS
Joseph Montelaro, MS
A. C. Moreau, MS
Ralph E. Motsinger, PhD
Steven S. Nicholson, DVM
Neil G. Odenwald, MS
A. P. Parham, MS
A. V. Patterson, Jr., MS
Lynn L. Pesson, PhD
Charles W. Pope, PhD
Charles W. Price, MA
Fae Roark, MS
Wayne Robichaux, PhD
Georgia Sanders, MS
Clyde J. St. Clergy, PhD
Jessie Mae H. Schneider, MS
Charles E. Severance, MS
Joseph L. Smilie, MS
Dennis R. Stipe, MS
John S Sullivan, Jr., PhD
Alice T. Teddlie, MS
Frances B. Thompson, DFA
N. Ruth Thompson, BS
Helen K. Tomb, MS
Irene Turner, MS
James S. Tynes, PhD
Bunnie W. Wascom, MS
Associate Specialist, Horticulture
Specialist, Agronomy
Specialist, Horticulture
Specialist, Horticulture
Specialist, Plant Pathology
Associate Specialist, Veterinary
Associate Specialist, Horticulture (On Leave)
Associate Specialist, Animal Husbandry
Specialist, Editorial
Specialist, Training, and Professor of Agricultural Education (On Leave)
Specialist, Poultry Marketing
Specialist, Editor
Specialist, Clothing
Specialist, Recreation
Assistant Program Specialist, Home Economics
Specialist, Farm Management
Specialist, House Furnishings (On Leave)
Specialist, Agricultural Engineering
Specialist, Agricultural Engineering (On Leave)
Associate Specialist, Agricultural Engineering
Associate Specialist, Performance Testing
Associate Specialist, Family Life
Editorial Artist
Assistant Specialist, Editorial Artist
Associate Specialist, Nutrition
Specialist, Nutrition
Associate Specialist, Entomology
Extension Assistant, Horticulture
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Elizabeth Williams, MS</td>
<td>Specialist, Consumer Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrol Wilson, PhD</td>
<td>Specialist, Animal Husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William C. Welch, BS</td>
<td>Extension Assistant, Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Bornman, Jr., MS</td>
<td>District Agent, Southeastern Louisiana District Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Brown, MS</td>
<td>Specialist, Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John P. Duke, MS</td>
<td>Extension Assistant, District Program Specialist--4-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada Hanchey, MS</td>
<td>District Program Specialist, Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. E. Hodgkins, MS</td>
<td>Associate District Program Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lamendola, MS</td>
<td>District Program Specialist, Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. R. McCrory, MS</td>
<td>District Agent, Central-Southwestern District Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude J. Naquin, PhD</td>
<td>Specialist, 4-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valmae Robertson, MS</td>
<td>District Program Specialist, Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. C. Smith, MS</td>
<td>District Agent, Northern District Program Specialist, Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogenia Trotter, Ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** LSU Catalogue, 1968-69, pp. 52, 53, 90, 91, 396-403.
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COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

State Office Staff

H. W. ANDERSON, Division Leader (Animal Science). Ph.D., LSU.
JAMES C. ARCHIE, Associate Specialist (Animal Science); Manager, Livestock Shows, Southern University. M.S., Southern University.
CATHERINE L. ARNOLD, Associate Specialist (Editorial). M.A., LSU.
JACK L. BAGENT, Division Leader (Environmental Protection and Management). Ph.D., LSU.
FRED E. BAKER, Associate Specialist (Agricultural Engineering). M.S., LSU.
JAMES F. BEATTY, Associate Specialist (Records, Branding, Management). Ph.D., LSU.
THOMAS C. BOYD, Associate Specialist (Editorial, Civil Defense). M.A., LSU.
THOMAS A. BURCH, Specialist (Agronomy). Ph.D., LSU.
EMILE A. CANGIENNE, Specialist (Entomology). M.S., LSU.
JAMES M. CANNON, Associate Specialist (Horticulture). Ph.D., LSU.
BONNIE C. CARTER, Assistant Specialist (Family Resource Management). M.S., LSU.
RANDALL B. CARVER, Associate Specialist (Plant Pathology). Ph.D., LSU.
L. A. CARVILLE, Specialist (Farm Management). M.S., LSU.
DANIEL L. CASSENS, Assistant Specialist (Forestry). Ph.D., University of Wisconsin.
BENNETE L. COX, Assistant State Club Agent. Ed.D., LSU.
JOHN A. COX, Director; Cooperative Extension Service. M.S., LSU.
OLEN D. CURTIS, Specialist (Agronomy). Ph.D., LSU.
ELSIE J. CYRUS, Assistant Specialist (Home Economics). M.S., Southern University.
FRANCES W. DAIGLE, Associate Specialist (Consumer Education). M.S., LSU.
DOUGLAS L. DEASON, Associate Specialist (Agricultural Engineering). Ph.D., Purdue University.
LAWRENCE W. de la BRETONNE, Jr., Extension Assistant (Sea Grant). M.S., LSU.
SANFORD B. DOOLEY, Assistant Specialist (Resource Development). Ph.D., Purdue University.
JOHN P. DUKE, Associate Specialist (Extension Education). Ed.D., LSU.
HELEN O. EDWARDS, Assistant Specialist (Communications). M.S., Columbia University.
BRUCE FLINT, Specialist (Extension Education). Ph.D., University of Wisconsin.
JAMES F. FOWLER, Associate Specialist (Entomology). Ph.D., LSU.
ARLENE M. FULTON, Extension Assistant (Family Life). M.S., University of Wisconsin—Stout.
WILEY M. FUTRELL, Assistant Specialist (Editorial). M.S., LSU.
EDWARD W. GASSIE, Specialist (Extension Education): Professor; Head, Department of Extension and International Education. Ph.D., LSU.
DORWAYNE GLOVER, Jr., Associate Specialist (Pest Management). M.S., Mississippi State University.
WILLIAM A. HADDEN, Specialist (Agricultural Engineering). M.S., LSU.
HARRY E. HATHAWAY, Specialist (Poultry). Ph.D., LSU.
KELLETT HATHORN, State Club Agent. M.S., University of Wisconsin.
V. H. HEBERT, Associate Specialist (Editorial). M.S., LSU.
LEWIS C. HILL, Specialist (Agronomy). M.S., LSU.
BETTY J. HODGKINS, State Agent (Home Economics). Ph.D., Florida State University.
TEDDY R. HOLMES, Specialist (Editor). M.S., LSU.
JOHN W. IMPSON, Assistant Specialist (Pesticide Safety). Ph.D., LSU.
J. H. JONES, Jr., Program Analyst; Professor, Department of Extension and International Education. Ph.D., University of Kentucky.
C. W. KENNEDY, State Agent; Manager of Livestock Shows. M.S., LSU.
BOBBY L. KILPATRICK, Specialist (Dairy). M.S., LSU.
SARA B. LINDER, Associate Specialist (Nutrition). M.S., University of Tennessee.
DENVER T. LOUE, Division Leader (Plant Sciences). Ph.D., LSU.
ALDEN MAIN, Associate Specialist (Forestry). Ph.D., Auburn University.
PHILLIP H. MASSEY, Associate Specialist (Editorial). M.A., LSU.
LOWELL L. McCOMICK, Specialist (Agronomy). Ph.D., Auburn University.
E. R. McCROY, District Agent (Central Southwestern District). M.S., LSU.
BOBBIE L. McFATTER, Extension Assistant (Clothing). M.S., LSU.
H. E. McFATTER, Specialist (Animal Science). M.S., LSU.
CALVIN O. MCKERLEY, Specialist (Animal Science). M.S., LSU.
EDYTHE A. MCLEAN, Associate Specialist (Editorial). M.A., LSU.
W. A. MEADOWS, Specialist (Horticulture). Ph.D., LSU.
WILLIAM E. MONROE, Specialist (Agronomy). M.S., LSU.
JOSEPH MONTELARO, Specialist (Horticulture). M.S., LSU.
DONNA E. MONTGOMERY, Associate Specialist (Nutrition). M.S., LSU.
MICHAEL W. MOODY, Assistant Specialist (Food Technology). Ph.D., LSU.
VICTOR B. MURRAY, District Agent (Southeastern District). M.S., LSU.
CLAUDE J. NAQUIN, Associate State Agent (4-H). Ph.D., LSU.
STEVEN S. NICHOLSON, Specialist (Veterinary Science). D.V.M., Texas A&M University.
MERRIBEL J. OTTENHOUSE, Specialist (Marketing). M.S., Texas Woman's University.
SARA B. LINDER, Assistant Specialist (Nutrition). Ph.D., LSU.
RUTH M. PATRICK, Assistant Specialist (Nutrition). Ph.D., LSU.
ARTHUR V. PATTERSON, Jr., Specialist (Editor). M.S., LSU.
MARGARET M. PEAVY, Assistant Specialist (Housing, House Furnishings). M.S., LSU.
RUSSELL R. PERRY, Jr., Head, Management Services. B.S., LSU.
CHARLES W. POPE, Specialist (Animal Nutrition). Ph.D., Michigan State University.
THOMAS E. POPE, Specialist (Horticulture). Ph.D., Ohio State University.
E. EARL PULS, JR., Assistant Specialist (Horticulture). Ph.D., University of Missouri.
NORMA G. ROBERTS, Associate State 4-H Club Agent. M.S., LSU.
WAYNE ROBICHAUX, Specialist (Recreation). Ph.D., LSU.
CLYDE J. ST. CLERGY, Division Leader (Economics and Resource Development). Ph.D., LSU.
GEORGIA SANDERS, Specialist (4-H). M.S., Kansas State University.
CHARLES W. SCHERER, Associate Specialist (Animal Science). Ph.D., University of Kentucky.
BARBARA D. SCHILDE, Associate Specialist (Pesticide Safety). M.S., LSU.
C. S. SHRLEY, State Club Agent. M.S., LSU.
JOSEPH L. SMILE, Specialist (Agricultural Engineering). M.S., LSU.
A. C. SMITH, District Agent (Northern District). M.S., LSU.
ROBERT H. SOLEAU, Associate Specialist (Rural Sociology). Ph.D., LSU.
DONALD H. SPURLOCK, Assistant Director (Business, Fiscal, and Personnel). M.S., LSU.
JOHN S. SULLIVAN, JR., Specialist (Animal Science). Ph.D., LSU.
NORVEL E. THAMES, Associate Director, Cooperative Extension Service. M.S., Cornell University.
MAUDE T. THEVENOT, Associate Specialist (EFNEP Coordinator). M.S., LSU.
N. RUTH THOMPSON, Associate Specialist (Editorial Artist). M.A., LSU.
MARY W. THRASHER, Assistant Specialist (Editorial Artist). M.F.A., Oklahoma State University.
ROGENIA G. TROTTER, Specialist (Housing, House Furnishings). M.S., Kansas State University.
IRENE TURNER, Specialist (Nutrition). M.S., LSU.
JAMES S. TYNES, Specialist (Entomology). Ph.D., Mississippi State University.
SATISH VERMA, Associate Specialist (Extension Education). Associate Professor, Department of Extension and International Education. Ed.D., LSU.
WILLIAM H. WATERS, Specialist (Dairying). Ph.D., LSU.
KENNETH N. WEGENHOFT, Assistant Specialist (Farm Management). Ph.D., Oklahoma State University.
HARRY K. WHITAM, Assistant Specialist (Plant Pathology). Ph.D., LSU.
LEODREY WILLIAMS, Associate Specialist (Agriculture). Ed.D., LSU.
CARROL WILSON, Specialist (Animal Science). Ph.D., LSU.
BETTY D. WOOD, Associate Specialist (Homemaker Council Coordinator). M.S., LSU.

*Also listed as member of instructional faculty.

## 1986

**LOUISIANA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE PERSONNEL**

(Unless otherwise shown, office address is: Knepp Hall, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge)

(Mailing address: Knepp Hall, Louisiana State University, University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803)

### ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Denver T. Loupe, Vice-Chancellor and Director</td>
<td>504/388-6065</td>
<td>102F Center Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bruce Flint, Associate Director</td>
<td>504/388-2391</td>
<td>102E Center Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. L. L. McCormick, Associate Director (Programs)</td>
<td>504/388-2487</td>
<td>102M Center Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIELD OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Office Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kermit J. Coulon, District Agent (Cane Belt Area)</td>
<td>504/582-2340, 582-2300</td>
<td>Box 64, Courthouse, Convent, LA 70723</td>
<td>504/222-6449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. Darland, Assistant District Agent (Southwest Area)</td>
<td>318/783-3493</td>
<td>P.O. Box 487, Crowley, LA 70527</td>
<td>318/733-3493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby H. Pascual, Associate District Agent (Metropolitan Area)</td>
<td>504/893-6449</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2440, Covington, LA 70434</td>
<td>504/893-6449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David L. Jones, District Agent (Red River Area)</td>
<td>318/797-1138 or Room 144, Bronson Hall, LSU, 8315 Youree Drive, Shreveport, LA 71115</td>
<td>318/797-1137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Stanley J. Lemondola, Associate District Agent (Eastern Area)</td>
<td>504/222-6498</td>
<td>P.O. Box 147, Greensburg, LA 70461</td>
<td>504/222-6498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C. A. Miller, District Agent (Acadiana Area)</td>
<td>318/389-4442</td>
<td>Box 106, Courthouse Bldg, Basement, New Iberia, LA 70561</td>
<td>318/389-4442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Donna M. Moore, Assistant District Agent (North Central Area)</td>
<td>318/644-5885</td>
<td>Route 1, Box S, Calhoun, LA 71225</td>
<td>318/644-5885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Leland C. Scoggin, Associate District Agent (Centra Area)</td>
<td>318/443-0322</td>
<td>P.O. Box 3727 Government Street, Suite 105, Alexandria, LA 71302</td>
<td>318/443-0322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DIVISION (STATE) LEADERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Office Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jack L. Baggett, Division Leader (Environmental Science)</td>
<td>504/388-2182</td>
<td>202L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Thomas A. Burch, Division Leader (Plant Science)</td>
<td>504/388-2186</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert B. M. Futrell, Division Leader (Communications)</td>
<td>504/388-2263</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Boddie B. McFatter, Division Leader (Home Economics)</td>
<td>504/388-6794</td>
<td>102E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C. J. Naquin, State Agent (4-H and other youth)</td>
<td>504/388-2196</td>
<td>102E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Clyde J. St. Clergy, Division Leader (Economics &amp; Resource Development)</td>
<td>504/388-2145</td>
<td>102E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. William H. Waters, Division Leader (Animal Science)</td>
<td>504/388-6702</td>
<td>102E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSONNEL AND PROGRAM Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Betty Hodgkins Fairchild, Assistant Director (Personnel &amp; Program Support)</td>
<td>504/388-6929</td>
<td>102H Center Bldg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Planning and Administrative Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Paul Duke, Associate State Agent (Programs &amp; Personnel)</td>
<td>504/388-6902</td>
<td>102H Center Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Satish Verma, Specialist (Program Development)</td>
<td>504/388-6194</td>
<td>102E Center Bldg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research and Program Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. K. Jones, Jr.</td>
<td>504/388-2183</td>
<td>102E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Edward W. Gassie</td>
<td>504/388-2183</td>
<td>102E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist (Extension Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Buck Greene, Assistant Director (Management Operations)</td>
<td>504/388-6007</td>
<td>102H Center Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lorraine Crawford (Bulletin Library &amp; Stockroom)</td>
<td>504/388-6191</td>
<td>102H Center Bldg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUSINESS AND FISCAL AFFAIRS AND CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Larry Stevenson, Head (Fiscal Affairs)</td>
<td>504/388-3177</td>
<td>102A Center Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman J. Sanchez, Analyst, Fiscal</td>
<td>504/388-6335</td>
<td>102A Center Bldg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Also holds academic appointment - See Extension Education Faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION OF ECONOMICS AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT:</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>Dr. Clyde J. St. Clergy, Division Leader</td>
<td>504/388-2145</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gerald G. Gistler, Specialist (Small Farm Program)</td>
<td>504/388-2145</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lawrence E. (Gene) Johnson, Specialist (Marketing -- Rice, Cotton, Soybeans, Livestock, Small Grain, 4-H)</td>
<td>504/388-6081</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill J. Ottenhouse, Specialist (Marketing)</td>
<td>504/388-6081</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kenneth J. Roberts, Specialist (Marine Resource Economics)</td>
<td>504/388-2145</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daniel Ray Robertson, Assistant Specialist (Marketing -- Soybeans, Vegetable, Dairy)</td>
<td>504/388-6081</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Clyde J. St. Clergy, Specialist (Public Affairs and Outreach)</td>
<td>504/388-2145</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kenneth N. Wagenholt, Specialist (Farm Management)</td>
<td>504/388-6081</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Dr. Wayne Robichaux, Specialist (Recreation)</td>
<td>504/388-2266</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sanford B. Dooley, Specialist (Resource Development)</td>
<td>504/388-2266</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Phillip A. Lewis, Associate State Agent (FAPRS -- Part-time)</td>
<td>504/388-4234</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret M. Moore, Associate Specialist (Resource Development &amp; Energy)</td>
<td>504/388-2266</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert R. Soltau, Specialist (Rural Sociology)</td>
<td>504/388-2266</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE:</td>
<td>Dr. Jack L. Bagent, Division Leader</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Energy</td>
<td>Dr. James S. Tynes, Specialist (Energy &amp; Engineering) &amp; Coordinator of Extension Energy Programs</td>
<td>504/388-6733</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Eugene (Gene) Baker, Specialist (Engineering Phase of Housing Program, Environmental Control)</td>
<td>504/388-2229</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joseph D. Bankston, Jr., Specialist (Marine Resource Engineer)</td>
<td>504/388-6733</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Branch, Associate Specialist (Farm Structures, Plans Service, Waste Disposal)</td>
<td>504/388-2229</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Douglas L. Deason, Specialist (Crop Processing &amp; Storage)</td>
<td>504/388-2917</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William A. Hadden, Specialist (Drainage, Irrigation, Land Leveling, Field Machinery -- Rice &amp; Sugarcane, 4-H Petroleum Power Program - Tractor &amp; Small Engine)</td>
<td>504/388-2229</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray V. McNamur, Associate Specialist (Farm Safety &amp; 4-H Automotive Program)</td>
<td>504/388-2229</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl G. Rester, Associate Specialist (Cotton Mechanization &amp; Pesticides)</td>
<td>504/388-2229</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>Dr. James S. Tynes, Specialist (Cotton Pest Management Coordinator, Soybeans, Livestock, Small Grain, 4-H)</td>
<td>504/388-2152</td>
<td>202M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jack L. Bagent, Specialist (IPM Coordinator, Rice, Sweet Potatoes, Structural, Pasture, Forage, Stored Grain, Household)</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jack L. Baldwin, Associate Specialist (Cotton, Grain Sorghum, Corn)</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dale K. Pollat, Specialist (Sugar Cane, Vegetables, Fruits, Ornamental &amp; Lawns, Home Gardens, Beekeeping &amp; Forest Insects)</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Safety</td>
<td>Dr. Mary L. Grodner, Specialist</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture, Wildlife and Sea Grant (Marine Advisory Programs)</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. James F. Fowler, Specialist (Wildlife)</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lawrence W. de la Bretonne, Associate Specialist (Aquaculture)</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gary L. Jensen, Associate Specialist (Aquaculture)</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michael W. Moody, Specialist (Seafood Technology)</td>
<td>504/388-2180</td>
<td>202D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION OF 4-H AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT:</td>
<td>Dr. C. J. Naquin, State Agent (4-H and other youth)</td>
<td>504/388-2196</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita J. Allen, Assistant Specialist (4-H)</td>
<td>504/388-2196</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Georgiana K. Dixon, Specialist (4-H)</td>
<td>504/388-2196</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daniel Fantans, Jr., Specialist (4-H)</td>
<td>504/388-2196</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellett Hathorn, Specialist (4-H)</td>
<td>504/388-2196</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Donald R. Hammett, Assistant Specialist (4-H)</td>
<td>504/388-2196</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Norma O. Roberts, Assistant State Agent (4-H and other youth)</td>
<td>504/388-2196</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Project Leader
1Also holds academic appointment -- See Extension Education Faculty.
2Reports directly to Dr. L. L. McCormick
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of Home Economics:</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bobbie B. McFatter, Division Leader</td>
<td>504/388-6794</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expanded Foods & Nutrition Education Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sara B. (Diane) Linder</td>
<td>Specialist (Coordinator)</td>
<td>504/388-1425</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family Development and Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen S. Bahn</td>
<td>Specialist (Family Resource Management)</td>
<td>504/388-1425</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Carolyn G. Carter</td>
<td>Specialist (Family Resource Management)</td>
<td>504/388-1425</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jerry C. Cochran</td>
<td>Specialist (Family Life)</td>
<td>504/388-6915</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Francs W. (Caroline) Daigle</td>
<td>Specialist (Extension Home Maker Council Coordinator/Furnishings)</td>
<td>504/388-3520</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Eloise P. Futrell</td>
<td>Specialist (Family Life)</td>
<td>504/388-3520</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bobbie B. McFatter</td>
<td>Specialist (Family Resource Management)</td>
<td>504/388-6794</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. James H. Rainey</td>
<td>Extension Associate (Housing)</td>
<td>504/388-3520</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Evie Z. Wilson</td>
<td>Extension Associate (Clothing)</td>
<td>504/388-6701</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Betty D. Wood</td>
<td>Specialist (Family Resource Management)</td>
<td>504/388-2781</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Food/Nutrition, Health/Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Peggy Gentry</td>
<td>Assistant Specialist (Nutrition)</td>
<td>504/388-1329</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna E. Montgomery</td>
<td>Specialist (Consumer Education)</td>
<td>504/388-5308</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ruth M. Patrick</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>504/388-6701</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John D. Schubert</td>
<td>Specialist (Health &amp; Safety)</td>
<td>504/388-1425</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sarethe B. Smith</td>
<td>Extension Associate (Nutrition)</td>
<td>504/388-6701</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Elizabeth S. Reames</td>
<td>Associate Specialist</td>
<td>504/388-6701</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Division of Plant Science:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agronomy</td>
<td>Dr. Walter C. Morrison, III</td>
<td>Specialist (Grain &amp; Oilseed Crops, Seed &amp; Soybeans)</td>
<td>504/388-6195</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Thomas A. Burch</td>
<td>Specialist (Cotton)</td>
<td>504/388-2186</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Olen D. Curtis</td>
<td>Specialist (Soil Fertilization, Testing &amp; Conservation)</td>
<td>504/388-1281</td>
<td>128 Sturgis Bldng.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Wade F. Faw</td>
<td>Specialist (Pasture, Forage Crops, Small Grains &amp; Tobacco)</td>
<td>504/388-2118</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Don Fontenot</td>
<td>Assistant Specialist (Sugarcane &amp; Fuel Alcohol)</td>
<td>504/388-2118</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Thomas J. Koske</td>
<td>Associate Specialist (Rice &amp; Grain Sorghum)</td>
<td>504/388-2118</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Earl E. Sanders</td>
<td>Associate Specialist (Weed Science)</td>
<td>504/388-6195</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Dr. Allen C. Main</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>504/388-4087</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Robert H. Miles</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>504/388-4510</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Dr. James M. Cannon</td>
<td>Specialist (Commercial Vegetables and Sweet Potatoes)</td>
<td>504/388-2222</td>
<td>268H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. James E. Courbaut</td>
<td>Assistant Specialist (Commercial Vegetables)</td>
<td>504/388-2222</td>
<td>258M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Thomas J. Koske</td>
<td>Associate Specialist (Vegetables, Home Gardens &amp; Turf)</td>
<td>504/388-2222</td>
<td>258L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. W. A. Meadows,</td>
<td>Specialist (Nursery, Turf &amp; Supt., Burden Research Center)</td>
<td>504/388-2222</td>
<td>268F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Thomas E. Pope</td>
<td>Specialist (Landscape Architecture)</td>
<td>504/388-2222</td>
<td>268F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Elmer E. Pult, Jr.</td>
<td>Specialist (Pomology, Weed Control &amp; Pecans)</td>
<td>504/388-2222</td>
<td>268G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>Dr. Harry Kenneth Whitem</td>
<td>Specialist (Soybeans, Cotton, Fruits, Forestry, Vegetables)</td>
<td>504/388-6195</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Clayton A. Hollier</td>
<td>Associate Specialist (Sugarcane, Grains, Rice, Ornamentals &amp; Pasture)</td>
<td>504/388-6195</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Overstreet</td>
<td>Extension Associate (Hematology)</td>
<td>504/388-2118</td>
<td>220 Harry D. Wilson Bldg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Project Leader*  
**Joint employee with Agricultural Experiment Station**  
*Also holds academic appointment — See Extension Education Faculty.*
### FULL-TIME COOPERATIVE EXTENSION POSITIONS
### AS OF AUGUST 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87 County Agents - 89 Associates and Assistants (4 Women)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Home Economics Agents - 68 Associates and Assistants</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Area Agents (25 men &amp; 7 women)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary -- full-time</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary -- part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Associates (Nutrition)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Associates (State Office) (1 man &amp; 3 women)</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist (86 men &amp; 22 women)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associates (2 men) -- part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Secretarial and Support Staff -- full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Secretarial and Support Staff -- part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Personnel Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary and Custodial Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Both</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- No. Men Agents doing 4-H Club work... 67
- No. Women Agents doing 4-H Club work... 70
- Nutrition Aides II ........................................ 15
- Nutrition Aides I ........................................... 129

### FULL-TIME PERSONNEL
### 1890 EXTENSION PROGRAMS, SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Economist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant County Agents (3 Associate County Agents)(1 County Agent)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Home Economists (2 Associate Home Economists)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Associates (1 Home Economics)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Area Agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Aides (11 Home Economics &amp; 2 Agriculture)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary -- part-time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists -- 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Personnel List, Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, August 1986, pp. 2-5.
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WILLIAM RUFUS DODSON
(1867-1951)

DR. DODSON RITES HELD IN BATON ROUGE

Baton Rouge, (AP)—Funeral services were held here today for Dr. William R. Dodson, 84-year-old former dean of the Louisiana State University College of Agriculture. Dodson died at his home near New Iberia, La., Saturday night.

He is survived by his wife; a daughter, Mrs. C. F. Whatley of Baton Rouge, and three sons, William R., Jr., and Joe, both of New Iberia, and Rogers of Amite.

Dodson was affiliated with LSU from 1894 through 1938, except for a seven-year period as a federal agriculturist.

He was a native of Belton, in Bell County, Tex., and a graduate from the University of Missouri in 1890, and in 1894 from Harvard. He came to LSU as botany instructor. In 1902 he became assistant director of the Agriculture Experiment Station and was named director in 1904. From 1909 until 1928 he was dean of the College of Agriculture.

DONATED LAND

Since his retirement in 1938 he lived near New Iberia, where he had served as secretary-manager of the Association of Commerce. He donated land at New Iberia for the Dodson Elementary School and founded the New Iberia Rotary Club.

He was named superintendent of the New Iberia Livestock Experiment Station in 1929, a federal government position.

He remained there until 1936 when he returned to LSU.

During World War I he served on the National Agricultural Advisory Committee and was in charge of the Federal Food Production Campaign in the south.

Dr. William R. Dodson

The death of Dr. William R. Dodson at New Iberia, at the age of 84, removes another of the group who revitalized agricultural education in Louisiana and laid the groundwork for what is now an immense system of practical experiment and demonstration, rooted in the teaching of boys and girls.

Joining the comparatively new agricultural college at LSU in 1894, Dr. Dodson became one of the first to carry directly to the farmer the lessons of scientific agriculture and to begin the patient task of overcoming those scruples against "book learning" which long persisted. In 1908, as head professor of the college and director of experiment stations, he aided in organizing and outlining study techniques for the state's first boys' corn clubs, under the program originated by Dr. Seaman A. Knapp.

In 1910, under the further influence of Dr. Knapp's farmers' co-operative demonstration work, a federal project, he reinstituted, with completely new ways of teaching, 'the farmers' short course at LSU. Four years later, with initiation of the Smith-Lever program, he added to his responsibilities the direction of the state extension service, and until 1917 labored at organizing the parishes, appointing agents, and incorporating all the elements of the new education--cotton-and corn-growing demonstrations, acreage reduction, rotation, cover crops, terracing, pruning, spraying, home food supplies and 4-H Clubs.

Thereafter he devoted himself to the deanship of the agricultural college and in 1944 rounded out 50 years' service to agriculture—a period in which he saw [—that] changed the whole face and structure of Southern agriculture.

WILLIAM ROBERT PERKINS
(1865-1939)

Prominent Agricultural Leader
Is Death Victim Here Monday

The death of William R. Perkins early Monday removed from the thinning ranks of pioneers in southern agriculture one of the most outstanding personalities and leaders.

A native of Oktibbeha County, Mr. Perkins made his way into prominence and leadership by self-denial and hard work and held his place in the esteem of leaders in agriculture by his well-rounded and up-to-date knowledge of the theoretical and practical agriculture.

With limited preparation, Mr. Perkins entered Mississippi State College in 1888, graduating in 1891. During his three years in college, he had no more than $60.00 in cash. His junior and senior years were financed by small pay from a student job in the chemistry laboratory.

Graduating with a bachelor of science degree in 1891, Mr. Perkins was employed as chemist for the Experiment Station until 1893, when he became agronomist. He was connected with the College as Station Agronomist and Professor of Agronomy until 1910 when he resigned to accept a position with Clemson College, South Carolina.

A practical farmer at heart, Mr. Perkins returned to Mississippi in 1912 to operate a farm. He demonstrated his ability to successfully apply scientific theories to practical operations of a farm, and in 1915 was called to Louisiana State University as Forage Crop Specialist for the Extension Department.

Establishing himself in this position, Mr. Perkins was chosen Director of the Extension Department of Louisiana, a position he held for a number of years.

He came back to Mississippi in 1928 as Assistant Director in charge of the South Mississippi Experiment Station at Poplarville, and in 1930 was made Director of the state system of Agricultural Experiment Stations, and then became vice-director of the Station under the late J. R. Ricks.

At the age of 70, Mr. Perkins retired from active duty, being along with Prof. J. C. Herbert, the first to be placed upon retirement by the College.

He did not cease activity and up until the time of his
death was busy compiling data for a history of the Experiment Station with which he became officially connected six years after its establishment in 1885.

During 48 years of active leadership in agricultural work, Mr. Perkins established a wide reputation as agricultural chemist, agronomist, practical farmer, and as an administrator in Experiment Stations and Extension Divisions.

Men high in agricultural divisions of the college today say he was one of the best informed and most practical agricultural leaders they have ever known. Many of them marveled at the accuracy of the information and the modernity of the ideas that were his at an advanced age.

He maintained a keen interest in affairs, and although of a reticent and retiring nature, he possessed a keen sense of humor that came from a clear insight into human nature.

Never a man to push himself forward, Mr. Perkins was often sought for his advice and counsel, and with clarity and directness his ideas were given honestly and pungently with practical application always shaping his answers to inquiries.

A lover of the outdoors, Mr. Perkins, until failing health prevented, fished and hunted with the zeal and enthusiasm of boyhood days spent on the streams and in the hills of Winston, where his father took up residence after the Civil War.

He was member of the Knights of Pythias, Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity, the Presbyterian church, and a former member of the Starkville Rotary Club.

Funeral services were held from the residence at 4 o'clock Tuesday afternoon, with burial in Odd Fellows Cemetery. Rev. J. C. Frist, pastor of the Presbyterian church, was in charge of final rites.

The esteem in which he was held by Mississippians and members of the Louisiana Extension force was attested to by the messages and florals that poured in Monday and Tuesday.

Mr. Perkins is survived by his wife, Mrs. Evelyn Montgomery Perkins; two daughters, Mrs. Robert Mayes of Memphis and Miss Evelyn Perkins of Baton Rouge, La.; a brother, John B. Perkins of Starkville, and a sister, Mrs. Pickens Watson of Kansas City, Mo.
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WILLIAM BENJAMIN MERCIER
(1868-1939)

William Benjamin Mercier (class of '92) was born September 6, 1868, at Summit, Pike County, Mississippi. Mississippi had not yet recovered from the ravages of the Civil War and the public schools of Copiah County where he received his early training taught mostly primary subjects.

When he entered Mississippi A. & M. College at Starkville in 1888 he found that he was short several high school subjects and so made up these subjects as well as carried the regular freshman schedule. There were 84 in the class but only 22 graduated in 1892. While in college Mr. Mercier acted as student farm manager. During this time a permanent pasture was started which still is considered a model.

He had two years of special student work at the Mississippi Experiment Station under Professor Tracey. This was followed by three years as farm manager of the Louisiana Experiment Station at Baton Rouge.

From 1896 to 1909 Mr. Mercier owned and operated a large farm in Mississippi, practicing general farming and stock raising. He found time to conduct field experiments in cooperation with the Mississippi Experiment Station and to assist with state farmers' institute work for two years.

Because of his general interest in agriculture, Mr. Mercier was appointed county agent in Amite County in 1909, but due to his leadership he was not allowed to remain there. Dr. Seaman A. Knapp—the Father of Extension Work—had been watching his work and later that same year appointed him assistant and agriculturist, Farmers Cooperative Demonstration Work, Washington, D.C. He served in this capacity until 1914, when he was named agricultural field agent, Cooperative Extension Work, in charge of Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee and North Carolina. From 1921 to 1923 he served as assistant chief and agricultural field agent of the Southern Region.

Constant travel over a wide territory undermined Mr. Mercier's health, and, in 1923, he was persuaded by Director W. R. Perkins to come to Louisiana as Assistant Director of Extension. He served in this capacity until 1928 when, upon the resignation of Director W. R. Perkins, he was named Director.

In 1931, the Louisiana State University relieved Director Mercier of many pressing administrative duties, and named him Director Emeritus. In this capacity he has found time to carry on various research studies, especially those
relating to the history and growth of extension work.

Mr. Mercier is co-author of a book, "The Knapp Method of Growing Cotton," which had a wide circulation during the early days of extension work. He is the author of "Extension Work in the South," "Negro Extension Work," and numerous bulletins and circulars.

Although Mr. Mercier spent most of his active years in Washington and in Louisiana, he still is keenly interested in his native state and has taken great pride in the progress that has been made within the past three decades.

JOHN WESLEY BATEMAN  
(1884-1969)

BATEMAN OUT AT UNIVERSITY 'AG' EXTENSION  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PLACED IN CHARGE OF WORK  
TEMPORARILY

The resignation of J. W. Bateman, director of the 
aricultural extension division of the Louisiana State 
University since October 1, 1931, was announced here at noon 
today by Acting President Paul M. Hebert of the university.  
The resignation is effective immediately.

H. C. Sanders, state agent and assistant director of 
the division, will be temporarily in charge, consideration 
of a permanent appointee to the position to come before the 
university board of supervisors at its next regular meeting 
on November 9, Dr. Hebert said.

Agricultural extension work is a co-operative project 
financed by the United States Department of Agriculture and 
the state and the appointment to the post of director must 
be approved by the federal department and the university 
board.

Dr. Hebert said this morning that he expects to confer 
with M. L. Wilson, director of extension in the U.S.D.A., as 
soon as possible.

Mr. Bateman is a native of Washington Parish and a 
graduate of the Louisiana State Normal college and of L.S.U.  
He taught successively in elementary and high schools, was 
head of the department of rural education at the Louisiana 
State Normal college, and subsequently county agricultural 
agent in Natchitoches Parish. He was a member of the staff 
of the state department of education for seven years before 
appointment to head of the extension division in 1931.

Mr. Sanders, a graduate of Clemson and L.S.U. has 
served successively as parish, district, and state agent in 
the division.

The board of supervisors at its meeting early this week 
considered widespread criticism of the extension division 
because what some persons called "political activity" in the 
campaign for governor this year. Governor Jones has 
referred in public addresses since his inauguration [to], 
"too many county agents standing around on [street] 
corners."
Mr. Bateman was out of town at an extension meeting at the time of the board meeting. He returned to the university this morning and, following a conference with Dr. Hebert, submitted his resignation.

HARRY CLAYTON SANDERS
(1898- )

Because the following information is taken, as written, from Director Sanders' vita contained in his thesis titled, "A Study of the Farm Organization in Claiborne and DeSoto Parishes Under the Agricultural Conservation Program," LSU, 1939, it is repeated in the first person.

VITA

I was born on a farm near Hico, Louisiana, in Lincoln Parish, February 19, 1898. In 1906 my family moved to Simsboro, also in Lincoln Parish, where I attended school, being graduated from the High School in June, 1916. In September of that year I entered the Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College at Clemson College, South Carolina as an irregular student and received the Degree of Bachelor of Science in Agriculture in June 1919. From October 6 to December 1, 1919, I was in the Officer Training Camp of Camp Taylor at Louisville, Kentucky. From September, 1919, to May, 1920, I was employed as Agricultural Teacher at the Fourth District Agricultural and Mechanical School at Carrollton, Georgia. On August 1, 1920, I went to Choudrant, Louisiana, as a teacher of Vocational Agricultural and remained there until July 20, 1923, when I was appointed District Agent in the Louisiana Agriculture Extension Service for Northwest Louisiana, where I am now serving.

On June 11, 1922, I was married to Mildred Smith of Simsboro, who died January 26, 1930. There are two children, Harry Clayton, Jr., and Elizabeth Ann. On December 25, 1931, I was married to Mary Ida Fortson of Homer, Louisiana.
Born January 28, 1912, at Peach, Wood County, Texas

Married—one daughter and two sons.

1932 Hosston (Caddo Parish), High School
1938 B.S. LSU, Major in Horticulture, Minor in Agronomy
1940 M.S. LSU, Major in Horticulture and Botany; Minors in Chemistry and Agronomy


"Retiring John Cox Reminisces On Years With Ag Extension"

When John A. Cox joined the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service while on terminal leave from the U.S. Infantry in 1945, he hardly could have dreamed of the changes in agriculture he was destined to witness in the next 32 years.

Cox, who moved up to state director of the Extension Service in 1961, will retire April 30. He will be honored with a farewell recognition program April 29 at 10:30 a.m. at the John M. Parker Agricultural Center on the LSU campus. Some 1,000 well-wishers and officials are expected to be on hand for the occasion.

Chatting in his office in Knapp Hall last week, surrounded by mementos of his years with Ag Extension, Cox reminisced about his early days with the service, his boyhood in Caddo Parish, and some of the changes that have come to pass both in Louisiana agriculture and the Extension Service.

Except for a short stint as agricultural agent for the St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad prior to World War II, and distinguished service in the infantry during the war, Cox has spent his entire career with the Extension Service.

Cox has watched agriculture move from a time when cotton was picked by field hands dragging their sacks behind them and cane was hand-harvested using a knife. Rice was harvested by threshing machines in the field.

"One of the most beautiful sights in the spring was to see 10 or 15 teams of mules breaking ground on the old..."
Catherine Plantation," he reminisced.

Today, mechanical cotton pickers, cane harvesting machines and combines handle the harvesting, and the mules have been replaced by tractors which themselves have evolved from iron-lug monsters into rubber-tired sophisticated pieces of machinery.

Cox sees chemical weed control, use of fertilizer and pasture improvement programs as major factors in the growth of Louisiana agriculture during the last 32 years.

"Thirty years ago experts were saying cattle would be a major industry in the South and Southeast sooner or later," Cox said. "Today the cattle industry is as strong or stronger in this part of the country as it is anywhere else including Texas, the West and Midwest.

"We've got 150-bushel-per acre corn now," Cox said. "As a 4-H'er I grew 70 bushels an acre, which was one of the highest yields around."

It is probably no accident that the agriculture committee of the Downtown Kiwanis Club in Baton Rouge, which Cox joined 15 years ago, is the club's most prestigious committee. The club annually funds and works with a number of youth agricultural programs, including 4-H achievement day and youth rodeos.

Cox teamed up with Steele Burden to establish the Louisiana Rural Life Museum, located on a 450-acre tract donated by the Burden family to LSU. The museum contains artifacts ranging from pioneer homes to a blacksmith shop to a three-kettle home sugar mill and a country church house.

Cox recently found in the attic of Knapp Hall an old wire recorder he once used to transcribe agricultural information for radio stations. He recalled that when he first began working with the Extension Service an agent had to get up at 4:30 or 5 a.m. and go down to the station for live broadcasts, because that was the time of day the farm programs were aired.

In those days, only two Louisiana radio stations had farm directors--KWKH in Shreveport and WWL in New Orleans, he said, "Now you find them everywhere."

The wire recorder began to make it easier for the Extension Service to put out agricultural information, he recalled. The wire cartridge for the recorder weighed several pounds and contained 30 minutes of recording time. The cartridges were mailed out to the radio stations, which,
in turn, mailed them back for re-use, Cox recalled. Today, a cassette tape can be mailed all over the state to radio stations with a minimum of effort and expense, he observed.

If it wasn't for the media, the Extension Service couldn't do any educational work with agriculture, home economics, community resources development and 4-H, Cox said.

Cox explained how the Extension Service is financed. The USDA provides 40 percent of the operating funds. The rest comes from the state and from individual parishes, with both police juries and school boards contributing. Police juries provide some $1 million of the Service's $15 million annual budget.

Cox initiated the Giant Step Program in 1967 with the aim of doubling the value of farming in Louisiana in five years—from $1 billion to $2 billion. Undaunted at only reaching $1.7 billion farm value in 1972, Cox immediately launched Giant Step II, aimed at even more growth. The result: Louisiana now has an agriculture value of $4 billion.

"What we did was make a detailed study of each parish's potential and what it could accomplish if the farmers took advantage of available technology," Cox recalled. "We had about 35 organizations and between 300 and 400 people at the state level providing input. Each person in the organization had his own goals and objectives."

Soybeans are a relatively new development in Louisiana and American agriculture. But Cox had a role in that development before World War II. In 1940, while working as agricultural agent for the Frisco Line, his first assignment was to develop soybeans for their oil in the South.

"I promoted enough soybean seeds to plant seven 7-acre plots between Memphis, Tenn., and Pensacola, Fla.," he said. "And we published a 'Grow Soybeans' booklet." He said that a cottonseed crusher was used to squeeze the oil from the soybeans grown on the experimental plots. "The market price was $1.20 per bushel and the yields ran 20 bushels to the acre," he recalled. "Now the yields are double that and the price is up as much as 500 percent."

But soybeans as an American crop were a long time coming. The absence of grain elevators for storage was one reason. The other was the lack of a foreign marketing capability, Cox said.

Crawfish, once damned by rice farmers because they made a shambles of their levees, are gleefully raised by rice
farmers between growing seasons as a supplemental income—at times almost as good as the rice income, he noted.

Cox said it is a little-known fact that the railroads did a great deal toward developing agriculture around the country. They had an organization of farm agents not much different from the Extension Service, he explained.

"The guy credited with developing the demonstration method of teaching, Seaman A. Knapp, worked with the railroad," he said. He said the Mennonites who came to Beauregard and Vernon parishes were brought there through the efforts of the Kansas City Railroad.

LSU has had to change a lot to keep up with the changes in agriculture, Cox said. But the number of state office staff members is only 25 more now than it was in 1945, moving from 441 to 467, he said. But more para-professionals are being used, primarily in nutrition education programs. The nutrition aides program is designed to improve diets and combat nutrition problems. The program uses 250 such aides, Cox said.

Year after year, one of the most popular programs in home economics is sewing, Cox said.

"You'd think sooner or later its popularity would play out, but it doesn't," he commented. "The classes combine social activities with learning to sew, and also helps sell a lot of cotton and other materials."

The Home Demonstration Clubs that once were among the few organized clubs for rural wives now count 35,000 Louisiana members. They have also changed their name to Homemaker Clubs, Cox said.

Cox recalled that the first 4-H camp he attended at Goldonna in 1932 accepted produce and chickens in payment of the $1.50 camping fee.

Today, 4-H'ers can participate in some 40 or 50 different projects, from hamsters to Simmentals, Cox said.

Cox served in the Pacific Theater during World War II, until he was wounded by a 150mm Japanese mortar shell. His list of decorations includes the Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, Philippines Liberation Medal and Combat Infantryman's Badge.

During Cox's career, the cost of farming has gone up "something tremendous," Cox said. "They say that farming is the only business around that buys at retail and sells at
wholesale. But even so, you aren't going to find many farmers who would rather do anything else."

"No farmer ever has all the equipment he wants and needs, and no farm is ever in as good a shape as its owner would like to have it in," Cox observed philosophically.

Now that he faces retirement, Cox plans to devote time to the hunting and fishing he's had to bypass in recent years in order to keep abreast of his Ag Extension duties.

SOURCE: Sunday Advocate (Baton Rouge), 16 April 1978, p. 3-I.
Loupe Named to Head LSU Extension Service

ALEXANDRIA — Denver T. Loupe, 51, was selected Friday to direct the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, a major division of the LSU Center for Agricultural Sciences and Rural Development.

Loupe is an agronomist and plant science specialist employed by the extension service for nearly 35 years. He will succeed extension director John A. Cox, who retires at the end of April after 33 years with the service, including 17 years as director.

His selection was announced here at an LSU Board of Supervisors meeting. He was one of 16 applicants for the job, which was advertised nationally. Six present employees of the extension service applied for the job and 10 persons from other states applied. The board was advised in its selection by a search committee, the LSU president and agricultural sciences chancellor.

Loupe is a native of Gonzales and a U.S. Navy veteran. Since 1972, he has headed the plant science division of the state extension program and supervised the work of six agronomy specialists, five horticulture specialists, two foresters and two plant pathologists.

As director of the extension service, he will administer a statewide program for spreading the results of agricultural research throughout Louisiana, by use of a staff of specialists and county agents and home demonstration agents in all 64 parishes.

Loupe is a former 4-H Club member and joined the extension service's state staff in 1954. He received three academic degrees at LSU, including the Ph.D. in botany and plant pathology.

Loupe's specialty is sugarcane. He is now secretary-treasurer of the American Society of Sugarcane Technologists. He was an assistant county agent in St. James Parish and has taught vocational agricultural education in Ascension Parish.
Appendix H

"Computer Joining Tractor As Part of Modern Farm"
Kenton, Ohio (UPI)—Like most farmers, Carter Cavalier begins his working day soon after sunrise and labors until well after dark. But unlike most farmers, he ends the day not in the barn, but in front of his home computer.

The high tech image may not fit the traditional farming profile, but analysts say both the image and the reality of farming are molding to the bottom line.

"Farmers historically kept their books in their back pockets. We all figured if we had money in our checking accounts we were okay," Cavalier said.

But as the margin has been shaved from farm profits during the recent lean years, Cavalier said faster and more accurate accounting has become the key to survival.

He said it used to take him four or five days at the end of every season to figure out how much he'd spent, and how much he could expect to make on the 1,800 acres he farms in north central Ohio.

"In between, I just sort of knew where I was," he said.

"Now, with the computer, I can make my deposits straight from the terminal, pay my bills, print up my checks, and then push a button and get a complete statement then and there I know right where I stand every week, every day if I want to."

Cavalier said this high speed and precision is crucial in analyzing cash flow and making the investment, operations and marketing decisions required in modern farming.

But the experts say only 8 percent to ten percent of U.S. commercial farmers are taking advantage of computerization, primarily because economic realities make them hesitant to spend the money.

A spokesman for Professional Farmers of America, the Cedar Falls, Iowa, communications service to which Cavalier subscribes, says the estimated 20,000 computers in use on American farms represent only the tip of the market.

Jim Dayton, president of Ohio Agriculture Computer Services Inc., agrees.

"There's a great pent-up demand for farm management help, and from the seminars and reviews we go to, we can see
that farmers are becoming fairly well educated as to what computers can do for them," Dayton said.

"But in order for this industry to boom we need good farming years," he said. "We're coming out of a cycle of bad weather, high interest rates and weak prices. The farmer sees what's available through the computer. Now he needs to see some money."

Cavalier acknowledged his $4,000 investment was a gamble in 1980. His wife Donna rolls her eyes at the memory.

"Computers were more expensive then, and I was sitting on three years of corn out there in the bins, waiting for a better grain price. But I went ahead with it because I just had to have a better handle on my business."

The Oklahoma-born farmer says his accounting degree tells him the purchase has been worthwhile. He hasn't delved too deeply into the marketing services, which come with a usage charge, but relies heavily on his computer for record-keeping and planning.

Cavalier points to the big manure spreader parked in front of the barn. "We use the computer spreadsheets in deciding to buy all our equipment now. Because the computer doesn't forget, we can keep track of the cost of applying chemicals, and we can play with the figures to determine when the spreader will pay for itself, or if it's feasible to hire it out to other farmers."

Similarly, the Cavaliers decided to buy a 12-row planter this year because the information fed into and spewed out of his computer told them the estimated $25,000 investment would pay off. It did.

But Cavalier says the best computer-assisted decision his family has made was to take part in the government Payment-in-Kind program.

"I resisted the idea, had almost decided we weren't going to get into it," he said. "But I went ahead and got three programs on floppy disk and ran our operation on it for over a month. It kept giving me the same answer: 'Get into it.'"

The Cavaliers held 500 acres back for PIK. It turned out to be a drought year, yielding 50 bushels of corn to the acre instead of their customary 119. "I don't know what the boys lost who were farming last year, but it was considerable," Cavalier said.
"PIK was a very sophisticated program with a lot of variables. There's no way on Earth anybody could sort through all that by pushing a pencil."

SOURCE: Sunday Advocate (Baton Rouge), 4 November 1984, p. 5-K.
Having been born (1944) and raised on a strawberry farm in Livingston Parish, I have always been interested in farm-related courses and activities. While a student at Albany High School from 1958 to 1962, I was a member of both the 4-H Club and the Future Farmers of America. These organizations, as well as courses taken in vocational agriculture, increased my appreciation of agriculture and taught me the importance of adopting improved farming techniques.

After graduating from Albany High School in 1962, I entered Southeastern Louisiana College (now University), where I graduated in May 1968, with a B.A. in sociology and numerous minors, including one in agriculture. The skills learned in vocational agriculture enabled me to work as an ironworker in industrial construction during the summers. Because of my farm background and training, I began my farming career as a contract broiler grower in June 1962 as a means of supporting myself because my father was permanently disabled by a stroke in May 1962. I continued raising chickens for nineteen years, until the fall of 1981.

After graduating from SLU, I worked briefly as an insurance salesman for New York Life Insurance Company's Baton Rouge office. At the same time I began work on a
masters degree in sociology at Southeastern. When I began my professional planning career in February 1969 with the Capital Economic Development District in Baton Rouge, I transferred to LSU, where I continued to pursue an M.A. in rural sociology. I began working for the State of Louisiana in the Department of Public Works as an Urban Planner I in November 1970, and, by January 1974, I was the Urban Planning Program Supervisor, having charge of administering the statewide "701" Planning Program. Beginning in 1975, when the Planning Program was transferred from Public Works to the Department of Urban and Community Affairs (DUCA), I served in various capacities and culminated my service with DUCA as a Planning Analyst VI, Program Manager of the statewide Louisiana Community Development Block Grant Program (LCDBG).

In January 1985, I transferred to the Louisiana Department of Commerce, Office of Commerce and Industry, where I am an Economic Development Specialist and presently serve as Coordinator of the Community Development and Resident Industry Program. As such, I have responsibility for assisting the State's 301 municipalities and 64 parishes to achieve sustained, balanced economic growth, and for helping the State's resident industries to remain economically viable and to generate employment opportunities.

As I progressed with work on my masters degree at LSU,
my major professor, Dr. Alvin L. Bertrand, Boyd Professor Emeritus of Sociology, suggested that I minor in Extension Education. Although admittedly reluctant at first, after I had completed two courses, Principles and Practices of Extension Education, and Program Development, taught by Dr. Edward W. Gassie and Dr. Bruce Flint, respectively, I was convinced of Extension Education's value and utility to me in my planning profession. Community planning is essentially an educational effort since it involves working with adults in informal settings. The techniques and methods of Extension Education are particularly appropriate because the Cooperative Extension Service pioneered and continues to perfect education methods which are used outside the formal classroom.

For these reasons, after graduating with an M.A. in rural sociology from LSU in August 1976, I applied for admission to the doctoral program in Extension Education and was accepted. My objectives were to increase my knowledge and understanding of the Louisiana Cooperative Service in particular and the federal service in general and to acquire skills which could be utilized in my professional planning career in order to make planning more efficient and effective. I am confident that these goals have been achieved.
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