

THE THIRD LEG OF THE STOOL
KENYON BUTTERFIELD AND THE
SMITH-LEVER ACT OF 1914

*ROBERT L. CHRISTENSEN, PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCE ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
AMHERST*

Copyright © 1995, Robert L. Christensen

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This monograph is dedicated to Robert G. Light, former Associate Director of University of Massachusetts Cooperative Extension, who first brought Butterfield to my attention and has been my friend and colleague for many years.

I thank the University of Massachusetts at Amherst for granting the sabbatical leave for the fall semester of 1994 which allowed me to prepare this monograph. The interest and support of the following people has been particularly worthy of note: Dr. Barry Field, Chair of the Department of Resource Economics; Dr. Robert Helgesen, Dean, College of Food and Natural Resources; and Dr. John Gerber, Associate Director, University of Massachusetts Cooperative extension.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the several librarians and archivists who have helped me in my search for the resource materials used in the preparation of this monograph. In every instance they were unstinting in their efforts to assist me in locating books, publications, and documents. Primary library sources were: the University of Massachusetts Library at Amherst, the Michigan State University at East Lansing, and the Library of Congress in Washington D.C. Additional source materials were provided by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges in Washington, D.C.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<i>PREFACE</i>	1
<i>A BRIEF HISTORY OF NON-FORMAL EDUCATION FOR FARMERS</i>	5
<i>BUTTERFIELD'S INVOLVEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTES</i>	7
<i>A NECESSARY DIGRESSION - SEAMAN KNAPP</i>	12
<i>BUTTERFIELD THE RURAL SOCIAL SCIENTIST</i>	21
<i>BUTTERFIELD'S EXTENSION ADVOCACY</i>	29
<i>A TANGLED TRAIL - THE LEGISLATIVE EVOLUTION</i>	39
<i>A POSTHUMOUS PERSPECTIVE</i>	49
<i>A SUMMARY OF THE BUTTERFIELD'S LEGACY TO THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES</i>	55
<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i>	58
<i>BIOGRAPHICAL CHRONOLOGY</i>	61
<u>APPENDICES</u>	
<i>APPENDIX A - The McLaughlin Bill</i>	66
<i>APPENDIX B - The Smith-Lever Act</i>	69
<i>APPENDIX C - Comparison of McLaughlin and Smith-Lever</i>	72
<i>APPENDIX D - Bills Relating to Agricultural Extension</i>	82
<i>APPENDIX E - "The Social Phase of Agricultural Education"</i>	97
<i>APPENDIX F - 1906 Report of the Committee on Extension Work</i>	106
<i>APPENDIX G - 1907 Report of the Committee on Extension Work</i>	111
<i>APPENDIX H - 1908 Report of the Committee on Extension Work</i>	113
<i>APPENDIX I - 1909 Report of the Committee on Extension Work</i>	120
<i>Appendix J - "Problems Confronting the Agricultural Colleges In their Extension Work..."</i>	132

**THE THIRD LEG OF THE STOOL -
Kenyon Leech Butterfield and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914**

by
Robert L. Christensen
Professor of Resource Economics
University of Massachusetts

PREFACE

"Each agricultural college, therefore, should develop as rapidly as possible a definite tripartite organization that will reveal the college in its three-fold function - as an organ of research, as an educator of students, and as a distributor of information to those who cannot come to the college. . . . To carry out the function of the agricultural college, we need, finally, a vast enlargement of extension work among farmers. This work will not only be dignified by a standing in the college coordinate with research and the teaching of students, but it will rank as a distinct department, with a faculty of men whose chief business is to teach the people who cannot come to the college. . . . Such a department will be prepared to incorporate into its work the economic, governmental, and social problems of agriculture." [Kenyon L. Butterfield, 1904]

The name Kenyon L. Butterfield is unlikely to be recognized by most of the University of Massachusetts class of 1995. Some might make a connection with Butterfield Hall, but then assume that the building was named after some wealthy alumnus. In fact, it is probable that some senior administrators of the University will likewise fail to recognize the name of one of the most influential people in land-grant college history. Butterfield may be unique in the fact that he served as president of three

land-grant colleges during his career: the Rhode Island Agricultural and Mechanical College, the Massachusetts Agricultural College, and Michigan Agricultural College. He is probably the only former administrator of the University to have had a U.S. naval ship named after him!

Butterfield was the President of the Massachusetts Agricultural College during the period 1906 to 1924. During his early tenure in Massachusetts he devoted considerable energy to promotion of the federal-state land-grant partnership that is one of the significant characteristics of the cooperative extension system. However, his advocacy for federal aid to land-grant colleges to support agricultural extension is first noted in 1897 when he proposed such assistance before the meeting of the American Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations (AAACES), while he was the superintendent of the Agricultural Institute programs in Michigan. [True, page 24. 1928.]

Some authorities credit the origin of the national Cooperative Extension System to Seaman Knapp and, in fact, an archway over Independence Avenue connecting the South Agriculture Building and the Administration Building of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is dedicated to Seaman Knapp. The intent of this

monograph is to show that the creation of the Cooperative Extension **system** through the Smith-Lever Act should be properly attributed to the efforts of Kenyon L. Butterfield. Indeed, Knapp's principal biographer Joseph Bailey wrote:

"Dr. Kenyon L. Butterfield, President of the Massachusetts Agricultural College, ... one of the ablest and most influential officials of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations for more than a generation, was the individual who, more than any other, was responsible for bringing the subject of extension work in agriculture before the Association, for forming its mind and formulating its policies on this matter, for organizing first a committee and then a section of the Association to cope with the question. Finally Butterfield was the pilot appointed to guide through Congress the McLaughlin bill that had been drafted under his supervision to embody the principles and provisions desired by virtually every delegate of the half a hundred state colleges and universities, who made their points of view known during the conventions of the Association from 1905 through 1912." [Bailey, page 250]

And another source says,

"President Butterfield might well be called the Father of the Smith-Lever Extension Act." [Bliss, et al, page 86. 1952.]

While Butterfield's public service career has many facets, some will be elaborated only briefly in this monograph. Butterfield was clearly one of the first to define and expound the subject matter of the rural social sciences. We will refer to his early writings and efforts to establish the disciplinary fields of agricultural economics and rural sociology. It should not be surprising that the concerns of these disciplines became integral with extension philosophy. It is the author's intention to focus primarily on those aspects of Butterfield's educational philosophy that relate to the content of extension legislation. We will document his work within the American Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations (AAACES) in promoting Extension as a legitimate and necessary function. We will refer to his writings and testimony that led to the passage of the Smith-Lever Act by the United States Congress in 1914. That act provided funding, established the structural organization and relationships, and defined the programmatic focus of the land-grant cooperative extension system. Because of the fact that the work of Seaman Knapp is contemporaneous, and

also bears on both extension technique and philosophy, the monograph contains a section on this extension pioneer.

Before beginning the detailed documentation of Butterfield's work on behalf of passage of the Smith-Lever Act, it will be helpful to trace some of the history of educational programs for farmers.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF NON-FORMAL EDUCATION FOR FARMERS

Early in the history of the United States some private organizations mounted efforts designed to improve agricultural practices and enhance rural life. For example, the Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture began in 1785 and the South Carolina Society for Promoting and Improving Agriculture was established in the same year. The Massachusetts Society for Promoting Agriculture formed in 1792. [True, A.C. 1928, page 3.]

These societies, which were typically statewide organizations, encouraged the formation of county societies. They evolved the concept of the county agricultural fairs which included among their purposes competitive exhibitions of livestock and agricultural produce. In a sense, these exhibitions were educational, as they demonstrated and promoted quality attributes. It is noted that lectures on agricultural subjects were sometimes included. For example, an address was given by John Lowell at a fair sponsored by the Massachusetts Society in 1818 and was subsequently published by the Society. [True, 1928, page 3.]

Also in Massachusetts, a weekly series of meetings was begun in the House of Representatives in 1839 to discuss agricultural issues. These meetings were open to the public and presented

lectures on agricultural topics by agriculturists and scientists of note. In 1840 one such meeting included addresses by the Commissioner for the agricultural survey of Massachusetts, Professor Stillman of Yale College, and the Honorable Daniel Webster. Mr. Webster's address compared the agriculture of England with that of Massachusetts. [Massachusetts Agricultural Survey, Report of the Agricultural Meeting. January 13, 1840. Salem. 1840]

The origins of the concept of formal involvement of colleges and professors in education of farmers and their families may have begun in Amherst, Massachusetts. It is recorded that in 1852, Edward Hitchcock, the President of Amherst College, proposed that "... qualified people, including professors and farmers, go into the different districts of the state during the winter months and instruct farmers and their families in their various specialties." In 1853 he elaborated this theme and urged the establishment of farmers' institutes and called for funding from the state legislature to establish and put into operation such institutes. [True pages 5-6]

Similar societies and programs occurred in other states, among them New York, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. Perhaps as a result of the work of the several societies, the

concept of farmers' Institutes became the next historical milestone in the evolution of extension education. The Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture was created by state statute in 1852. Among the duties prescribed for the Secretary of the Board was the visitation of the several agricultural districts of the state and the presentation of lectures on the practice and science of agriculture. Over the ensuing decade, the best means of providing such education was debated. It is salutary that in 1857 Mr. Boutwell, speaking to the Barnstable Agricultural Society, proposed the appointment of six professors of agriculture, each with a different specialty, who could be assigned to districts of 50 towns to visit farms and advise farmers, institute experiments, hold meetings, and give lectures. In 1858, the Board voted to print and distribute tracts on a wide variety of agricultural topics. [True, 1928, page 6-7.]

The Board debated the advisability of holding public meetings for farmers on agricultural topics from 1857 to 1863. Finally, in 1863, the Board voted to support an annual meeting for lectures and discussions to be held in December and that leading agriculturists would be invited to attend. That Fall the first such meeting was held in Springfield, Massachusetts. Speakers included several prominent professors and scientists from the region. [True, 1928, page 7.]

Butterfield's Involvement in Agricultural Institutes

Late in the 19th century several other states began organized programs of education for farmers. In many cases these programs were called agricultural institutes. One of the most successful of these efforts was in Michigan. In 1895, the Michigan legislature passed an act charging the State Board of Agriculture to initiate farmers' institutes throughout the state. Kenyon Butterfield was appointed to the post of Superintendent of Institutes, and was given an annual budget of \$5,000. Butterfield had graduated from the Michigan Agricultural College in 1891 with a bachelor's degree, ranking first in his class. From 1891 until his appointment to the Institute post he worked as the Editor of the Michigan Grange magazine and field representative. [History of Michigan Agricultural College. 1915.]

There is no doubt that Kenyon Butterfield was an excellent choice for the task. Not only had he received a bachelor's degree from the Michigan Agricultural College ranking first in his class, but he brought with him his farm background and family heritage of public service. His grandfather, Ira Butterfield, Sr., served in the Michigan legislature at the time the Morrill Act was passed creating the land-grant college system. He was chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee involved in debates

over the curriculum and administration of the Michigan Agricultural College. It is said that Ira Butterfield Sr. helped to found the college. [Kuhn, page 62]

Kenyon's father, Ira Butterfield Jr. not only managed a successful farm, but also served in state government and in the state agricultural society for many years. Among his posts was that of Deputy Collector and Inspector of Customs at Port Huron from 1879 to 1885. He was appointed to the State Board of Agriculture in 1889, became Secretary of the Board in 1889 and continued in that post through 1899. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the State Agricultural Society beginning in 1881, became Secretary from 1891 through 1895, and was Vice President of the Society from 1895 through 1897 and became the President in 1898.

The Institutes organized and developed under Kenyon Butterfield's direction proved popular, and during 1895-1896 some 70 county Institutes were held. Most were of 1 to 2 day duration and included speakers furnished by the Board of Agriculture, professors from the agricultural college, and respected and knowledgeable people from the local community.

A review of Butterfield's correspondence files from the

years when he gave the Michigan Institutes leadership reveals the herculean job this was. First, he had to establish local county contacts who would assist in helping to form county "Societies" with by-laws, officers, and a paid membership. Much of the correspondence is involved with stimulating the formation of the Farmers' Institutes in the counties assisting them in putting together programs, making meeting arrangements, continually hassling local contacts (officers) for reports, getting announcements placed in local newspapers, etc. Preparing the annual reports of the Institutes was apparently a difficult and thankless task when the information had to be pried out of the local officers of the Societies. Often, correspondence was misdirected, misplaced, or forgotten. This is not to say that there were problems in every county. It appeared that in most counties there was great enthusiasm for the Institutes, and conscientious attention to detail. As always, much depended on the local leadership.

It appears that, from the first, the intent of the Institutes (and Butterfield) was to improve the state of knowledge of farming methods through education. This education was drawn from experimentation by scientists and from practical experience. It is evident that the agricultural college was regarded as an important source of this educational knowledge.

Programs held even in locations far from the agricultural college would have professors from the college as speakers. Mrs. Mary Mayo was recruited by Butterfield to lead the women's sessions. "Reports show that 5,300 women attended Mrs. Mayo's sections at 20 institutes, including the state meeting." [ibid, page 160.]

An effort was made to involve young people in the Institutes. Butterfield developed the idea of contests among high school students. These contests were for the best essays resulting from their attendance at the Institutes. The essays were evaluated by the Department of English at Michigan Agricultural College. The best 5 essays would be published and the winner of the best essay would receive a scholarship of room rent for one year's attendance at the agricultural college.

Butterfield also initiated multi-county "Round Up" Sessions and a statewide Round Up held at the agricultural college campus. The multi-county "Round Ups" lasted for as long as 4 days, drawing people from several counties. The logistical problems were apparently great, taxing the capacity of the host community to provide lodging for the visitors. The statewide Round Up survives today as the annual "Farmers' Week" held at Michigan State University.

Butterfield is given credit for the scheme of inducing the railroads centering Lansing to run excursions to the college grounds for the week of the Statewide Round Up. It is estimated that in August of 1899, 3,000 people arrived by train to visit the college, hear speeches, and view demonstrations. [ibid, page 201.]

Kenyon Butterfield resigned as Superintendent of Institutes in the summer of 1890 to pursue a Master's degree from the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. A history of the first century of the Michigan State College noted "Mr. Butterfield left the work (Institutes) in a high state of perfection for his successor." [Kuhn, page 161]

Butterfield's own words express his views on the value of the Institutes: "I am inclined to believe that the greater value of institutes lies in inspiration rather than in information. At best, the time is short, one theme can occupy but a few minutes. It is a common observation that a strong institute stirs and wakes a whole community, and I conceive this to be one of the chief functions and best results of our institute work." [ibid, page 163.]

Throughout his life and work Butterfield voiced a continuing

theme of concern with the totality of rural life. He clearly saw the needs of farmers and their families as a part of the larger fabric of the community in which they lived and worked and saw the church, the Grange, and other organizations as potential vehicles for the social and economic improvement of life in rural areas. His view of extension education encompassing more than farming technology often brought him into conflict with those who saw extension work as limited to agriculture.

A NECESSARY DIGRESSION - SEAMAN KNAPP

[Unless otherwise noted, the following summary of Seaman A. Knapp's career and efforts in extension are drawn from Bailey's definitive work "Seaman A. Knapp - Schoolmaster of American Agriculture".]

SEAMAN ASAH EL 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. (From the Resolution of Congress authorizing a Knapp Memorial Tablet and Arch in Washington, 1933.)

No history of the Smith-Lever Act, and those individuals instrumental in its passage, would be complete without reference to Seaman A. Knapp. Knapp is given major credit for the origins

of Cooperative Extension work in the United States. He is memorialized in an archway over Independence Avenue in Washington connecting the Department of Agriculture Administration Building with the South Building. In addition, the Department of Agriculture sponsors an annual Memorial Lecture in his name to "commemorate the life and work of Dr. Seaman A. Knapp - the father of the Cooperative Extension concept." Knapp **can** be credited with the development of a demonstration process and technique that proved to be a highly successful method for education of farmers in improved methods for crop and livestock production.

Seaman Knapp was born in 1833 in upper New York state and, although his father was a doctor, grew up on a self sufficient farm. His early education began in a one-room school and continued at a private preparatory school in Vermont. He entered Union College in Schenectady, New York in 1854 and received the A.B. two years later. He and his wife joined the faculty of the Washington County Seminary and Collegiate Institute (New York) in 1857. While there Knapp was given the title of Professor of Higher Mathematics and Latin.

[Bailey notes that, while Knapp's published vita shows an A.M degree, there appears to be no record of such a degree

granted by a college or university. He also seems to have acquired a ministerial title, although how this came about is not documented by Bailey, and later was pastor of a church in Vinton, Iowa. Apparently, the ministerial qualification first gave him the title of Dr. and the honorary LL.D. was conferred on him by Upper Iowa University in 1882.]

In 1863 Knapp returned to Poultney, Vermont as co-proprietor of Troy Academy, his old preparatory school. This school was then renamed the Ripley Female College. Then in 1864, Knapp and others incorporated a new school for young men to be called the Poultney Normal Institute.

In 1866 Knapp and his family moved to Iowa. Knapp purchased 200 acres of land in Vinton, Iowa and, although crippled by an accident while in Vermont, began farming. His entire sheep flock was lost due to severe weather and he subsequently rented the farm and became pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Vinton for the next two years. In 1869 Knapp became superintendent of the state school for the blind in Vinton. While in this post, he regained the use of his leg and resumed farming, becoming a prominent swine farmer, and writing and speaking on the subject. Around 1878 he resigned his post at the School for the blind and devoted full time attention to his hog

breeding business and promotion of improved agricultural practices.

According to his biographer Bailey, Knapp went throughout Iowa expounding his views on improving agriculture, "... went around evangelizing so tirelessly that he appeared to function almost as a one man Farmer's Institute." [Bailey, page 68] In 1876 he became the editor of the Western Stock Journal and Farmer which later evolved into Wallace's Farmer.

He was appointed to the Chair of Practical and Experimental Agriculture at Iowa State Agricultural College in 1879 and in March of 1880 he took residency as superintendent of the college farm. Kansas and Purdue had offered him a presidency which he had declined in order to remain in Iowa.

His personal experiences in farming had shown him the need of farmers for practical knowledge and he had come to believe that farmers should get reliable scientific information from whatever source available. He was a supporter of the establishment of agricultural experiment stations and the Hatch Act of 1887 creating the national experiment station system. In fact, a review of his efforts on behalf of federal funding for agricultural research might well earn him the epitaph of "father

of the Hatch Act".

The 1880's were a period of turmoil for the Iowa State College with conflicts over authority for administration between the administration of the College and its Board of Trustees. Six different Presidents served over an eight year period. Knapp was among the six. He took a leave 1886 and in early 1887 he resigned his professorship.

In 1873 Knapp had founded a bank in Vinton and served as its President until leaving Vinton. In 1885 he joined the North American Land and Timber Company with the task of planning the development of more than a million acres of land in Louisiana and moved to Lake Charles, Louisiana in the winter of 1885. Part of the agreement included his rights to some of the development properties. In 1889 Knapp left the syndicate to devote full time to his other interests. These included formation of a new bank and a rice milling company in Lake Charles. He also became editor of the Rice Grower and founder and president of the "Rice Association".

In 1902 Seaman Knapp accepted an appointment as Special Agent for the Promotion of Agriculture in the South with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to establish and supervise a few

demonstration farms in the south. These farms were essentially government operated rather than owned and operated by farmers.

[Brunner and Yang, page 8]

In 1904 Knapp, then employed by the Bureau of Plant Industry in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, was given responsibility for teaching farmers in the southern states how to combat the problem of the boll weevil through adoption of a set of cultural practices. Under Knapp's direction 22 men, working in Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana, recruited farmers to follow these practices and become demonstration sites. In 1904 alone 1,000 meetings were held and 7,000 farmers agreed to participate in demonstrations. The concept quickly spread to other southern states as its success was demonstrated. [Smith and Wilson, page 36]

Knapp's work attracted the attention of the General Education Board, an organization to promote education in the South. The General Education Board was funded in large part by gifts from John D. Rockefeller. After conferences between Knapp and representatives of both the United States Department of Agriculture and the Board, an agreement was reached in which the Board would provide funding to the Department of Agriculture to support the "Knapp movement" in the South. This "silent partner"

arrangement began in 1906 and ended in 1914 and provided funding totaling nearly a million dollars over that period. As will be noted later, it was hinted by critics that the demonstration work funded under the arrangement between the Department of Agriculture and the Foundation was part of a larger scheme for economic development in the south that would benefit Rockefeller's corporate investments. [Bailey page 218]

Knapp was critical of the agricultural Institutes that had become prevalent in many states. He observed that federal funds that had been given to colleges in support of Institutes he had observed in Texas and Louisiana had been "wasted". According to Knapp those hired to conduct the Institutes promoted special interests and were more political appointees than educators. As a result he became convinced that his demonstration work was more effective in promoting change than the Institutes and the Institutes should, therefore, no longer be given federal money. [Scott, page 220]

Knapp's disdain for the professors in the land-grant colleges is well documented. It apparently stems from difficulties he encountered while he served as the President of the Iowa State Agricultural College and later conflicts with entomologists over control methods for the boll weevil. His

bitter disagreements with some professors and college administrators engendered a suspicion and distrust of academics that he carried for the rest of his life. [Scott, page 208]

Knapp opposed the basing of extension at the agricultural colleges and is quoted as saying at one point "Three reasons Mr. Secretary. These gentlemen, number one, don't know anything about farming. Number two, they don't know anything about education. And number three, they don't know anything about people." He also was quoted as follows : " They talk of wanting to do extension, but they have nothing to extend". [Bailey, page 233] After a meeting in Texas Knapp is quoted as saying that he was "... a good bit disappointed with the college people; they are immensely narrow and fault finding." [Scott, page 219]

For their part, the professors and experiment station researchers were not terribly supportive of Knapp's work. They were not enthusiastic about what they saw as a federal program directed and controlled from Washington. They distrusted recommendations based, at least in part, on anecdotal evidence and experimental results that were not subjected to rigorous testing for reliability. Perhaps some jealousy was involved since the demonstration programs had proven to be quite popular with farmers and with their elective representatives. They were

also probably missed that Knapp chose to exclude them from participation. [Scott, page 219]

Knapp apparently remained unreconciled to the land-grant institutions, and the farmers cooperative demonstration work he led was largely kept separate from the agricultural colleges. While the need for a central administrative and coordinative office in each state logically suggested those functions be at the land-grant college, Knapp refused to accept this premise and declined to join with them or work with them except in a very limited way. He distrusted the ability of the colleges and their faculty to be effective in teaching farmers. Most of the people he employed in the demonstration work had gained their knowledge from long and practical farming experience rather than from formal education and academic research. [Scott, pages 214, 220, 226 and 229]

Bailey, in his biography of Seaman Knapp, cites several examples of jointly conducted work with colleges of agriculture. He suggests Knapp astutely formed liaisons with some colleges in states where political support would be influential for the Department of Agriculture's extension work. Significantly, one such state was South Carolina, the home state of Congressman Lever. Bailey characterizes Knapp as a consummate politician

with a genius for public relations and mobilization of public opinion to overcome opposition. (Bailey, pages 225 and 276)

Knapp did not support the idea that supervision and direction of extension work in the states should be centered at the agricultural colleges. He saw it as a federal enterprise to be controlled and directed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, just as other line agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, etc. are managed. Work would be planned, directed, and agent supervised from there. While Butterfield acknowledged that oversight for the spending of federal dollars would be necessary, he felt primacy over control and direction of individual state programs should reside with the states and most logically be vested with the land-grant colleges. Here is one of the differences between Knapp and Butterfield that is of great significance in the evolution of the Smith-Lever Act. [Rasmussen, page 36]

Knapp died in 1911, three years before the passage of the Smith-Lever Act. However, the McLaughlin Bill was introduced in 1909 and the Dolliver Bill in 1910 and it can be assumed that Knapp's views were reflected in statements of Agriculture department officials during the debates and testimony on those bills. It is of passing interest that his son, Bradford Knapp

served as the head of the Office of Extension Work in the South from 1914 to 1921. [Rasmussen, pages 51 and 80]

BUTTERFIELD THE RURAL SOCIAL SCIENTIST

Throughout his career Butterfield was concerned with the social and economic well being of rural people. This led him to become one of the pioneers in defining the rural social sciences. In particular, his academic writings and leadership were instrumental in helping to define the academic disciplines of agricultural economics and rural sociology.

In 1903, in a letter to D.J Crosby of the Office of Experiment Stations, USDA, Butterfield wrote,

"Personally I divide the general subject of rural social science into two divisions, agricultural economics and rural sociology."

Seminal papers include a paper presented at the AAACES meetings in 1904 titled "The Social Phase of Agricultural Education." In this paper, Butterfield first cogently and concisely set forth his definition of the mission of the land-grant college:

"The permanent function of the agricultural college is to serve as a social organ or agency of first importance in helping to solve all phases of the rural problem."

Butterfield then identified the several aspects of the farm problem as: (1) the problem of increasing the technical skill of farmers, (2) the need for improved business skills on the part of farmers, (3) the need for growth and prosperity of the agricultural industry as a whole, (4) the need for enhanced and effective political influence by farmers, and (5) the need to secure social and cultural amenities of society for farmers.

He then went on to say that "... the farm problem is not merely one of technique, fundamental as technical skill must be; that it demonstrates that the problem is also one of profound economic, political, and social significance." He points out, that unfortunately "... the present effort (by the colleges) is partial, because the emphasis is placed on the technical, and especially upon the individual, phases of the problem. The industrial, the political, and the social factors are not given due consideration."

Butterfield continued by asserting that the colleges needed

to expand their attention to the rural social sciences, and that it was not sufficient to simply add some courses, but that it would require a conscious statement of educational policy. He challenged the land-grant college "to be the inspiration, the guide, the stimulator of all possible endeavors to improve farm and farmer." And, "So we shall see the college consciously endeavoring to make of itself a center where these men and women of the farm shall find light and inspiration and guidance in all the aspects of their struggle for a better livelihood and a broader life." Writing in his book "Chapters in Rural Progress", Butterfield said, "No man will have acquired an adequate agricultural education who has not been trained in rural social science, and who does not recognize the bearing of this wide field of thought upon the business of farming as well as upon American destiny." [Butterfield, 1908 page 202]

In order to fulfill this vision Butterfield urged that greater emphasis be placed on the social sciences. He noted a relative paucity of knowledge of the economics of the industry and a near void in knowledge with respect to social questions relating to farming and the rural community. He stated his belief that the "natural place to begin work in rural social science is the agricultural college. In order to remedy, in part, this deficiency Butterfield suggested that every course of

study (major) should include subject matter courses in agricultural economics and rural sociology, or alternatively, that technical courses include attention to the social issues of agriculture.

In a 1904 address at the St. Louis Exposition Butterfield presented rather detailed outlines for a course in agricultural economics and a course in rural sociology appropriate for inclusion in the agricultural curriculum of the land-grant agricultural college. [Butterfield, 1908 pages 219-220]

Butterfield rationalized the inclusion of social studies into the curriculum by arguing that graduates of the college should be educated in the broad sense, and they have an obligation to assume positions of social leadership as well as the exercise of their technical training. "It is not enough that he do his particular work well; he has a public duty. Only thus can he pay all his debt to society for the training he has had."

Specifically, he says, "He (the student) should study agricultural economics and rural sociology, both because rural society needs leaders and because, in the arming of the man, the knowledge of society's problems is just as vital as either expert information or personal culture."

In 1906, Butterfield wrote to E.E. Elliot as follows:

"Personally I differentiate agricultural economics and rural sociology from each other and from all other phases of rural economy, so called. I think the distinction is very clear. Farm management is concerned with the economy of the farm from the purely individual and business point of view. Agricultural economics considers all of those large industrial questions that have to do with the general movement of agricultural development and its relation to other industries. Rural sociology is confined, more particularly, to those questions that have to do with the people that live under rural conditions, their characteristics, their opportunities, their organizations, their education, etc. ... I have sometimes used rural social science to include rural sociology, rural economics, and questions of government that might be considered of particular significance in rural development. This, you see, would exclude farm management." [Butterfield Collection, Library of Congress]

That he was recognized and credited with leadership in defining these emerging disciplines is evinced by both his

writings and by a number of letters from colleagues. Perhaps belatedly, others joined him in recognizing and advocating the need for attention to the rural social sciences in the agricultural college curriculum.

From Eugene Davenport to Butterfield 4/20/1915:

"Indeed if any one field in agriculture can make a special claim on the institution (land-grant agricultural college) it is the field of economics because, in the last analysis, not only the food production but the lives of the farmers and of all others is very largely an economic problem."

[Butterfield Collection, Library of Congress]

From Liberty Hyde Bailey 4/22/1915:

"I feel that it is the privilege and the opportunity of the agricultural college to engage in research, extension teaching, and the enterprises touching the economic, social, educational, and religious sides of rural life. ... We all look to your institution, so long as you are at the head of it, to develop very strongly along the lines of social, organizational and economic work for country life." [Butterfield

collection, Library of Congress]

From Mr. Monahan, Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior, 1915:

"I am certain that many of the people in the United States occupying positions which offer the best opportunity to know about these things are regarding the Massachusetts Agricultural College as a leader in the development of the rural social sciences."

[Butterfield Collection, Library of Congress]

Butterfield not only advocated for the development of the disciplines of rural social sciences but he is also credited with being among the first in the nation to teach courses focusing on the agricultural economy and social conditions of rural America. While earning his A.M. (1900-1902) at the University of Michigan he was identified as an instructor in rural sociology. The record also shows that he taught the first course in rural sociology offered at a land-grant college while he served as President of the Rhode Island Agricultural College. He prepared an outline paper for the U.S. Department of Agriculture Office of Experiment Stations describing a course in rural sociology in 1904. That outline along with a similar outline for a course in agricultural economics was presented by Butterfield at the 1904

St. Louis Exposition may well represent the earliest such statements of the dimensions of these emerging disciplines.

[Butterfield, 1904]

Early in his administration Butterfield had organized the faculty into five divisions. A totally new area of academics to the College was defined as the Division of Rural Social Science, which he personally directed. This Division consisted of three departments : agricultural education, agricultural economics and rural sociology. [Cary, page 106]

The agricultural education department's responsibility was to train people who would teach in the agricultural high schools and also those who would become county extension agents. This program had actually begun shortly after Butterfield's arrival in Massachusetts when the legislature approved an appropriation of \$5,000 to establish a "normal department" for the training of teachers of agriculture. [Cary, page 111]

The agricultural economics department was conceived as being separate and more specifically focused than the academic programs labeled political economy. As noted previously, Butterfield also viewed the theory and subject matter of agricultural economics as distinct from "farm management". The latter, while drawing in

part on the principles of economic theory, was clearly individual farm oriented and vocational in character. To lead the agricultural economics department Butterfield brought Alexander Cance from Wisconsin to the College. [Cary, page 112]

There can be little question that Butterfield provided the intellectual leadership for the department of rural sociology as well as teaching the basic course. In fact, the 1926 INDEX listing of the faculty shows no one (after Butterfield's departure) with this specialty. [1926 INDEX and Cary, 1962, page 112]

BUTTERFIELD'S EXTENSION ADVOCACY

Butterfield received his primary collegiate education at the Michigan Agricultural College, one of the first such institutions chartered in the nation (1855). It became a land-grant college following the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862. At the time of Butterfield's graduation in 1891 the land-grant colleges were still primarily agricultural in focus and were relatively small in terms of faculty and numbers of graduates. The Hatch Act of 1887 had created the agricultural experiment station system and the impacts of that Act on the college and its faculty were undoubtedly being felt by students. It is likely that the new

mandate for applied research as part of the mission of the land-grant college was inculcated in graduates. Certainly, Butterfield, with his farm background, would recognize the need for communication of newfound knowledge to the farmers who would put it in practice.

Butterfield's role as superintendent of the Michigan Farmer's Institutes from 1895 through 1899 is detailed elsewhere in this monograph. His experience in this role gave him an appreciation of the task of the extension educator uncommon among college and university administrators both then and now.

Butterfield was very active in the affairs of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations (AAACES) during his career. In 1897 Butterfield first suggested, at a meeting of the American Association of Farmers' Institute Managers, that federal funds should be provided by the national government to the land-grant colleges for agricultural extension work. It appears to be the earliest call for the legislation which became the 1914 Smith-Lever Act. At that same meeting he advocated the idea of "... systematic, long continued and thorough instruction to farmers the year through." [True, page 24, and Sixty Years, 1973]

In 1899 Butterfield urged the AAACES to appoint a committee to confer with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in relation to the creation in the Department of a "bureau" to encourage farmers' institutes and agricultural college extension. In 1904, while President of the Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Butterfield proposed to the AAACES the establishment of a committee on extension work. In 1905 the AAACES established a standing Committee on Extension Work and Butterfield was named as its chairman. In 1906 the Committee on Extension Work provided a first report. Among other topics the report provided the first attempt at defining extension education. Among the documents in the Library of Congress Butterfield collection are draft outlines essentially identical to the definition provided in the Committee report.

"Extension teaching in agriculture embraces those forms of instruction, in subjects having to do with improved methods of agricultural production and with the general welfare of the rural population, that are offered to people not enrolled as resident pupils in educational institutions."

[Proceedings, AAACES, 1906]

In elaboration, four categories of extension work appropriate for the colleges to engage in were listed. These

included: (1) farmer's institutes, (2) itinerant lectures other than institutes, (3) literature and correspondence, and (4) field demonstrations, cooperative tests, exhibits, and the like. The report also noted as appropriate educational work with agricultural societies and other such organizations (suggesting the later connection with the Farm Bureau) and activities with boys and girls clubs. [Proceedings, AAACES, 1906]

Also in 1904, at the annual meeting of the AAACES, Butterfield (now President of the Rhode Island Agricultural and Mechanical College) presented a major seminal paper titled "The Social Phase of Agricultural Education." In this paper are contained several themes that recur regularly in subsequent years. They include his views relative to the field of rural social studies and the imperatives for the colleges of agriculture to encompass more than technical instruction in their courses of study. The paper also contains his clearly stated conviction of the need for the colleges to establish an expanded program of extension education. The following quotes are significant with respect to cooperative extension:

"Each agricultural college, therefore, should develop as rapidly as possible a definite tripartite organization that will reveal the college in its three-fold function - as an

organ of research, as an educator of students, and as a distributor of information to those who cannot come to the college."

and

" To carry out the function of the agricultural college, we need, finally, a vast enlargement of Extension work among farmers. This work will not only be dignified by a standing in the college coordinate with research and the teaching of students, but it will rank as a distinct department, with a faculty of men whose chief business is to teach the people who cannot come to the college." [Bliss, et.al. pages 78-79]

In 1905 the AAACES appointed the Land Grant College Extension Committee and named Butterfield as its chair. (He was to serve 2 three-year terms as chair.) In 1906 the committee in its report recommended (among others) that each college organize a department of extension teaching in agriculture of equal status with other departments or divisions, with a competent director and a corps of men at his disposal. If that was not possible, a faculty committee on extension teaching was suggested. [Bliss, et. al. page 82]

[In 1906 Butterfield accepted the Presidency of the Massachusetts Agricultural College.]

By 1907 the AAACES Committee on Extension reported that the agricultural colleges in 39 states were doing extension work. Much of this work was in connection with the farmers' Institutes. An Extension Section of the AAACES was created in 1909, moving the area of work to an equal status with the sections on resident instruction and research. The popularity and success of extension activities expanded rapidly during the first decade of the century. By 1912 it was reported that over 7,500 farmers' Institutes were held with a total attendance of more than 4 million persons.

While one gains the impression that not all the membership of the AAACES shared Butterfield's concept and commitment to extension education, there were other forces at work. The Hatch Act of 1887 had provided federal funding for expanded programs of agricultural research at the land-grant colleges. The steadily increasing productivity of the experiment station research and the acknowledged applied nature of that research was accompanied by increased public demand for the knowledge generated. Note is made of the demand for the "Farmers' Bulletins" published by the experiment stations and the increasingly heavy volume of correspondence from farmers and others seeking information.

In fact, the demands for extension work were found to

constitute an encroachment on the resources needed for resident instruction and research. Therefore, one of the arguments for the creation of the extension services was that it would free researchers to do more research rather than spend their valuable time responding to public demands. Thus, from the outset, extension's mission has been to be the intermediary by which research knowledge would be interpreted and transmitted to the ultimate users. [True, History of Agricultural Education page 279: AAACES Proceedings, 1906 and 1908, Appendices F and H.]

Thus, it is not surprising that the land-grant colleges began the quest for additional federal funding support for extension work. In 1908 Butterfield presented a report to the AAACES from the Committee on Extension, which he chaired. The following excerpt from that report clearly states the rationale for federal support for extension work.

"It is the belief of your committee that the chief means of stimulating the proper recognition and adequate organization of extension work in agriculture in our land-grant colleges is a federal appropriation for this work. We are quite aware of the objections that may be made to this proposition - that we already have too much federal supervision; that the federal treasury is inadequate to the demands made upon

it; that it is becoming too easy to rush to the federal government whenever money is desired for any public purpose; and that initiative should be left to the states. But there are fundamental reasons, so it seems to your committee, why we have a right, and, indeed a duty, to ask congress to appropriate money for this purpose. Extension work in the land-grant colleges differentiates itself sharply from research work on the one hand, and from the instruction of resident students on the other. There is little chance for argument on the proposition that the organization of resident instruction through the Morrill and Nelson Acts and the organization of research and experimentation through the Hatch and Adams Acts is chiefly responsible for the progress in agricultural education that has been made during the past few decades. It is true that a few individual states had recognized their obligations and opportunities before any of these acts were passed. But what has brought these types of work into well organized form, and what put them on a substantial foundation, was the federal appropriation. We can think of no argument that has ever applied or does now apply to federal appropriations for agricultural colleges and experiment stations that does not equally apply to extension work, which is organic and vital in the development of the functions of the institutions which we

represent." [Smith and Wilson pages 40-41]

The 1908 Report also contains significant wording concerning the proposed scope of extension work. It clearly reflects Butterfield's well documented concerns with social and economic aspects of rural life:

"We desire to record our belief that extension teaching should, at the very beginning, be put on the broadest basis, and that in the work of the extension department of the agricultural college there should be fully recognized the economic and social phases of agriculture and also that great untouched field for educational work, home life on the farm. We will never reach the heart of the rural problem until we at the land-grant colleges and experiment stations are prepared to be of assistance to the farmers and their families along the higher reaches of their own lives."

[Bliss, et. al. pages 83-84]

The 1908 statement suggested an appropriation of \$10,000 per state per year and this amount was contained in a proposal made to Congress in 1909. The Report of the Extension Committee also argued as follows: "It divides the responsibility between national and state governments and completes the circle of

national aid for the land grant colleges on principles already recognized in the two Morrill Acts, in the Nelson Act, in the Hatch Act, and in the Adams Act." [Bliss, et. al. , page 85]

In 1908 President Theodore Roosevelt appointed the Commission on Country Life. This five member panel included Butterfield, Liberty Hyde Bailey as Chair, Gifford Pinchot, Henry Wallace, and Walter Page. During the duration of the Commission Butterfield also served as chair of the AAACES Committee on Extension. It is not surprising that the Commission's report to Congress in 1909 contained language quite similar, if not identical, to earlier statements attributable to Butterfield. This similarity led Bliss, et.al. to conclude, "The wording of this statement is very similar to the wording of the extension committee reports and was probably written, or strongly influenced, by Dr. Butterfield." [Bliss, et.al. page 85]

Following are excerpts from the language of the Commission report:

"Each state college of agriculture should be empowered to organize as soon as practicable, a complete department of college extension, so managed as to reach every person on the land in its state, with both

information and inspiration. The work should include such forms of extension teaching as lectures, bulletins, reading courses, correspondence courses, demonstrations and other means of reaching the people at home and on their farms. It should be designed to forward not only the business of agriculture, but sanitation, education, home-making, and all interests of community life. ... We suggest the establishment of a nation-wide extension work. The first or original work of the agricultural branches of the land-grant college was academic in the old sense; later there was added the great field of experiment and research; there now should be added a third coordinate branch, comprising extension work, without which no college of agriculture can adequately serve its state. It is to the extension department of these colleges, if properly conducted, that we must now look for the most effective rousing of the people of the land." [Report of the Commission on Country Life]

In 1911 Butterfield completed his second three-year term as chair of the AAACES Extension Committee. However, it is clear that he left his "stamp" on the positions of the AAACES relative to extension work and the form that subsequent legislation would

take. The Proceedings of the AAACES contain his continued participation in discussions relating to extension work and he also testified in Congressional legislative hearings.

A Tangled Trail - The Legislative Evolution

Probably the logical starting point for the legislative history is with the McLaughlin bill. This bill originated in the draft that Butterfield and Hamilton prepared at the behest of the AAACES in 1909. This draft was in essence the recommendation and plans submitted by Butterfield's committee in 1908 and again in 1909. Essentially the intent of the legislation was to encourage and support extension departments in the land-grant agricultural colleges. Provisions included federal funding for extension work (contingent on state matching,) allowance for the possibility of the state dividing the funds among institutions, and extending the franking privilege to the colleges for extension materials. The colleges would be free of direct control from Washington over the development and implementation of programs tailored to the needs of farmers in their state and could use whatever teaching methods were deemed appropriate. Thus, the framers were obviously concerned that extension be locally administered, rather than from the federal level, and that extension work not be limited to such activities as institutes or demonstrations.

The draft fathered by Butterfield and Hamilton became the bill introduced by Congressman McLaughlin of Michigan in the House of Representatives in 1909. The McLaughlin bill did not get out of the House Agriculture Committee, but, at the same time, was not seriously opposed by the members of that committee. [Scott pages 292-93]

[A copy of the McLaughlin Bill is contained in an Appendix to this monograph.]

One of the problems at the time was some confusion resulting from a broader movement seeking federal funding for vocational education. In 1906, a bill had been introduced in both houses of Congress (the Pollard-Burkett Bill) that would provide federal funding to state normal schools for the training of teachers of agriculture, mechanic arts, home economics, and related subjects.

In 1907, Representative Davis introduced a bill to appropriate federal money to agricultural high schools for instruction in agriculture and home economics, and to the states for establishment of branch experiment stations. In 1909, another version of the Davis bill would have included funding for the state normal schools as proposed in the earlier Pollard-Burkett Bill. In 1910, Senator Dolliver introduced two bills, one essentially the same as the McLaughlin Bill and the other was for vocational agriculture education. After debate, it was decided

that the two bills should be combined. This was done, and although there was broad support from a spectrum of interest groups, the bill was not passed by Congress.

At hearings on both the McLaughlin and Dolliver bills, a number of representatives from the land-grant community testified. Three general arguments in support of federal funding were offered:

1. that maintenance of the national food supply was a serious problem for all citizens of the country;
2. that migration of people off the farms to the city tended to leave in the country people who needed most the information and assistance land-grant college extension could provide if more funding was available;
3. that the federal government, through its methods of taxation, was in a position to aid the states in financing extension work.

Butterfield, on behalf of the Committee on Extension, presented a memorandum in support of the McLaughlin Bill. The advantages were cited as follows:

1. It would stimulate national interest for agricultural education.

2. It would help people in poor, small, or backward states to improve their condition relative to more progressive and wealthy states.
3. It would give the extension movement a degree of national direction.
4. It would let the states define and develop their own programs.
5. It would include womens' work.
6. It would establish a central office in each state which would more closely link the colleges and experiment stations to the people and their needs.
7. It would relieve the pressure on the experiment stations to conduct extension work.
8. It would complete the circle of financial aid to the agricultural colleges begun with the 1862 Morrill Act and the Hatch Act of 1887. [True, 1928, page 104]

Dolliver died late in 1910 and Senator Page of Vermont continued the effort to win passage of federal funding for vocational education and extension through the period 1911 to 1913. Interestingly, one of the bills during this time, which failed to win approval, was introduced by William McKinley and would have expanded Seaman Knapp's work to a national basis with control being based with the state agricultural colleges. [Scott

pages 292-295]

Probably a major reason for the failure of most of these bills to win approval was the active opposition of the AAACES. It was the strong belief of spokesmen for the Association that proposals for federal aid to extension and vocational education should be separate. In 1910, and again in 1922, the Association went on record as being opposed to the two propositions being contained in a single bill. [Scott, pages 296-97]

In 1911, a group of representatives from the AAACES, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, H.H. Gross of the National Soil Fertility League, and Representative Lever of South Carolina met to draft a version that all could support. The resulting bill was introduced in 1912 in the House by Representative Asbury Lever of South Carolina, and in the Senate by Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia. [Scott, page 299]

The Soil Fertility League headed by Mr. Gross numbered several prominent industrialists and agriculturists in their membership and on their Board. Letters from Mr. Gross to Dr. Butterfield may be found in the Butterfield papers in the University of Massachusetts Library archives. Mr. Gross expresses great concern in these letters that extension education

not come under the control of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He argued that direction from the federal level would lead extension work to become politically motivated, lose the mission of education based on research knowledge, and become an instrument of government policy and patronage. In the debates and testimony on the extension bills, the Soil Fertility League was a powerful ally of Butterfield and the AAACES.

The House Committee on Agriculture reported out favorably the Lever Bill, with only minor amendments. The bill authorized agricultural colleges to create extension departments, allowed the states to designate the institutions to administer the program, defined the educational purposes of extension, provided an annual grant of \$10,000 to each state, and would appropriate an additional amount of \$300,000 initially, and \$3,000,000 over ten years to be made on a matching basis and allocated by a formula based on rural population relative to total population. The Committee was impressed by the success of Seaman Knapp's work and added an amendment that stipulated that 75 percent of monies available under the act should be expended for field instruction and demonstration. [Scott, pages 299-300]

Hearings on the Smith and Lever bills were held in early 1912. A number of representatives from the land-grant college

community testified, as did representatives of the National Grange, the Soil Fertility League, the American Bankers' Association, and the presidents of several agricultural colleges, including President Butterfield of the Massachusetts Agricultural College. [True, 1928, page 108]

Butterfield's statement at the hearings offers an additional rationale for extension education of farmers and federal support of those activities. In fact, it could be offered today. He identified as a major issue the problem of conserving the soil resources as a necessary condition for maintaining soil fertility and the productive capacity of agriculture. "Absolutely the only way we can expect or hope to conserve the soil fertility of this country is to conserve the intelligence of the great masses of people who till the soil. That means that every man must be reached. ... It seems to me that this is the real argument for federal aid: that the only way by which we can conserve our soil resources is to educate the people on the land." [Butterfield, Hearing Record, February 29, 1912, pages 110-111]

The House passed the Lever Bill in August 1912, and it was sent to the Senate. However, in January of 1913, Senator Page introduced a substitute bill which revived the concept of combining vocational education and extension work in the same

funding appropriation, which was accepted on a close vote in the Senate. In the House-Senate conference committee, House members refused to accept the Senate version and the bill died for that session. [Scott, page 301]

In the spring of 1913, Lever and Smith reintroduced their respective bills in the House and Senate. Now, however, there occurred some opposition from those who questioned the potential duplication by the colleges of the demonstration work conducted by the Department of Agriculture that had proven so successful under the direction of Seaman Knapp. Further, battle lines had been joined between the advocates of the farmer cooperator demonstration and county agent systems of Knapp and the more formal lecture, conference, study clubs, and experimental plot demonstrations advocated by the AAACES Extension Committee. The colleges were wary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and federal control in general. The advocates of a federally directed system believed that the colleges' extension programs were relatively ineffective, that Knapp's work was vastly superior in demonstrating to farmers the value of improved practices, and that agents placed in the counties/communities were the best method of contacting farmers and providing information. [Scott, pages 304-305]

[As time has passed it is clear that the extension system evolved as a combination of the two approaches. That is, the county agent concept was embraced, and both demonstration and field plot work are common elements of extension programs today.]

In the spring of 1913, the executive committee of the AAACES met with Secretary of Agriculture David Houston to seek agreement on the form of legislation that would be acceptable to both camps. They came to an agreement as follows:

1. They agreed that a federal appropriation was needed.
2. It was agreed that extension work in a state should be directly administered by the agricultural college in the state.
3. It was agreed that extension projects supported by federal funding should be mutually accepted by the college and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
4. No cooperative arrangement for extension work would be made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture with any corporation or commercial concern. However, such entities could donate funds to be used by the colleges in consultation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. [Scott, page 307]

{Point 4. in the above outline was almost certainly a reaction to the clandestine arrangement of the Board on Education and Rockefeller with the U.S. Department of Agriculture that supported Knapp's demonstration work in the south and which was resented by the land-grant colleges.}

In the fall of 1913, Lever introduced a revised version which incorporated changes that met the criteria noted above. Emphasis in the new bill was placed on the "cooperative" relationship between the colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture in extension work. Secretary Houston supported this bill and, in fact, stated that only the colleges were equipped to manage the work (in response to suggestions that some portion of funding be made available to state boards or departments of agriculture). [Scott, page 308]

A review of the record of debates on the Smith-Lever Bills of 1912 through 1914, shows that most of the debate centered on two issues: (1) the formula to be used in apportioning additional monies to the states, and (2) a more basic philosophical question of whether this form of support should be provided to one profession (farming) and not to carpenters, bricklayers, and other professions.

At this point the legislation moved quickly. The House passed the Lever bill on January 19 of 1914. The Senate accepted the Lever version of the bill on February 7. President Wilson signed it on May 8, 1914. [Scott, pages 309-310]

A copy of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 is included as an appendix to this monograph. Also in an appendix is a side-by-side comparison of the provisions of the McLaughlin Bill and the Smith-Lever Act. This comparison shows rather clearly that the essence of the legislative intent of Butterfield, as embodied in the McLaughlin Bill, remained intact in the Smith-Lever Act passed some five years later.

A POSTHUMOUS PERSPECTIVE

"Henry Goodell was succeeded in 1905 by the last of the ardent agriculturists, young Kenyon Butterfield of Michigan. He quickly introduced extension courses for area farmers and began a practical two-year program in agriculture which, in 1928, was institutionalized as the Stockbridge School. Butterfield revamped the curriculum to include courses with titles such as "Agricultural Economics", "Rural Home Life", "Rural Journalism", and even "Rural Sociology". ...

Butterfield returned to Michigan in 1924, and "Mass Aggie" began its slow, halting, but irresistible drift toward a broad based liberal arts curriculum." [125_
Years Pioneering in the Public Interest", University of
Massachusetts.]

The somewhat revisionist view expressed in the above quotation does a disservice to Kenyon Butterfield's contributions to both the University of Massachusetts and the land-grant system. In fact, during Butterfield's 18 year tenure at the Massachusetts Agricultural College the institution changed in profound ways that marked the beginnings of the evolution toward the Commonwealth's major public university. During this period the number of faculty quadrupled, a graduate school was organized and the number of graduate students increased from 7 in 1908 to 73 in 1926. In 1906 the college had 250 undergraduates, by 1916 there were nearly 600. The curriculum expanded from a set of largely vocational courses oriented to future farmers, to include the additional depth and breadth in the natural sciences needed by future researchers. As noted above, he can certainly be credited with initiating courses in the social sciences. And his efforts on behalf of cooperative extension are clearly documented.

For those revisionists who would fault Butterfield's modest attention to the humanities and arts it seems necessary to recall that he was appointed to the presidency of an agricultural college. By all accounts he functioned magnificently in that role. His avowed purpose upon accepting the appointment was to help develop a quality institution that would study and teach the fundamental sciences bearing on agriculture in its broadest context, that would educate both future farmers and leaders in the various agriculturally related professions, and that would disseminate information to the people of the Commonwealth who were not resident students of the college. He defined the scope of the agricultural colleges as embracing the entire field of food supply, including production, distribution, consumption and preservation, and the general welfare of the rural population. He urged that the college strive to provide an educational experience that was **"educative, broadening, cultural - to give instruction in the natural and social sciences so that it will yield that discipline and liberal training that belongs to the educated man."** [Butterfield, 1906, p.26]

By 1911 Butterfield had organized the faculty of 23 departments into several divisions. These divisions were: agriculture, humanities, horticulture, natural sciences, and rural social science. The faculties in the natural sciences,

horticulture, and agriculture, already capable, continued to strengthen the curriculum and expand research. The humanities division included the departments of languages and literature, a department of economics, and another of history and government. The English department, in particular, grew substantially in faculty and courses offered in the decade from 1910 to 1920. However, there was only modest growth in foreign languages and the arts. The new division of rural social sciences, Butterfield's own area of specialty, included the departments of agricultural economics, agricultural education, and rural sociology. It is noted that by 1916, only 10 years after Butterfield assumed the Presidency, the college offered a total of 275 courses to its students. [Cary, page 124]

Among Butterfield's innovations in extension work was a program which would be called today "community economic development". He appointed an extension agent as a rural development specialist whose assignment was to assist local communities in solving their problems whether they involved water supply, schools, new industries, or other issues affecting the welfare of people in the community. It is significant to point out to those who fault Butterfield for insufficient attention to the arts and humanities that even this work came under severe criticism from the Board on Agriculture and many farm leaders who

felt that extension work should be limited to education on crop production and livestock husbandry, and, in fact, was regarded by some as a misappropriation of funds. There is on record the proceedings of a series of hearings on this topic. [Commission on Investigation of Agricultural Education, 1916-17]

The outbreak of World War One halted the rapid expansion of the college experienced from 1906 to 1916. Large numbers of students had enlisted as well as some faculty. Many returned to the farm to assist in food production for the war effort. Only 118 freshmen enrolled for the fall semester of 1917. The senior class was half the size of the previous year. [Cary, page 131]

The period immediately following the end of the war was difficult. Not only had student enrollments dropped but changes in the state government occurred that drastically affected the autonomy of the college and the authority of its president. In 1918 the legislature terminated the college charter and established the College as an administrative unit of the state government. The college was placed under the direction of the commissioner of education. A new state budget system was instituted which established a line item budget which deprived the college administration of flexibility in management of funds. The states Supervisor of Administration exercised control over

appointments, titles, duties, qualifications, and publication specifications. Butterfield struggled with this system and experienced increasing frustration until in 1924, when he resigned to accept the Presidency of the Michigan Agricultural College. [Cary, page 141-143]

Butterfield's letter of resignation to the College Trustees contains the following statement:

"For nearly five years I have been compelled to work under a system of State House control which, as applied to the College, I regard as wholly unsound in principle, in practice highly detrimental to efficiency and true economy, as well as seriously discouraging to my co-workers on the staff. ... The Commonwealth must decide very soon whether it wishes a first rate or a third rate college on this campus. I am certain that the College can never be maintained at a high point of efficiency, much less develop as it should, until your Board (of Trustees) once more has full authority." [Butterfield, May 16, 1924]

In a testimonial to Butterfield marking his departure from the Massachusetts Agricultural College the following appears:

"For twenty-five years he was recognized as one of the outstanding leaders and prophets in the field of rural affairs. He was one of the first to advocate and plan for a nation wide system of Extension Service; he was one of the first to see the problem of the farmer as one not primarily of production but as one of distribution. Moreover, he constantly stresses the fact that the rural problem is essentially a human problem and that the social conditions of the rural people are a significant and important factor. ... We are now too close to the administration of this great leader to be able adequately to evaluate his service to the college or to society. Future historians will accord him his permanent place in the development of American Life. But without hesitation, we may characterize President Butterfield as a man of wide vision and of able leadership; a wise administrator and builder; a man of rare personal charm with firm moral convictions and high ideals; a champion of the individual, and an advocate of all good causes."

[Ralph J. Watts, 1926 Index, University of Massachusetts]

A Summary of the Butterfield Legacy to the Land-Grant Colleges

Rural Social Sciences:

- * In his 1904 paper "The Social Phase of Agricultural Education", Butterfield called for expanded attention to the rural social sciences by the agricultural colleges.
- * In 1904 Butterfield first exposed his outlines for courses in agricultural economics and rural sociology at the St. Louis Exposition and in papers for the Office of Experiment Stations, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- * In 1911 the Committee on Instruction of the American Farm Management Association adopted Butterfield's divisions for disciplinary study as a basis for making the distinctions between agricultural economic, farm management, and rural sociology that endure to this time.
- * Taught Rural Sociology at the University of Michigan in 1902 and both Rural Economics and Rural Sociology at the Rhode Island Agricultural College.
- * Appointed a Professorship in Rural Sociology in 1906, and formed a Division of Rural Social Sciences at the Massachusetts Agricultural College in 1911.

- * There is documentary evidence that Butterfield's peers regarded him, and the Massachusetts Agricultural College, as providing national leadership in the development of the rural social sciences.

The Smith-Lever Extension Act of 1914

- * First proposed federal pecuniary support of extension work in 1897.
- * In 1899 proposed the naming of a committee to confer with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in order to develop a plan for encouraging farmer's institutes and agricultural college extension.
- * In his seminal 1904 paper "The Social Phase of Agricultural Education", Butterfield called for "...a vast enlargement of extension work among farmers..." by the land-grant colleges "...dignified by a standing in the college coordinate with research and teaching of students...".
- * Urged the AAACES to establish a "Committee on Extension Work" which was named in 1905 with Butterfield as Chair.
- * In 1906, as Chair of the AAACES Committee on Extension Work, Butterfield presented a report defining a

taxonomy of extension work and recommending the establishment of a department of extension teaching in each land-grant college "commensurate with other

departments or divisions". This recommendation was repeated in the 1907 report.

- * In 1908, as Chair of the AAACES Committee on Extension work, presented a report recommending the establishment of extension work in each land-grant institution and urging federal support for this purpose.
- * In 1909, Butterfield and Hamilton, at the behest of the AAACES drafted a bill subsequently introduced by Congressman McLaughlin in the U.S. House of Representatives. Butterfield offered testimony in support. It was not acted upon.
- * In 1910 Senator Dolliver introduced a bill essentially the same as the McLaughlin bill. Butterfield offered testimony in support. It was not acted on.
- * Over the period 1910-14 several bills relating to extension were introduced and debated in the Congress. Butterfield offered testimony, particularly in support of the bills offered by Congressman Lever and Senator Smith.
- * In 1914 the Smith-Lever Act was passed by Congress and signed by the President. This Act contains essentially those features advocated by Butterfield over the preceding decade and has significant similarity to the McLaughlin bill that Butterfield helped draft.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations (AAACES), Proceedings, 1896 - 1913. (The author of this monograph located a complete set of these Proceedings at the offices of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC.)
- Bailey, Joseph C., "Seaman A. Knapp - Schoolmaster of American Agriculture", Columbia University Press, New York, 1945
- Beal, W.J., "History of the Michigan Agricultural College and Biographical Sketches". Published by the Agricultural College, East Lansing, MI, Wynkoop, Hallenbeck Crawford Co. Printers, 1915
- Blauch, Lloyd E., "Federal Cooperation in Agricultural Extension Work, Vocational Education and Vocational Rehabilitation", U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1935
- Bliss, R.K., et.al., "The Spirit and Philosophy of Extension Work", Graduate School, U.S. Department of Agriculture and Epsilon Sigma Phi, Washington, D.C., 1952
- Brunner, Edmund des. and E. Hsin Pao Yang, "Rural America and the Extension Service", Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1949
- Butterfield, K.L., "Inaugural Address" October 17, 1906
- Butterfield, K.L., "The Family", Published for the American Sociological Society by the University of Chicago Press, 1909
- Butterfield, K. L., "Report on Rural Conditions and Sociological Problems in South Africa", Carnegie Corporation, New York, 1929
- Butterfield, K.L., "The Rural Mission of the Church in Eastern Asia", International Missionary Council, New York, 1931
- Butterfield, K.L., "The Farmer and the New Day", The MacMillan Co., New York, Microbook Library of American Civilization, 1902
- Butterfield, K.L., "Education and Chinese Agriculture", China

Christian Education Association, Christian Monographs
#1, 1922

Butterfield, K.L., "The Country Church and the Rural Problem",
The Carew Lectures, The University of Chicago Press,
1911

Butterfield, K.L., "The Christian Mission in Rural India", The
International Missionary Council, New York, 1930

Butterfield, K.L., "The Christian Enterprise Among Rural People",
Cokesbury Press, Nashville, 1933

Butterfield, K.L., "Chapters in Rural Progress", University of
Chicago Press, 1913

Butterfield, K.L., "Chapters in Rural Progress", University of
Chicago Press, 1908

Butterfield, K.L., "Address Delivered at the Dedication of the
Agricultural High School at Petersham, MA", George H.
Ellis Co. Printers, Boston, 1909

Butterfield, K.L., "Letter of Resignation", May 16, 1924.
University of Massachusetts Archives. Amherst

Butterfield Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Cary, Harold Whiting, "The University of Massachusetts - A
History of One Hundred years", University of Massachusetts,
Amherst, 1962

Caswell, L.B., "Brief History of the Massachusetts Agricultural
College - Semicentennial, 1917", F.A. Bassette Co. Printers,
Springfield, MA, 1917

Hamilton, John (ed.), "College Extension in Agriculture", U.S.
Government Printing Office, Washington, 1910

Kelsey, Lincoln D. and C.C. Hearne, "Cooperative extension Work",
Comstock Publishing Associates, Ithaca, NY, 1955

Kirkpatrick, John E. K.L. Butterfield, et.al. "College Control in
Michigan", The Antioc Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1929

Kuhn, Madison, "Michigan State - The First Hundred Years", The
Michigan State University Press, East Lansing, 1955

- Martin, O.B. "The Demonstration Work - Dr. Seaman A. Knapp's Contribution to Civilization", The Stratford Co. Boston, 1921
- Rasmussen, Wayne D., "Taking the University to the People - Seventy-Five Years of Cooperative Extension, Iowa State University Press, Ames IA, 1989
- Robbins, Hayes, "The Labor Movement and the Farmer" , Series Title "The farmers Bookshelf" edited by K.L. Butterfield. Harcourt Brace and Co., New York ca. 1922
- Scott, Roy V. , "The Reluctant Farmer - The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914", University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1970
- Smith, Clarence B. and Meredith Wilson, "The Agricultural Extension System of the United States", John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1930
- True, Alfred C., "A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785-1923", U.S. Department of Agriculture Miscellaneous Publication Number 15, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1928
- True, Alfred C., "A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785-1925", U.S. Department of Agriculture Miscellaneous Publication Number 36, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1929
- University of Massachusetts Cooperative Extension Service, "A History of Sixty Years of Cooperative Extension Service in Massachusetts", The Epsilon Sigma Phi, Amherst, 1973

KENYON LEECH BUTTERFIELD

BIOGRAPHICAL CHRONOLOGY

(Courtesy of University of Massachusetts Archives, Library of Congress, Massachusetts Agricultural College Yearbooks, and a variety of other references)

- 1868 Born June 11, at Lapeer, Michigan to Ira H. Jr. and Olive Butterfield.
- 1891 Graduated from Michigan Agricultural College with B.S. degree, head of class.
- 1891-1892 Assistant Secretary, Michigan Agricultural College
- 1892-1896 Editor of the Michigan Grange Newspaper - The Grange Visitor.
- 1893-1903 Editor, Grange Department of the Michigan Farmer
- 1895 Married Harriet Millard of Lapeer, Michigan.
- 1895-1899 Superintendent, Michigan Farmer's Institute, and field agent, Michigan Agricultural College.
- 1897 Butterfield first proposed pecuniary aid by the national government to land-grant colleges for agricultural extension work at a meeting of the American Association of farmer's Institute Workers in Columbus Ohio, October 27-28.
- 1898 Butterfield recommended the creation of an Extension department at the Michigan Agricultural College.
- 1899 Butterfield proposed naming a committee to confer with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in order to develop a plan to encourage farmer's institutes and agricultural college extension.
- 1900-1902 Graduate study, University of Michigan.
- 1902 Earned A.M. degree, University of Michigan, Instructor in Rural Sociology.
- 1903-1906 President, Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. Taught first course in rural

- sociology offered at a land-grant college. Presented an outline for a course in rural sociology to the Office of Experiment Stations in 1904. Urged the study of "Rural Social Science" to include both agricultural economics and rural sociology.
- 1904 Appointed Collaborator in Charge, Agricultural Division, Department of Economics and Sociology, Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1904-16
- 1905 A "Committee on Extension Work" was established as a standing committee of the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations with Butterfield as Chair. He was responsible for a resolution advocating an appropriation to the Office of experiment Stations for assisting in organizing more effective agricultural extension teaching.
- 1906-1924 President, Massachusetts Agricultural College.
- 1906 Professorship in Rural Sociology created at the Massachusetts Agricultural College.
- 1908 Appointed to Country Life Commission by President Theodore Roosevelt; Chapters in Rural Progress published. Chair of AAACES Committee on Extension which presented a report recommending the establishment of extension work in each land-grant institution and urged federal support for the purpose of carrying on extension work in agriculture.
- 1909 Carew Lecturer, Hartford Theological Seminary. A bill drafted under the leadership of Butterfield was introduced in Congress which would provide an annual appropriation to the land-grant institutions for the purpose of carrying on extension work.
- 1910-19 Member, Massachusetts Homestead Commission
- 1910 Honorary LL.D., Amherst College; The Country Church and the Rural Problem published.
- 1911 A Division of Rural Social Science established at the Massachusetts Agricultural College.

1913 Appointed to Commission for the Study of Agricultural Credit and Cooperation in Europe by President Woodrow Wilson. Served as First Vice-Chairman and Acting Chairman.

1913 First agricultural agent hired by the Massachusetts Agricultural College to provide state-wide programs of education and information for farmers.

1913-18 President, Massachusetts Federation for Rural Progress

1917 Chairman, Massachusetts Food Supply Commission.

1917 President, Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations.

1918 Chairman, National Service Commission Congregational Council

1918-1919 Member, U.S. Army Educational Commission; Educational Director, American Expeditionary Forces.

1919 The Farmer and the New Day published.

1919 Elected president of the American Country Life Association.

1919 Elected president of the World Agriculture Society.

1921 Honorary LL.D., from Rhode Island State College.

1921-22 Member, Burton Commission on Christian Education in China.

1921-22 Member, China Agricultural Commission.

1922 Education and Chinese Agriculture published.

1923 A Christian Program for the Rural Community published.

1924 Named President of the Michigan Agricultural College.

- 1924-28 President of the Michigan Agricultural College.
- 1929 Report on "Rural Conditions and Sociological Problems in South Africa" published by the Carnegie Foundation.
- 1930 The Christian Mission in Rural India published by the International Missionary Council.
- 1931 The Christian Mission of the Church in Rural Asia published by the International Missionary Council.
- 1933 The Christian Enterprise Among Rural People published.
- 1935 Died November 26 in Amherst, Massachusetts.

Honors, Etc.

President, Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts
and Professor of Political Economy and Rural Sociology

President, Massachusetts Agricultural College and Head of the
Division of Rural Social Science

Collaborator in Charge of Agricultural Division, Department of
Economics and Sociology, Carnegie Institute of Washington,
1904-16

President, Michigan Agricultural College

LL.D., Amherst College

LL.D., Rhode Island State College

Appointment to Country Life Commission by President Theodore
Roosevelt

President, American Country Life Association

President, World Agriculture Society

President, American Association of Agricultural Colleges and
Experiment Stations

President, New England Association of Federal-State Colleges and
Universities

Member, Department of Immigration, National Civic Federation

Advisory Committee of the National Agricultural Committee, Near
East Relief

Vice President of the American Board of Commissioners for
Foreign Missions

Medal, International Congress of Arts and Sciences

Medal, France 1919, "Officer of Agricultural Excellence and
Public Instruction"

Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Chairman, New England Research Council on Agriculture and Food
Supply

Member, National Institute of Social Science; New York Academy of
Political Science; American Academy of Political and Social
Science; American Economic Association; American
Sociological Society; League of Nations, etc.

APPENDIX A

H.R. 15422, Sixty-first Congress, second session.
Introduced by Congressman McLaughlin of Michigan
December 15, 1909

[The provisions contained in this bill are attributed to President Butterfield of the Massachusetts Agricultural College and John Hamilton, farmers' institute specialist, United States Department of Agriculture.]

A BILL For increase of appropriation to agricultural colleges for extension work.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to be paid as hereinafter provided to each State and Territory, for the more complete endowment and maintenance of agricultural colleges now established or which may hereafter be established in accordance with the act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and the acts of Congress approved August thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety, and March fourth, nineteen hundred and seven, the sum of ten thousand dollars, in addition to the sum named in the said acts for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and ten, and a like amount annually thereafter, to be applied by these colleges in giving instruction and demonstrations in agriculture, home economics, and similar lines of activity to persons not resident in these colleges in the several communities, as may be provided by the States accepting the provisions of this act, and in conveying and imparting to such persons information with reference to the improvement of rural life.

Sec. 2. That at any time after two years from the date on which any State or Territory has accepted the appropriation made by this act and has actually organized a separate and distinct department of extension work in connection with and as a part of its agricultural college there shall be available from the National treasury, in addition to the ten thousand dollars herein appropriated for the purposes named in this act, an amount of money for each State and Territory equal to the amount appropriated by the State or Territory to its agricultural colleges for the current year for extension work. *Provided, That the additional appropriation to any State or Territory shall not exceed an amount equal to one cent per capita of the total population of the State or Territory as shown by the last United*

States census.

Sec. 3. That all printed matter issued from the agricultural colleges for the furtherance of extension work, as provided in this act, shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States and dependencies free of charge for postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may from time to time prescribe.

Sec. 4. That the sums hereby appropriated to the States and Territories for extension work shall be annually paid in equal quarterly payments on the first day of January, April, July, and October of each year by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture, out of the Treasury of the United States, to the treasurer or other officer duly appointed by the governing boards of said colleges to receive the same, and such officer shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture, on or before the first day of September of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year and of its disbursement on schedules provided by the Secretary of Agriculture. The grants of money authorized by this act are made subject to the legislative assent of the several States and Territories to the purpose of said grants; *Provided*, That payment of such installments of the appropriation herein made as shall become due to any State or Territory before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made upon assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 5. That no money shall be paid out under this act to any State or territory for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students, but the establishment and maintenance of such college separately for white and colored students shall be held to be a compliance with the provisions of this act if the funds in such State or Territory be equitably divided as hereinafter set forth: *Provided*, That in any State in which there has been one college established in pursuance of the act of July 2, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and also in which an educational institution of like character has been established, or may be hereafter established, and is now aided by such State from its own revenue for the education of colored students in agriculture and the mechanic arts, however named or styled, or whether or not it has received money heretofore under the act to which this act is an amendment, the legislative branch of such State may propose and report to the Secretary of Agriculture a just and equitable division of the fund to be received under this

act, between one college for white students and one institution for colored students, established as aforesaid, which shall be divided into two parts and paid accordingly, and thereupon such institution for colored students shall be entitled to the benefits of this act and subject to its provisions, as much as it would have been if it had been included under the act of eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and the fulfillment of the foregoing provisions shall be taken as a compliance with the provisions with reference to separate colleges for white and colored students.

Sec. 6. That if any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State or Territory for the further and more complete endowment, support and maintenance of agricultural colleges 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 or Territory to which it belongs, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to such State or Territory, and no portion of said moneys exceeding five per centum of each annual appropriation shall be applied, directly or indirectly, under any pretense whatever, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or to the purchase or rental of land. It shall be the duty of each of said colleges annually, on or before the first day of January, to make to the Governor of the state or Territory in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in the direction of 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 by each of said colleges to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 7. That on or before the first day of July in each year, after the passage of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury as to each State and Territory whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for colleges or of institutions for colored students under this act, and the amount which thereupon each is entitled, respectively, to receive. If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold a certificate from any State or Territory of its 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 close of the next Congress; in order that the State or Territory 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. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby charged with the proper administration of this law.

Sec. 8. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make annual report to Congress of the receipts and expenditures and work of the institutions in all of the States and Territories receiving the benefits of this act, and also whether the appropriation of any State or Territory has been withheld, and, if so, the reason therefor.

Sec. 9. That Congress may at any time annul, suspend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this act.

APPENDIX B

SMITH-LEVER ACT

Smith-Lever agricultural extension act. Sixty-third Congress, H.R. 7951. May 8, 1914.

[Bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Asbury Lever of South Carolina and in the Senate by Hoke Smith of Georgia.]

An Act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That 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 inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State 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 the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts" (Twelfth Statutes at Large, page five hundred and three), and of an Act of Congress approved August thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety (Twenty-sixth Statutes at Large, page four hundred and seventeen and chapter eight hundred and forty-one), agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture: Provided, That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established the appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be administered by such

college or colleges as the legislature of such State may direct: Provided further, That, pending the inauguration and development of the cooperative extension work herein authorized, nothing in this Act shall be construed to discontinue either the farm management work or the farmers' cooperative demonstration work as now conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 2. That cooperative agricultural extension 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; 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 receiving the benefits of this Act.

Sec. 3. That for the purpose of paying the expenses of said cooperative extension work and the necessary printing and distributing of information in connection with the same, there is permanently appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$480,000 for each year, \$10,000 of which shall be paid annually in the manner hereinafter provided, to each State which shall by action of its legislature assent to the provisions of this Act: Provided, That payment of such installments of the appropriation hereinbefore made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this Act may, in the absence of prior legislative assent be made upon the assent of the governor thereof duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury: Provided further, That there is also appropriated an additional sum of \$600,000 for the fiscal year following that in which the foregoing appropriation first becomes available, and for each year thereafter for seven years a sum exceeding by \$500,000 the sum appropriated for each preceding year, and for each year thereafter there is permanently appropriated for each year the sum of \$4,100,000 in addition to the sum of \$480,000 hereinbefore provided: Provided further, That before the funds herein appropriated 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 such college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such additional sums shall be used only for the purposes hereinbefore stated, and shall be allotted annually to each State by the Secretary of Agriculture and paid in the manner hereinbefore provided, in the proportion which the rural population of each

State bears to the total rural population of all the States as determined by the next preceding Federal census: Provided further, That no payment out of the addition appropriations herein provided shall be made in any year to any State until an equal sum has been appropriated for that year by the legislature of such State, or provided by State, county, college, local authority, or individual contributions from within the State, for the maintenance of the cooperative agricultural extension work provided for in this Act.

Sec. 4. That the sums hereby appropriated for extension work shall be paid in equal semiannual payments on the first day of January and July of each year by the Secretary of the treasury upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture, out of the Treasury of the United States, 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 before the first day of September of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year, and of its disbursement, on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 5. That if any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State for the support and maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension works, 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 to which it belongs, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to said State, and 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 colleges, promoting agricultural trains, or any other purpose not specified in this Act, and not more than five per centum of each annual appropriation shall be applied to the printing and distributions of publications. It shall be the duty of each of said colleges annually, on or before the first day of January, to make to the governor of the State in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in the direction of 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 and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 6. That on or before the first day of July in each year after the passage of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture

shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury 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. If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold a certificate from any State or its 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 any State from which a certificate has 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.

Sec. 7. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make an annual report to Congress of the receipts, expenditures, and results of the cooperative agricultural extension work in all of the states receiving the benefits of this Act, and also whether the appropriation of any State has been withheld; and if so, the reasons therefor.

Sec. 8. That Congress may at any time alter, amend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this Act.

APPENDIX C

COMPARING THE SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF THE MCLAUGHLIN BILL OF 1909 WITH THE SMITH-LEVER ACT OF 1914

McLaughlin Bill

H.R. 15422, Sixty-first Congress, second session.
Introduced by Congressman
McLaughlin of Michigan
December 15, 1909

Smith-Lever Act

Smith-Lever agricultural extension act. Sixty-third Congress, H.R. 7951. May 8, 1914. Bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Asbury Lever of South Carolina and in the Senate by Hoke Smith of Georgia.

[The provisions contained in this bill are attributed to President Butterfield of the Massachusetts Agricultural College and John Hamilton, farmers' institute specialist, United States Department of Agriculture.]

A BILL For increase of appropriation to agricultural colleges for extension work.

An Act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto.

[While the short titles of the bills do not always convey the full intent of the proposed legislation, it is worth noting that the wording of the McLaughlin Bill calls for an increase in appropriation to agricultural colleges for extension work, the Senate title appears to have the purpose of establishing cooperative extension work as a function of the land grant college.]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United

States

States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to be paid as hereinafter provided to each State and Territory, for the more complete endowment and maintenance of agricultural colleges now established or which may hereafter be established in accordance with the act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and the acts of Congress approved August thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety, and March fourth, nineteen hundred and seven, the sum of ten thousand dollars, in addition to the sum named in the said acts for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and ten, and a like amount annually thereafter, to be applied by these colleges in giving instruction and demonstrations in agriculture, home economics, and similar lines of activity to persons not resident in these colleges in the several communities, as may be provided by the States accepting the provisions of this act, and in conveying and imparting to such persons information with reference to the improvement of rural life.

of America in Congress assembled, That 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 inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State 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 the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts" (Twelfth Statutes at Large, page five hundred and three), and of an Act of Congress approved August thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety (Twenty-sixth Statutes at Large, page four hundred and seventeen and chapter eight hundred and forty-one), agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture: Provided, That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established the appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State may direct: Proved further, That, pending the inauguration and development of the cooperative extension work herein authorized, nothing in this Act shall be

construed to discontinue either the farm management work or the farmers' cooperative demonstration work as now conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

[The McLaughlin Bill would appropriate \$10,000 annually to be given to the land grant college in State or Territory to be used "for instruction and demonstrations in agriculture, home economics, and similar lines of activity to persons not resident in these colleges... " and in "conveying and imparting to such persons information with reference to the improvement of rural life." This virtually identical language appears in Section 2 of the Smith-Lever Act.

The Smith-Lever Act states the purpose as follows: "That 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." Of some significance is the fact that Smith-Lever requires that the work be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. Further, the Smith-Lever Act states that passage "shall not be construed to discontinue either the farm management work or the farmers' cooperative demonstration work" of the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture.]

Sec. 2. That at any time after two years from the date on which any State or Territory has accepted the appropriation made by this act and has actually organized a separate and distinct department of extension work in connection with and as a part of its agricultural college there shall be available from the National treasury, in addition to the ten thousand dollars herein appropriated for the purposes named in this act, an amount of money for each State and Territory equal to the

Sec. 2. That cooperative agricultural extension 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; and this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State

amount appropriated by the State or Territory to its agricultural colleges for the current year for extension work. *Provided*, That the additional appropriation to any State or Territory shall not exceed an amount equal to one cent per capita of the total population of the State or Territory as shown by the last United States census.

agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of this Act.

[Section 2 of the McLaughlin Bill deals with the base appropriation amount of \$10,000 and the formula for distribution of additional appropriations.]

Section 2 of Smith-Lever begins by defining the nature of extension work, using much the same language as in Section 1 of the McLaughlin Bill. In addition, there is the requirement that the work in the State must be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the land grant agricultural college.]

Sec. 3. That all printed matter issued from the agricultural colleges for the furtherance of extension work, as provided in this act, shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States and dependencies free of charge for postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may from time to time prescribe.

Sec. 3. That for the purpose of paying the expenses of said cooperative extension work and the necessary printing and distributing of information in connection with the same, there is permanently appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$480,000 for each year, \$10,000 of which shall be paid annually in the manner hereinafter provided, to each State which shall by action of its legislature assent to the provisions of this Act: Provided, That payment of such installments of the appropriation hereinbefore made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this Act may, in the absence of prior legislative assent be made upon the assent of the governor thereof duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury: Provided further, That there is also appropriated an additional sum of \$600,000 for the fiscal year following that in which the foregoing appropriation first becomes available, and for each year thereafter for

seven years a sum exceeding by \$500,000 the sum appropriated for each preceding year, and for each year thereafter there is permanently appropriated for each year the sum of \$4,100,000 in addition to the sum of \$480,000 hereinbefore provided: Provided further, That before the funds herein appropriated 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 such college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such additional sums shall be used only for the purposes hereinbefore stated, and shall be allotted annually to each State by the Secretary of Agriculture and paid in the manner hereinbefore provided, in the proportion which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States as determined by the next preceding Federal census: Provided further, That no payment out of the addition appropriations herein provided shall be made in any year to any State until an equal sum has been appropriated for that year by the legislature of such State, or provided by State, county, college, local authority, or individual contributions from within the State, for the maintenance of the cooperative agricultural extension work provided for in this Act.

[Section 3 of the McLaughlin Bill explicitly extends the franking privilege to extension printed materials, while Smith-Lever does not. Section 3 of the Smith-Lever Act deals entirely with funding provisions. The Smith-Lever Act appropriates \$10,000 annually to each State or Territory, and provides an additional total appropriation each year for seven years, to become a total of \$4,580,000 by the end of the seventh year. These additional grants would be paid to the State or Territory in the proportion in which the total rural population of the State bears to the total rural population of all the states. The appropriations to a State or Territory, in addition to the \$10,000, must be matched by funds contributed from within the State.]

The McLaughlin Bill, in Section 2, likewise appropriates \$10,000 for each State or Territory, plus an amount not greater than 1 cent per capita of the total population of the State or Territory. McLaughlin also requires State or Territory matching of this additional appropriation.]

Sec. 4. That the sums hereby appropriated to the States and Territories for extension work shall be annually paid in equal quarterly payments on the first day of January, April, July, and October of each year by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture, out of the Treasury of the United States, to the treasurer or other officer duly appointed by the governing boards of said colleges to receive the same, and such officer shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture, on or before the first day of September of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year and of its disbursement on schedules provided by the Secretary of

Sec. 4. That the sums hereby appropriated for extension work shall be paid in equal semiannual payments on the first day of January and July of each year by the Secretary of the treasury upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture, out of the Treasury of the United States, 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 before the first day of September of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year, and of its disbursement, on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Agriculture. The grants of money authorized by this act are made subject to the legislative assent of the several States and Territories to the purpose of said grants; *Provided*, That payment of such installments of the appropriation herein made as shall become due to any State or Territory before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made upon assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury.

[The major difference here is that the McLaughlin Bill calls for quarterly payments, while Smith-Lever specifies a semi-annual payment schedule. The latter portion of this section of the McLaughlin bill, referring to assent by the States and Territories, is included in Section 3 of the Smith-Lever Bill.]

Sec. 5. That no money shall be paid out under this act to any State or territory for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students, but the establishment and maintenance of such college separately for white and colored students shall be held to be a compliance with the provisions of this act if the funds in such State or Territory be equitably divided as hereinafter set forth: *Provided*, That in any State in which there has been one college established in pursuance of the act of July 2, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and also in which an educational institution of like character

has been established, or may be hereafter established, and is now aided by such State from its own revenue for the education of colored students in agriculture and the mechanic arts, however named or styled, or whether or not it has received money heretofore under the act to which this act is an amendment, the legislative branch of such State may propose and report to the Secretary of Agriculture a just and equitable division of the fund to be received under this act, between one college for white students and one institution for colored students, established as aforesaid, which shall be divided into two parts and paid accordingly, and thereupon such institution for colored students shall be entitled to the benefits of this act and subject to its provisions, as much as it would have been if it had been included under the act of eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and the fulfillment of the foregoing provisions shall be taken as a compliance with the provisions with reference to separate colleges for white and colored students.

[The McLaughlin Bill contains this rather lengthy section that clearly intends to make sure that the 1890 land grant institutions are eligible for extension appropriations. The Smith-Lever Act inclusion of the 1890 institutions in Section 1 was apparently deemed sufficient to make them eligible.]

Sec. 6. That if any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State or Territory for the

Sec. 5. That if any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State for the support and

further and more complete endowment, support and maintenance of agricultural colleges 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 or Territory to which it belongs, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to such State or Territory, and no portion of said moneys exceeding five per centum of each annual appropriation shall be applied, directly or indirectly, under any pretense whatever, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or to the purchase or rental of land. It shall be the duty of each of said colleges annually, on or before the first day of January, to make to the Governor of the state or Territory in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in the direction of 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 by each of said colleges to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension works, 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 to which it belongs, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to said State, and 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 colleges, promoting agricultural trains, or any other purpose not specified in this Act, and not more than five per centum of each annual appropriation shall be applied to the printing and distributions of publications. It shall be the duty of each of said colleges annually, on or before the first day of January, to make to the governor of the State in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in the direction of 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 and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

[Section 6 of the McLaughlin Bill refers to loss or misapplication of money for the agricultural colleges, while the Smith-Lever Act specifies loss or misapplication of money provided for cooperative extension. Smith-Lever also prohibits the use of extension funding for college teaching and lectures, agricul-

tural trains, or other purposes not specified by the Act.]

Sec. 7. That on or before the first day of July in each year, after the passage of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury as to each State and Territory whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for colleges or of institutions for colored students under this act, and the amount which thereupon each is entitled, respectively, to receive. If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold a certificate from any State or Territory of its 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 close of the next Congress; in order that the State or Territory 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. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby charged with the proper administration of this law.

[The two are essentially identical except that the McLaughlin Bill includes a reference to "institutions for colored students" and Smith-Lever specifies that the appropriation be for cooperative agricultural extension work.]

Sec. 8. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make

Sec. 6. That on or before the first day of July in each year after the passage of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury 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. If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold a certificate from any State or its 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 any State from which a certificate has 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.

Sec. 7. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make

annual report to Congress of the receipts and expenditures and work of the institutions in all of the States and Territories receiving the benefits of this act, and also whether the appropriation of any State or Territory has been withheld, and, if so, the reasons therefor.

an annual report to Congress of the receipts, expenditures, and results of the cooperative agricultural extension work in all of the states receiving the benefits of this Act, and also whether the appropriation of any State has been withheld; and if so, the reasons therefor.

[The McLaughlin and Smith-Lever language is essentially identical, except that Smith-Lever specifies cooperative agricultural extension work.]

Sec. 9. That Congress may at any time annul, suspend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this act.

Sec. 8. That Congress may at any time alter, amend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this Act.

[Virtually identical language, substantively identical.]

APPENDIX D

BILLS RELATING TO AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION
Introduced in Congress Dec.15, 1909 to Dec. 12, 1913

Proceedings, AAACES 1915. pages 35-44 as compiled by A.C. True

H.R. 15422, U.S. 61st Cong., 2nd. Sess., Dec. 15, 1909

(1) McLaughlin, J.C. A bill for increase of appropriation to agricultural colleges for extension work. 7 p. Washington, Govt. printing office, 1909

Introduced by Mr. McLaughlin of Michigan, referred to the Committee on agriculture Dec. 15, 1909; hearings held Feb. 24, 1910.

Identical with McLaughlin (25); similar to Lever (15); embodies a plan of legislation outlined by the Executive committee of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and

Experiment Stations (3).

(2) U.S. Congress, House Committee on Agriculture, Hearings during the 2nd session of the 61st Congress. 3 v. Washington, Govt. printing office, 1910.

"Increase of appropriation to agricultural colleges" [H.R. 15422, U.S. 61st Cong. 2nd Sess] v. 3. p. 173-198.

Hearing held Feb. 24, 1910. Mr. C.B. Scott, chairman. Statements of Dr. J.L. Snyder, President Michigan agricultural college, Dr. W.E. Stone, President Purdue University and Dr. W.O. Thompson, President Ohio state university and Chairman of the Executive committee of the Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations (c.3. p. 173-192): **Memorandum on the McLaughlin bill submitted on behalf of the Committee on extension work of the Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations, Dr. K.L. Butterfield, chairman (v. 3, p 193-198).**

(3) Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations - Committee on extension work. Report [with discussion and action of the association thereon.] (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas. (1909) p. 34-39, 72-79).

Dr. K.L. Butterfield, chairman, The plan adopted in the McLaughlin bill (1) is outlined in this report (p. 37-38) in accordance with preliminary suggestions made by the committee in their report of the previous year (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colles and Exper. Stas. 22 (1908) (p. 40-42).

S. 4676, U.S. 61st. Cong., 2nd Sess., Jan. 5, 1910

(4) Dolliver, J.P. A bill to provide for an increased annual appropriation for the support of colleges for the benefit of agriculture established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and regulating the expenditure thereof, and making appropriation to enable the Department of Agriculture to investigate, demonstrate, and report upon methods of extension work. 7p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1910]

Introduced by Senator Dolliver of Iowa, referred to the Committee on agriculture and forestry Jan. 5, 1910; hearings held Feb 24; reported from the committee (7) June 22 with the recommendation that the bill be superseded by S. 8809 (6) which combines the provisions of this bill with those of S. 4675 (Dolliver).

(5) U.S. Congress Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry.

Agricultural colleges and experiment stations; hearing ... on the bill S. 4676, [U.S. 61st. Cong., 2nd. Sess.] 14p. Washington, Govt. print. off., 1910.

Hearings held Feb. 24, 1910. Senator Dolliver, chairman; statements of Dr. C.B. Curtiss, Dean of agriculture, Iowa state college and Dr. W.H. Jordan, Director of New York state agricultural experiment station, representing the Executive committee of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and experiment Stations.

S. 8809 U.S. 61st. Cong., 2nd. Sess., June 22, 1910.

(6) Dolliver, J.P. A bill to cooperate with the states in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining extension departments in state colleges, and in preparing teachers for these vocational subjects in state normal schools, and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 13p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1910]

Reported by the Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry June 22, 1910. Senator Dolliver of Iowa, chairman, as a substitute for S. 4675 and S. 4676, Dolliver (4), combining the provisions of both; placed on calendar "under Rule IX" Jan. 11, 1911, the author having died. S. 4675 made provision for vocational education in schools and does not appear in this list.

Identical or practically so with Page (10), Page (11, original form), Wilson (16), Godwin (26), Anderson (27), Goodwin (34), Goodwin (51).

(7) U.S. Congress Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry.

Cooperation with the states in providing vocational education, June 22, 1910 ... Report to accompany S. 8809, 5p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1910]. (U.S. 61st Congress, 2nd Sess. Senate Report 902).

Submitted by Senator Dolliver, introduces S. 8809 (6), explains its provisions and enumerates organizations formally endorsing the bill.

(8) Hamilton, John. Some of the problems of extension work in American agricultural colleges. I. Financial support. (Proc. Assoc. American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations 24(1910) p. 81-82

Read Nov. 17, 1910, as part of the report of the Committee on extension work of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations; compares McLaughlin (1) with Dolliver (6).

(9) Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations. A round table discussion of Senate bill 8809 ... led by W.E. Stone (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Coll. and Exper. Stas. 24 (1910) p. 93-106).

Held November 17, 1910; compares McLaughlin (1) with Dolliver (6).

S. 10905, U.S. 61st. Cong., 3rd. Sess., March 3, 1911

(10) Page, C.S., A bill to cooperate with the states in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in state normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in state colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 13 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1911].

Introduced by Senator Page of Vermont, referred to the committee on agriculture and forestry March 3, 1911.

Identical or practically so with Dolliver (6), Page (11, original form), Wilson (16), Godwin (26), Anderson (27), Goodwin (34), Goodwin (51).

S. 3, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 1st. Sess., April 6, 1911.

(11) Page, C.S. A bill to cooperate with the states in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in state normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in state colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 16 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1911].

Introduced by Senator Page of Vermont, referred to the Committee on agriculture and forestry April 6, 1911; reported with amendments (12) Feb. 26, 1912; debated June 5; an amended bill substituted by Mr. Page June 14, 1912 (45) q.p., for subsequent history.

The original form identical or practically so with Dolliver (6); Page (10); Wilson (16), Godwin (26), Anderson (27), Goodwin (51); amended form of Feb. 26, 1912 similar to Wilson (35).

For discussion see (19), (20).

(12) U.S. Congress Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry.

Vocational education, February 26, 1912 Report to accompany S. 3. 75 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912.] (U.S. 62nd Cong., 2nd Sess., Senate Report 405).

Submitted by Mr. Page; includes a subcommittee report containing extracts from correspondence and endorsements of the

bill by educational, agricultural and commercial officials and organizations.

(13) U.S. Congress Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry.

Vocational education; report of the subcommittee of the Committee on agriculture and forestry, United States Senate 62nd Congress, on Senate bill 3. 71 p. Washington, Govt. print. off. 1912.

Submitted by Senator Page; includes extracts from correspondence and endorsements of the bill.

H.R. 10865, U.S. 62nd Cong., 1st Sess., May 30, 1911

(14) McHenry, J.G. A bill for the advancement of agriculture. 3 p. [Washington, Govt, print, off., 1911].

Introduced by Mr. McHenry of Pennsylvania, referred to the Committee on agriculture, May 30, 1911.

H.R. 11542, U.S. 62nd Cong., 1st Sess. June 12, 1911

(15) Lever, A.F. A bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with the agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved March 2, 1887. 6 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1911].

Introduced by Mr. Lever of South Carolina, referred to the Committee on agriculture June 12, 1911.

Similar to McLaughlin (1) and (25). For other bills by the same author see (30), (36), (50), (54).

For discussion see (19), (20).

H.R. 12156, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 1st. Sess., June 29, 1911.

(16) Wilson, W.B. A bill to cooperate with the states in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in state normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in state colleges or agriculture and mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 13 p. [Washington, Govt. Print. off., 1911].

Introduced by Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania, referred to the Committee on agriculture, June 29, 1911.

Identical or practically so with Dolliver (6), Page (10), Page (11, original form), Godwin (26), Anderson (27), Goodwin (34), Goodwin (51).

H.R. 13489, U.S. 62nd Cong., 1st Sess., Aug. 10, 1911.

(17) McKinley, W.B. A bill to provide for increases annual appropriation to the several states for the agricultural colleges established under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and for the demonstration of practical and scientific methods of agriculture. 3 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1911].

Introduced by Mr. McKinley of Illinois, referred to the Committee on agriculture Aug. 11, 1911.

For a modified form introduced Dec. 7, 1911 see (24).

(18) ?

(19) Stone, W.E. Pending federal legislation. (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas. 25(1911) p. 81-82).

Read Nov. 16, 1911; discusses Page (11), Lever (15) and McKinley (17) bills.

(20) Hunt, T.F. Pending federal legislation. (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas. 25 (1911) p. 82-85).

Read Nov. 16, 1911; discusses McLaughlin (1), Page (11), Lever (15), and McKinley (17) bills.

(21) Hayes, W.M. [Federal legislation for agricultural extension and vocational education]. (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas. 25(1911) p. 86-89)

Read Nov. 16, 1911; treats the subject in a general way without reference to any specific measure.

(22) Claxton, P.P. [Federal legislation for agricultural extension and vocational education]. (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas. 25 (1911) p. 89-94.

Read Nov. 16, 1911.

(23) Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations - Executive Committee. Report[together with supplementary report of the Committee on extension work relative to federal appropriations and the discussion and action of the association thereon]. Proc. Assoc. of Amer. Colleges and Exper, Stas., 25 (1911) p 114-124).

Submitted Nov. 17, 1911. Dr. W.O. Thompson, chairman.

H.R. 14928, U.S. 62nd Cong., 2nd Sess., Dec. 1911.

(24) McKinley, W.B. A bill to provide for increased annual appropriations to the several states for the agricultural colleges established under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862 and for the demonstration of practical and scientific

methods of agriculture. 3 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1911]

Introduced by Mr. McKinley of Illinois, referred to the Committee on agriculture Dec. 9, 1911; a modified form of (17).

H.R. 15256, U.S. 62nd Cong, 2nd Sess., Dec. 9, 1911.

(25) McLaughlin, J.C. A bill for increase of appropriation to agricultural colleges for extension work. 6 p. [Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1911].

Introduced by Mr. McLaughlin of Michigan, referred to the Committee on agriculture Dec. 9, 1911.

Identical with McLaughlin (1); similar to Lever (15).

H.R. 15458, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Dec. 12, 1911.

(26) Godwin, H.L. A bill to cooperate with the states in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in state normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in state colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 13 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off. 1911].

Introduced by Mr. Godwin of North Carolina, referred to the Committee on agriculture Dec. 12, 1911.

Identical or practically so with Dolliver (6), Page (11, original form), Wilson (16), Goodwin (34), Goodwin (51).

H.R. 16842, U.S. 62nd Cong., 2nd. Sess., Jan. 4, 1912

(27) Anderson, C.C. A bill to cooperate with the states in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in state normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in state colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 13 p. [Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1912]

Introduced by Mr. Anderson of Ohio, referred to the Committee on Agriculture Jan. 4, 1912.

Identical or practically so with Dolliver (6), Page (10), Page (11, original form), Wilson (16), Godwin (26), Goodwin (34), Goodwin (51).

S. 4563, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd, Sess., Jan. 16, 1912.

(28) Smith, Hoke. A bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with the agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress

approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1912]

Introduced by Senator Smith of Georgia, referred to the Committee on agriculture and forestry, Jan. 16, 1912; hearings held March 1 and 5, 1912.

Practically identical with Lever (30); for subsequent bills by the same author see (48), (52).

(29) U.S. Congress Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry.

To establish agricultural extension departments; hearings ... 62nd Congress, 2nd Session, on S. 4563. 83 p. [Washington, Govt. Printing Off., 1912]

Hearings held March 1, 5. Senator Henry E. Burnham, chairman, hearings conducted by Senator Smith; statements of Dr. H.L. Russell, Dean of the College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin, Dr. Howard Edwards, President, Rhode Island state college, Dr. A.M. Soule, President of Georgia state college of agriculture, Mr. B. F. Harris, President, Illinois banker's association, Prof. T.C. Adkeson, member of the legislative committee of the National grange, Mr. J.R. Chapman, Jr. President, Northwestern national bank, Minneapolis, Mr. Oliver Wilson, President National grange, Mr. Wesley C. McDowell, Chairman of the Executive council, North Dakota banker's association, Dr. W.D. Gibbs, President, New Hampshire college of agriculture and mechanic arts, Mr. H.B. Gross, President National Soil Fertility League, Dr. W.O. Thompson, President Ohio State University and representing the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment stations, Senator Page of Vermont.

H.R. 18160, U.S. 62nd Cong. 2nd. Sess., Jan. 17, 1912.

(30) Lever, A.F. A bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 6 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912]

Introduced by Mr. Lever of South Carolina, referred to the Committee on agriculture Feb. 17, 1912; hearings held Feb. 29, March 1, 2, 1912.

Practically identical with Smith (28); for other bills by the same author see (15), (36).

(31) U.S. Congress House Committee on agriculture. Agricultural extension departments; hearings ... on H.R. 18160 [U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess.] and various other bills relating to

agricultural extension. 66 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912.] (Also in U.S. Congress House Committee on agriculture. hearings 62nd. Congress, 2nd. and 3rd. Sessions, on miscellaneous bills. Washington, 1913 p. 109-171.)

Hearings held Feb. 29, March 1,2, 1912. John Lamb chairman; covers the whole subject of federal aid for agricultural extension and is not limited to definite bills of which the chairman states there are 16 pending; statements of Dr. K.L. Butterfield, President of Massachusetts agricultural college, Dr. A.M. Soule, President Georgia state college of agriculture, Mr. B. F. Harris, Vice-President, First national bank, Champaign, Ill., Mr. Joseph Chapman, Jr. Chairman of the Committee of agricultural development of the American Banker's Association, Mr. H.H. Gross, President National soil fertility league, Dr. Howard Edwards, President Rhode Island state college, Hon. Myron T. Herrick, U.S. Ambassador to France, Mr. Oliver Wilson, Master of the National grange, Prof. T.C. Adkeson of the Legislative committee of the National grange, Mr. Wesley C. McDowell, Chairman of the executive council of the North Dakota banker's association, Dr. H.J. Patterson, Director Maryland agricultural experiment station, Dr. H. L. Russell Dean of the College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin, Dr. W.O. Thompson, President Ohio state university and Chairman of the Executive committee of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations.

S. 4834, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Jan. 25, 1912

(32) Owen, R.L. A bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with the agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 6 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912]

Introduced by Senator Owen of Oklahoma, referred to the Committee on agriculture and forestry, Jan. 25, 1912.

Identical with Morgan (33).

H.R. 20282, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Feb.16, 1912

(33) Morgan, D.A. A bill to establish extension departments in connection with the agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 6 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912]

Introduced by Mr. Morgan of Oklahoma, referred to the Committee on agriculture, Feb. 16, 1912.

Identical with Owen (32).

H.R. 20476, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Feb. 20, 1912

(34) Goodwin, W.A. A bill to cooperate with the states in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in state normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in state colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 13 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912]

Introduced by Mr. Goodwin of Arkansas, referred to the Committee on agriculture, Feb. 20, 1912.

Identical or practically so with Dolliver (6), Page (10), Page (11, original form), Wilson (16), Godwin (26), Anderson (27), Goodwin (51).

H.R. 21490, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., March 7, 1912.

(35) Wilson, W.B. A bill to cooperate with the states in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in preparing teachers for these vocational courses in state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in state normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 15 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912]

Introduced by Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania, referred to the Committee on agriculture March 7, 1912.

Similar to Page (11), as reported with amendments from the Committee on agriculture and forestry Feb 12, 1912; for other bills by the same author see (16), (43).

H.R. 22871, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., April 4, 1912.

(36) Lever, A.F. A bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912]

Introduced by Mr. Lever of South Carolina, referred to the Committee on agriculture April 4, 1912; reported with amendment April 13, 1912 (37); debated Aug. 13, 22, 23; amended and passed the House Aug. 23; referred to Senate committee on agriculture and forestry Aug. 24; reported from the Senate committee with amendments Dec. 14 (38); debated Dec. 3, 18, 1912, Jan. 2, 17, 1913; S. 3 Page (45) offered as a substitute Jan. 17; substitute withdrawn and resubmitted in amended form Jan. 24; debated in connection with Page (45) Jan. 24, 27; amended Jan. 27; the Page

bill as amended Jan. 27 accepted as a substitute Jan. 29; Senate amendment {i.e. substitution of the Page bill} disagreed to and conference asked by House Feb. 6; conference agreed to by Senate Feb. 7; a motion made Mar. 2, 3, 4 that the Senate recede from the amendment and pass the House bill was not acted upon; further endorsement read in the Senate April 17, 1913.

The amended form reported by the Senate committee Dec. 14, 1912, identical with Smith (48); for other bills by the same author see (15), (50), (54).

(37) U.S. Congress House Committee on agriculture. Establishment of agricultural extension departments. April 13, 1912 ... Report to accompany H.R. 22871. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912] (U.S. 62nd. Cong. 2nd. Sess., House of Representatives Report 546).

Submitted by Mr. Lever.

(38) U.S. Congress Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry. Establishment of agricultural extension departments, Dec. 14, 1912 ... Report to accompany H.R. 22871. 14 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912] (U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Senate report 1072).

Submitted by Mr. Smith; contains abstracts of endorsements of the bill as it was first introduced as H.R. 18160, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess. Lever (30).

(39) Smith, Hoke [Statement regarding H.R. 22871, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Nov. 13, 1912]. (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas., 26 (1912), p. 18-19).

(40) Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations - Committee on extension work. Federal aid. (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas., 26 (1912) p. 63.

Part of the report of the committee, Dr. A.M. Soule, chairman.

(41) Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations - Executive Committee. Memorial to the United States Senate [urging passage of H.R. 22871]. (Cong. Record, 49 (1912-13). Pt. 1, p. 15; Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas., 26 (1912), p. 99-101).

The pagination given in the last named reference includes discussions and action taken by the association.

(42) Gross, H.H. [Statement regarding H.R. 22871, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Nov. 14, 1912]. Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas., 26, (1912), p. 101-104.

H.R. 23581, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., April 20, 1912

(43) Wilson, W.B. A bill to provide for cooperation with the states in promoting instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in preparing teachers for these vocational subjects in state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts, in state normal schools, and in other training schools for teachers supported by the public; in maintaining extension departments of state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; in maintaining branches of state experiment stations; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 28 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912]

Introduced by Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania, referred to the Committee on agriculture April 20, 1912; hearings held April 23-26, 1912.

Practically identical with Page (45) and (47); a combination of Wilson (16) and (35).

(44) U.S. Congress House Committee on agriculture. Vocational education; hearings on H.R. 23581 [U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess.] 152 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912] (Also in

U.S. Congress House Committee on agriculture. Hearings on miscellaneous bills and other matters ... 62nd. Cong., 2nd. and 3rd. Sessions. Washington, 1913. p. 219-375).

Hearings held April 23, 24, 25, 26, 1912. John Lamb, chairman; gives statements of representatives of many agricultural educational and industrial organizations and institutions and a list of newspapers and periodicals that had formally endorsed the Page-Wilson bill.

S. 3, U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., June 14, 1912

(45) Page, C.S. A bill to provide for cooperation with the states in promoting instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in preparing teachers for these vocational subjects in state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts, in state normal schools, and in other training schools for teachers supported by the public; in maintaining extension departments of state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; in maintaining branches of state experiment stations; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 28 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912]

Introduced by Mr. Page of Vermont, referred to the Committee on agriculture and forestry, June 14, 1912. (remainder of citation incomplete)

H.R. ? U.S. 62nd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Aug. 1, 1912

(46) Flood, H.D. A bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with the agricultural colleges and high schools in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1912].

Introduced by Mr. Flood of Virginia, referred to the Committee on agriculture Aug 1, 1912. Identical with Flood (49)

S. 3, U.S. 63rd. Cong., 1st. Sess., April 7, 1913

(47) Page, C.S. A bill to provide for cooperation with the states in promoting agricultural instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in preparing teachers for these vocational subjects in state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts, in state normal schools, and in other training schools for teachers supported and controlled by the public, in maintaining extension departments of state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; in maintaining branches of state experiment stations; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 28 p., [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913].

Introduced by Senator Page of Vermont, referred to the Committee on agriculture and forestry April 7, 1913.

Practically identical with Wilson (43) and Page (45).

S. 46, U.S. 63rd. Cong., 1st. Sess., April 7, 1913.

(48) Smith, Hoke. A bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913].

Introduced by Mr. Bacon for Mr. Smith of Georgia, referred to the Committee on agriculture and forestry April 7, 1913.

Identical with Lever (36) in amended form as reported by the Senate committee on agriculture and forestry Dec. 14, 1912, and with Lever (5); for other bills by the same author see (28), (52).

H.R. 156, U.S. 63rd. Cong., 1st. Sess., April 7, 1913.

(49) Flood, H.D. A bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with the agricultural colleges and high schools in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913].

Introduced by Mr. Flood of Virginia, referred to the Committee on agriculture April 7, 1912. Identical with Flood (46)

H.R. 1692, U.S. 63rd. Cong., 1st. Sess., April 7, 1913.

(50) Lever, A.F. A bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913].

Introduced by Mr. Lever of South Carolina, referred to the Committee on agriculture, April 7, 1913.

Identical with Lever (36) as reported in amended form by the Senate committee Dec. 14, 1912, and with Smith (48); for other bills by the same author see (15), (30), (36), (54).

H.R. 2874, U.S. 63rd. Cong., 1st. Sess., April 17, 1913.

(51) Goodwin, W.A. A bill to cooperate with the states in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in state normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure. 13 p. [Washington, Govt. Print. off., 1913].

Introduced by Mr. Goodwin of Arkansas, referred to the

Committee on agriculture, April 17, 1913.

Identical or practically so with Dolliver (6), Page (10), Page (11, original form), Wilson (16), Godwin (26), Anderson (27), Goodwin (34).

S. 3091, U.S. 63rd. Cong., 1st. Sess., Sept. 6, 1913.

(52) Smith, Hoke. A bill to provide for cooperative extension work in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto and the United States Department of Agriculture. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913].

Introduced by Senator Smith, referred to the Committee on agriculture and forestry Sept 6, 1913; endorsements read and referred to the Committee Oct. 7, 16, Nov. 3, 17; reported without amendments (53) Dec. 10, 1913; debated Jan. 17, 28, 1914; H.R. 7951 Lever (54) substituted Jan. 28, q.v. for subsequent history; S. 3091 indefinitely postponed Feb. 7, the substitute bill having passed the Senate.

A redraft of Smith (48), the result of a conference between the author, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Mr. Lever; identical with Lever (54) for other bills by the same author see (28), (48); a modification of this bill is Tribble (60).

(53) U.S. Cong. Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry

Providing for cooperative agricultural extension work, Dec. 10, 1913 ... Report to accompany S. 3091. 14 p. [Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1913]. (U.S. 63rd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Senate Report 139).

Submitted by Senator Smith; contains endorsements of this and similar bills previously before Congress.

H.R. 7951, U.S. 63rd. Cong., 1st. Sess., Sept 6, 1913.

(54) Lever, A.F. A bill to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913].

Introduced by Mr. Lever of South Carolina, referred to the Committee on agriculture Sept. 6, 1913; hearings held Sept. 23; reported with amendments (56) Dec. 5; debated, amended and passed the House Jan. 19, 1914; referred to the Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry Jan. 20; reported with amendment (57) Jan. 26; substituted in Senate for Smith (52) Jan. 28; debated

Jan. 28, 29, 30, 31, Feb. 2, 5, 6, 7; amended and passed the Senate Feb. 7; Senate amendment disagreed to by the House and conference asked Feb. 21; conference agreed to by Senate Feb. 25; conference report made and agreed to by the Senate April 27, and by House May 2; examined and signed in the House and Senate May 4; signed by the President of the United States May 8, 1914.

Identical with Smith (52); for other bills by the same author see (15), (30), (36), (50).

(55) U.S. Cong. House Committee on agriculture. Agricultural extension; hearings ... 63rd. Congress, 1st. Sess., on H.R. 7951 commonly known as the Lever agricultural extension bill. 58 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913].

Hearings held Sept. 23, 1913. A.F. Lever, chairman; statement of Dr. B.F. Galloway, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. David F. Houston, Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. A.E. Holder representing the American federation of labor, Dr. W.O. Thompson, President Ohio state university, Mr. E.H. Jenkins, Director Connecticut agricultural experiment station; text of original bill, Lever (50), with proposed modifications and an analysis thereof in parallel columns (p. 24-30); tentative suggestions agreed to by the Executive Committee of the Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations after consultation with the Secretary of agriculture and correspondence relating thereto (p. 31-32).

(56) U.S. Congress House Committee on agriculture. Cooperative agricultural extension work ... Report Dec. 8, 1913, to accompany H.R. 7951. 13 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913]. (U.S. 62rd. Cong., 2nd. Sess. House of Representatives Report 110).

Submitted by Mr. Lever.

(57) U.S. Cong. Senate Committee on agriculture and forestry. Cooperative agricultural extension work, Jan. 26, 1914. ... Report to accompany H.R. 7951. 1 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913]. (U.S. 63rd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Senate Report 175).

Submitted by Mr. Smith.

(58) U.S. Congress Conference Committee. Cooperative agricultural extension work, April 28, 1914 ... Conference report to accompany H.R. 7951 [U.S. 63rd. Cong., 2nd. Sess.] 4 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1914].

(59) Davenport, Eugene. The relations between the federal department of agriculture and the agricultural colleges and experiment stations (and discussion by the association). (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas. 27 (1913) p 121-143)

Read Nov. 14, 1913; discusses Lever (54).

H.R. 9841, U.S. 63rd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Dec. 4, 1913

(60) Tribble, S.J. A bill to provide for cooperative extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto and the United states department of agriculture. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off.,

1913].

Introduced by Mr. Tribble of Georgia, referred to the Committee on agriculture Dec. 4, 1913.

A modification of Smith (52)

H.R. 10393, U.S. 63rd. Cong., 2nd. Sess., Dec. 12, 1913

(61) Adair, J.A.M. A bill to establish agricultural-extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 7 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1913].

Introduced by Mr. Adair of Indiana, referred to the Committee on agriculture Dec. 12, 1913.

[Smith-Lever agricultural extension act] May 8, 1914

(62) ***U.S. Congress. An act to provide for agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several states receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto. 3 p. [Washington, Govt. print. off., 1914]. (Public No. 95, 63rd. Congress, H.R. 7951; also in U.D. Congress Statues at large. 38 (1913-15) p. 372-375).***

(63) Houston, D.F. Address of Welcome. (Proc. Assoc. Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas., 28 (1914) p 29-33

Delivered Nov. 11, 1914; includes remarks on the operation of the Smith-Lever act.

(64) Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations. The administration of the Smith-Lever extension act. (proc. Assn. of Amer. Agr. Colleges and Exper. Stas., 28 (1914) p. 111-129.

Addresses by Dr. W.O. Thompson representing the executive committee of the association, Dr. A.C. True representing the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Dr. C.B. Curtiss of Iowa, Dr. A.M. Soule of Georgia, Dr. A.A. Wilson of Minnesota, and Dr. B.I. Wheeler of California representing the agricultural colleges and experiment stations; delivered Nov. 12, 1914.

(65) Association of American agricultural colleges and experiment stations. Report of a special committee to study types of extension organization and policy in the land-grant colleges. (Proc. Assoc. Amer. agri. colleges and exper. stas., 28 (1914) p. 260-62.

Read Nov. 12, 1914; Dr. T.R. Bryant, chairman.

(66) U.S. Department of Agriculture -- Office of experiment stations. [Editorial on the Smith-Lever act.] Exper. Sta. Record, 30 (1914) no. 7 p. 601-609.

APPENDIX E

AAACES Proceedings 1904 Paper by K.L. Butterfield pages 56-61

THE SOCIAL PHASE OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

A paper on this subject was presented by K.L. Butterfield, of Rhode Island, as follows:

I have been asked to speak in behalf of the study of "rural economics". This term is, I presume, supposed to cover broadly those subjects which treat of the economic and social questions that concern farming and farmers. The whole range of social science as applied to rural conditions is thus apparently made legitimate territory for discussion. In view of the importance and character of this field of study, it seems wise to approach it, if possible, through the avenue of its underlying philosophy. Only in this way can the validity of the subject be established and its place in agricultural education be justified. I have therefore chosen as a specific title "The Social Phase of Agricultural Education." In the treatment of the topic an endeavor has been made to hold consistently in mind the point of view of the agricultural college.

It is a principle in social science that the method and scope of any social institution depend upon its function. Therefore the organization, the methods, and the courses of the agricultural college should be made with reference to the functions of the college. What is this function? What is the college designed to accomplish? What is its social purpose? Why does society need the agricultural college? Answers to these questions are of two kinds - those that explain the contemporary and passing functions of the college, and those that illustrate its permanent and abiding service to society and particularly to the rural portion of society. The college of yesterday was obliged to train its own teachers and experimenters; today it may add the task of training farm superintendents; tomorrow it may organize an adequate extension department. Course and methods will change as new contemporary needs arise, but there abides always the abiding final service of the agricultural college - its permanent function. This function will be defined in different ways by different men, but I venture to define it as follows: **The permanent function of the agricultural college is to serve as a social organ or agency of first importance in helping to solve all phases of the rural problem.** We shall not attempt at once to argue this proposition. We must, however, try to answer the question, What is the rural problem? And the answer may be revealed, without need of extended discussion, the mission of the college.

(1) The days are going by when agriculture may be classed with the mining industries. Soil culture is supplanting pioneer farming. Skill is taking the place of empiricism. The despotism of the grandfather is passing. Applied science and business practice have been hitched to the plow. Yet the most obvious need of American agriculture is better farming. Improved farm land in the United States gives but \$9 of gross return per acre. The average yield per acre of corn is 23.5 bushels, whereas a very modest ideal would be double this amount. The wheat yield is 13.5 bushels per acre; in Germany nearly twice as much. These are crude, but legitimate, illustrations of our inferior farming. We must have greater yields of better products, secured at less cost per unit. **The farm problem is therefore first of all a problem of increasing the technical skill of our farmers.** Science unlocks the cabinet of Nature's treasures, but only the artist farmer can appreciate and use the storehouse thus opened to him.

(2) But produce growing is not the only aspect of the farm problem. Each effective pair of shears needs two blades; in this case produce selling is the other blade. Mere productiveness does not solve the farm question. The farmer cares less for the second spear of grass than he does for a proper return for the first spear. Business skill must be added to better farming methods. **The farm problem is also a business question.**

(3) The moment, however, we begin to discuss price we enter a realm where economic factors dominate. We commonly say demand and supply determine price; but effective demand and effective supply are the resultants of many forces. The supply of a given product is influenced by the cost of growing in various locations, by cost of transportation, by competition of other countries. The demand is influenced by the state of wages, by standards of living, by effectiveness of distribution. The farmer may not always control these conditions, but he must reckon with them. He must know the laws of economics as well as the laws of soil fertility. The farm problem becomes then an industrial question, for the farmer's prosperity is influenced most profoundly by the economic life of the nation and of the world. And in a still wider sense is the rural question one of economics. The industry as a whole must prosper. It is of no great moment that here and there a farmer succeeds. The farming class must prosper. Of course individual success in the case of a sufficient number of farmers implies the success of the industry, but it is quite possible to have a stagnant industry alongside numerous individual successes. The farmer as a whole must be continually and speedily advancing to better economic conditions.

(4) No may we ignore the political factor in the rural problem. Doubtless the American farmer, like most Americans,

places undue reliance upon legislation. But we can not disregard the profound industrial and social effects of either wise or foolish laws. The political efficiency of the farmer will have much to do in determining class progress. Furthermore, the political duties of farmers must be enforced, their influence must continue to be exerted in behalf of the general policies of government. It is of vital consequence to our democratic govern-

ment that the American farmer shall in nowise lose his political instinct and effectiveness.

(5) The consideration of the political phase of the question leads us to the heart of the farm problem. For it is conceivable that the farmers of this country may as a class be skilled growers of produce, successful sellers of what they grow, and indeed that the industry as a whole may be prosperous, and yet the farming class in its general social and intellectual power fail to keep pace with other classes. It is not impossible that a landlord-and-tenant system, or even a peasant system, should yield fairly satisfactory industrial conditions. But who for a moment would expect either system to develop the political and general social efficiency that American democratic ideals demand? Even if there is no immediate danger of either of these systems becoming established in America, we still desire that our farmers as a class shall secure for themselves the highest possible position not only in industry but in the political and social organization of American society. Indeed this is the ultimate American rural problem, to maintain the best possible status of the farming class. No other statement of the problem is satisfactory in theory. No other is explanatory of the struggles and ambitions of farmers themselves. The American farmer will be satisfied with nothing less than securing for his class the highest possible class efficiency and largest class influence, industrially, politically, socially. It is true that industrial success is necessary to political and social power, but it is also true that social agencies are needed in order to develop in our American farmers the requisite technical skill, business method, and industrial efficiency. The influence of such social forces as education, developed means of communication, the organization of farmers, and even the church, must be invoked before we can expect the best agricultural advancement. And the end is after all a social one. The maintenance of class status is that end.

This analysis of the rural problem is necessarily brief, almost crude, but I hope that it reveals in some degree the scope and nature of the problem; that it indicates that **the farm problem is not one merely of technique, fundamental as technical skill must be; that it demonstrates that the problem is also one of profound economic, political, and social significance.** If this be so, do we need to argue the proposition that the function of the agricultural college is to help solve all phases of the problem? We all recognize the place of the college in assisting our farmers to greater technical skill. By what pleas shall we gainsay the mission of the college in ministering to rural betterment at all points, whether the conditions demand technical skill, business acumen, industrial prosperity, political power, or general social elevation? **Why shall not the agricultural**

college be all things to all farmers?

Assuming that this statement of the permanent mission of the agricultural college is an acceptable one, the practical inquiry arises, Does the college, as now organized, adequately fulfill its function, and, if not, by what means can the defect be remedied? The colleges are doubtless serving the industrial and social need to some degree. But I believe that it is not unjust to assert that the existing courses of study in agriculture, the organization of the college, and the methods of work are not adequate if the college is to secure and maintain this supreme leadership all along the line of rural endeavor. This is not criticism of existing methods. The colleges are doing good work. But the present effort is partial, because the emphasis is placed on the technical, and especially upon the individual, phases of the problem. The industrial, the political, and the social factors are not given due consideration. Our present-day agricultural course, on the vocational side, is chiefly concerned with teaching the future individual farmer how to apply the principles of science to the art of farming, and in training specialists who shall make further discoveries either in the realm of science or in the application of the scientific principle to the art. The technical element absolutely dominates the vocational portion of the agricultural course. Very slight attention is given to the discussion of other phases of the farm problem. To meet the needs of the future the whole spirit and method of the agricultural college must be "socialized" - to use an overworked phrase for want of a better one. We must get away from the idea that the individual and the technical aspects of agricultural research and teaching are the sufficient solution of the farm problem.

When we ask, What are the means for "socializing" the agricultural college? the expected answer may be, The study of rural social science, or "rural economy." But I am pleading not merely for the addition of a few subjects to the course of study, but for an educational policy. The answer, therefore, will not be quite so simple. What, then, are the methods by which the college may more fully assume its function of helping to solve all phases of the farm problem?

(1) The indispensable requirement is that the college shall consciously purpose to stand as sponsor for the whole rural problem. It is to assume a place of leadership in the campaign for rural betterment. Whether or not it is to be the commander in chief of the armies of rural progress, it should be the inspiration, the guide, the stimulator of all possible endeavors to improve farm and farmer. This attitude of mind is purely a matter of ideals, deliberately formed in the light of the abiding needs of the farming class. It is the intangible but pervasive influence of an object which is perfectly definite even if

avowedly spiritual. It is a question of atmosphere. It is a matter of insight. The college must have a vision of the rural problem in its entirety and in its relations. At the college we should find, if anywhere, the capacity to understand the ultimate question in agriculture. We know that this ultimate question in agriculture can not be expressed alone by the terms nitrogen, or balanced ration, or cost per bushel, but must be written also in terms of the human problem, the problem of the men and women on the farm. So we shall see the college consciously endeavoring to make of itself a center where these men and women of the farm shall find light and inspiration and guidance in all the aspects of their struggle for a better livelihood and a broader life. The college must avow its intention of becoming all things to all farmers. Whether this means the study of fertility, of animal nutrition, of soil bacteriology, or whether it means the consideration of markets, of land laws, of transportation. of the country church, of pure government, the college will lead the way to the truth.

(2) As the first requisite is that of the conscious ideal or purpose, the second is one of organization. **It seems to me that the socialization of the college can not proceed very far until the principle of university extension is pretty fully recognized.** The college must be in constant and vital touch with the farmers and their associations. **Therefore each agricultural college should as rapidly as possible develop a definite tripartite organization which reveals the college in its threefold function as an organ of research, as an educator of students, and as a distributor of information to those who can not come to the college. These are really coordinate functions and should be so recognized.** The college should unify them into one comprehensive scheme. The principle of such unity is perfectly clear; for we have in research the quest for truth, in the education of students the incarnation of truth, and in extension work the democratization of truth. Until these three lines of effort are somewhat definitely recognized and organized the college can not work as a leader in solving the rural problem.

(3) **The social sciences, in their relation to the rural problem particularly, must receive a consideration commensurate with the importance of the industrial, the political, and the social phases of the farm question.** In research, for instance, the colleges should make a study of the history and status of these aspects of agriculture. As a matter of fact, we know very little of these things. There have been but few scientific investigations of the economic features of the industry, and practically nothing has been done in the more purely social questions. Here is a great untilled field. How the various farm industries have developed, a comprehensive study of the agricul-

tural market, the relation of transportation to the industry, the tendencies as to centralization of farms and tenant farming; the sociological questions of rural illiteracy, pauperism, insanity, health, education, the effects of rural life upon character, religious life in the country - a hundred subjects of importance in the solution of the farm problem are almost virgin soil for the scientific investigator. It is the business of the agricultural college to assist, if not to lead, in such work of research. It is work that must be done before the social phases of agricultural education can be fully developed.

When we come to the course of study we face a question difficult for some colleges, because the agricultural curriculum is already overcrowded. I have not time to discuss this practical administrative question. I believe, however, that it can be worked out. What I wish to emphasize is the idea that in every agricultural course the social problems of farmers shall have due attention. **We should not permit a person to graduate in such a course unless he has made a fairly adequate study of the history and status of agriculture; of the governmental problems that have special bearing on agricultural progress; of such questions in agricultural economics as markets, transportation, business cooperation, and of such phases of rural sociology as farmer's organizations, the country church, rural and agricultural education, and the conditions and movements of the rural population. For the college can not carry out the purpose we have ascribed to it, unless these subjects are given an important place in the course of study.** We talk about the place of the college in training leaders, usually meaning by leaders men who are expert specialists or possibly farmers of extraordinary skill. Do we realize that the greatest need of American agriculture to-day is its need of social leadership? Nothing can be more imperative than that the agricultural college shall send out to the farms both men and women who have not only the capacity to win business success, but who also have the social vision, who are moved to be of service to the farm community, and who have the training which will enable them to take intelligent leadership in institute, school, church, grange, and in all movements for rural progress. **Upon the college is thrust the responsibility of training men and women to understand the whole rural problem and from the vantage point of successful farming to be able to lead the way toward a higher status for all farmers.**

Possibly the argument for introducing rural social science into the agricultural course is chiefly a sociological one. But there is also involved a pedagogical question of most profound significance. For several decades the educational camp has been sharply divided over the ancient but recurring controversy between the Greek cultural ideal and the Roman utilitarian ideal.

I venture the opinion that these two forces of educational idealism will soon reach a compromise which for all practical purposes will take the question out of debate. The classicist will concede that the scope of the term culture may be greatly enlarged and he may even allow a quite new definition of the cultivated man. It will be generally admitted, to use Professor Bailey's phrase, that "every subject in which men are interested can be put into pedagogical form and be a means of training the mind." On the other hand the technical educator will concede that a college graduate in whatever course should be a cultivated man and that there are certain studies with which all cultivated men should have some familiarity. The technical college will, moreover, be compelled to employ instructors who can so teach the technical subject that it shall not only give the knowledge and training desired, but shall also yield sound culture, become truly liberalizing and vision giving. But a greater question remains. As society becomes more fully self-directive the demand for social leadership increases. Almost instinctively we look to the college-trained man for such leadership. We expect him to understand and to help answer the questions that society has to meet. **It is not enough that he do his particular work well; he has a public duty. Only thus can he pay all his debt to society for the training he has had.** Yet today our technical courses are largely engaged in training individuals who, barring some general culture, are highly specialized experts. What preparation, for instance, does the future engineer get in college for facing such a matter as the labor question? He is likely to be brought into close touch with this question. But as a rule he is not especially qualified to handle it. The point of view of the course he has pursued is technique, ever technique. He secures in college little incentive and less training for intelligent performance of his duty as citizen and as member of society. The problems of mathematics are not the problems of industry, and profound study of chemistry gives neither the premises nor the data for sound judgements upon social questions. These public questions can not be left to social experts. A democratic society must insist that all its educated men shall be leaders in solving society's problems. But even the educated men can not lead unless they have first been taught. I believe society has more to fear from technical experts who either neglect their social duty or are ignorant of the social problems than it has from highly trained specialists who have never studied Greek nor mastered Browning. Moreover, under modern conditions, have we a right to call that man cultivated who ignores the great social problems of the age? We face here one of the coming educational questions, How can the industrial course be made to train men for the social leadership the new regime demands? I see no answer except that the course must be made truly and broadly vocational,

and consequently that large place must be given to social studies, and particularly to the concrete problems of government, industry and social life.

If we examine our agricultural course from this standpoint, we shall have to admit that it has the flaw common to most industrial courses. It is too technical. It is not truly vocational. It does not present the social view point. It does not stimulate the student to social activity. It does not give him a foundation for intelligent social service when he shall go to the farm. **He should study agricultural economics and rural sociology, both because rural society needs leaders and because, in the arming of the man, the knowledge of society's problems is just as vital as either expert information or personal culture.**

(4) **To carry out the function of the agricultural college we need, finally, a vast enlargement of extension work among farmers. This work will not only be dignified by a standing in the college coordinate with research and the teaching of students, but it will rank as a distinct department, with a faculty of men whose chief business it is to teach the people who can not come to the college.** This department should manage farmers' institutes, carry on cooperative experiments, give demonstrations in new methods, conduct courses of reading, offer series of extension lectures, assist the schools in developing agricultural instruction, direct the work of rural young people's clubs, edit and distribute such compilations of practical information as now appear under the guise of experiment station bulletins, and eventually relieve the station of the bulk of its correspondence. **Such a department will be prepared to incorporate into its work the economic, governmental, and social problems of agriculture. It will give the farmers light on taxation as well as upon tree pruning. The rural school will have as much attention as corn breeding. The subject of the market - "the distributive half of farming," as John M. Stahl calls it - will be given as much discussion as the subjects bearing on production.** We shall find here a most fertile field for work. The farmers are ready for this step. They have, as a rule, appreciated the real nature of the farm problem more fully than have our agricultural educators. Perhaps at times they have placed undue reliance upon legislation. Perhaps in periods of depression they have overweighed the economic pressure as against the lack of skilled farming. But the great body of farmers has rightly estimated the importance of the economic, political, and social questions as related to their ultimate prosperity. In grange meetings, for example, the subjects which arouse great interest are such themes as taxation, the rural telephone, the country school, and business cooperation. The explanation of all the farmers movements is that the farmers believe the farm problem to be much more than a question

of technique. They want light on the whole problem.

The college, chiefly through its socialized extension department, has a mission also to those professional people whose sphere of work is in the rural community. The rural educator, the country clergymen, the editor of the country paper, and even the lawyer and physician who deal with country people should have a large share in helping to solve the farm problem. They, too, need to know what the rural problem is. They, too, need the eye that sees the necessary conditions of rural betterment and the heart that desires to help in rural progress. By some of the same methods that reach the farmers themselves can the college instruct and inspire these others.

And, finally, the college will take its place as the "social organ or agency of first importance in helping to solve the farm problem in all its phases.": The church, the school, the farmer's organizations - all these social organs have their work to do. None can do the work of the others. But they should work together. Each should appreciate its own mission and its own limitations; each should recognize the functions of the others, and all should intelligently unite their forces in a grand campaign for rural betterment. **More properly than perhaps any other agency the socialized extension department of the agricultural college can act as mediator and unifier, serve as the clearing house and directing spirit in a federation of rural social forces. Inspired by the conscious purpose of the college to help at all points in the solution of the farm question, informed by the knowledge acquired through research into the economic and social problems of agriculture, aided by a multitude of educated farmers trained in the college to know the rural problem and to lend a hand in its settlement, dignified by its status as a coordinate branch of the college activities, the extension department may well act as the chief agency of stimulation and unification in the social movements for rural advancement.**

In this discussion the practical details of carrying out the programme advocated have not been touched upon. When once it becomes a distinct policy of the college to assume leadership in the movement for rural betterment, such questions as subject matter for study, textbooks, qualified instructors, and time in the curriculum will settle themselves. Neither has nay attempt been made to give illustrations; and therefore this paper may seem dogmatic if not academic, a prophecy rather than an outline of progress, the statement of an ideal rather than a practical programme. But I think there is abundant evidence that a current is setting in toward the enlargement of the work of the agricultural college along the social lines indicated. The rapid development of farmer's institutes, the growth of other phases of

extension teaching, the sentiment of those in authority that the experiment station must soon slough off its work of education and confine itself to research, the holding of occasional conferences for rural progress, in which country teachers and pastors join with the farmers, the initiative of the college in federating various state farmers' organizations into one grand committee, the inauguration of several brief course in agricultural economics and rural sociology, the cooperation of some of the colleges with the Carnegie Institution in an investigation into the history and conditions of agriculture in its economic and social phases, the pride with which a few of our colleges point to an increasing number of young men they are sending to the farms - all these facts seem clearly to indicate that the agricultural college will soon assert its function of leader in the endeavor to solve all phases of the rural problem.

If the analysis thus far offered is a correct one, the question of "rural economics" is far from being merely a matter of adding three or four subjects of study to the agricultural course. It involves the very function and policy of the college itself. It alone gives proportion to the problem of agricultural education, because, while distinctly admitting the need for better farming and the consequently fundamental necessity of the technical training of farmers, it emphasizes the importance of the economic and political, and social aspects of rural development. And it thereby indicates that only by a due recognition of these factors, in purpose, in organization, and in course of study, can the American agricultural college fulfill its mission to the American farmer.

APPENDIX F

From Proceedings AAACES 1906, pages 68-73

K.L. Butterfield of Massachusetts presented the following report:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION WORK

Your committee decided that its first task was to make an investigation into the present status of agricultural extension teaching in the United States. The hearty cooperation of the Office of Experiment stations of the United States department of Agriculture was easily secured, and Prof. John Hamilton Farmers' Institute Specialist in that Office, was designated to assist the committee. The committee thereupon chose him as its secretary, and he has carried on the details of the enquiry. We desire to express our cordial appreciation of the assistance of the Office of Experiment Stations and particularly to indicate our great obligation to Professor Hamilton, whose thorough sympathy with extension teaching in agriculture, his long experience in work of this character, and his enthusiasm for progress have enabled him not only to place before your committee important data, but to embody many suggestions for the development of the work. Your committee has not hesitated freely to utilize his comments and suggestions.

A schedule indicating the forms of extension work to be embraced by the investigation, together with a list of queries, was prepared and sent out by the Office of Experiment Stations, accompanied by a circular letter signed by the Director of the Office, to about 5,000 persons representing the various organizations from which information was desired.

There was also formulated the following tentative definition of extension teaching in agriculture as a basis for the investigation:

"Extension teaching in agriculture embraces those forms of instruction, in subjects having to do with improved methods of agricultural production and with the welfare of the general population, that are offered to people not enrolled as resident pupils in educational institutions."

The committee also attempted to group in some logical fashion the various forms of extension work which were supposed to be in vogue. Six groups were made as follows:

Group A, Farmers' Institutes. - The Farmers' Institutes are a phase of the itinerant lecture system classified under Group B. but they form so large and distinctive a movement that it seemed wise to put them in a class by themselves. Historically they are the earliest form of organized extension teaching. They have been for thirty-five years the means of disseminating real

agricultural teaching. They are supported by large grants on money, are now pretty thoroughly organized, and the institute workers have an association of their own, For these reasons they deserve a separate classification.

Group B, Itinerant lectures other than farmers' institutes - Here are listed the lectures and addresses given by the members of the agricultural college and station staff and by employees of other institutions, including miscellaneous lectures, regular courses of extension lectures, traveling schools of various types, special railroad trains designed for educational purposes, and addresses before teachers' institutes on distinctly agricultural themes, Various minor endeavors must, of course, also be grouped here.

Group C, Literature - Comprising those forms of extension teaching developed by means of written and printed materials. This literature consists of the great mass of regular correspondence about agricultural subjects carried on through the experiment stations, colleges, boards of agriculture ,etc.; also the various publications of these institutions, including station bulletins, regular reports, miscellaneous pamphlets, and the like; correspondence courses; reading courses; traveling libraries; and the publication, particularly by educational institutions, of periodicals dealing with agricultural subjects.

Group D comprises all those efforts in which the particular emphasis is laid on object lessons, or outdoor practicums. These include such activities as field demonstrations of various operations, such as spraying; cooperative demonstrations in which, because of the nature of the work, it is necessary to have the assistance of the individual farmer; and cooperative tests, as of varieties adapted to different localities. These tests, by the way, are close to the borderline between the work of the experiment station and of the extension department, but are classified here because in many cases they are essentially for the purpose of education and not for the gaining of new knowledge. Educational exhibits at agricultural fairs, made by colleges, experiment stations, etc., and attempts to secure visits of inspection to the colleges and stations by farmers and others interested, where those visits are essentially for the purpose of education, also come in this group.

The above four groups, A, B, C, and D, are intended to include all of those forms of extension teaching in agriculture which belong to universities, colleges, and other departments, agencies, or institutions whose work is distinctly and primarily educational.

Group E, on the other hand, was meant to include those aspects of the work of the multitudinous rural societies, as carried out in their meetings and propaganda, which aim to

instruct. These may comprise the efforts of agricultural fairs to introduce educational feature; programmes of the various horticultural, livestock, and other agricultural societies; lecturer's hour in the grange; village improvement societies; civic associations with rural betterment sections; rural study clubs; boys' and girls' agricultural clubs or institutes, such as the Junior Naturalists in New York, The Nature Guard in Rhode Island, etc.; and agricultural students' unions of various types. Rural societies, in carrying out many of these lines of endeavor, are quite dependent upon the colleges and stations for their material, and oftentimes for the initiative. Nevertheless, the classification is logical, because eventually the work must be fostered and developed through the capacity and persistence of the voluntary organizations themselves.

Group F.- It was meant here to outline a field which is somewhat indefinite in character, but one in which the colleges have a part, together with other agencies. It comprises that form of endeavor which attempts to secure cooperation among various rural organizations and institutions, such as efforts to secure joint sessions between other associations, the organization of associations of teachers and school patrons, the formation of leagues or federations of rural societies for rural progress, the installation of a town room as a social center for the town, etc.

It will be noticed that no provision has been made for the special or short course teaching as at present carried on by at the agricultural colleges. Whatever may be the advantages from the administrative point of view of listing this work as extension teaching, it was agreed by the two committees that **the discussion of short courses belongs to the committee of instruction in agriculture.**

It will be observed further that this entire classification is based primarily upon varieties of work to be done, and secondarily upon types of institutions doing the work. It is an attempt to lay out a logical division of the field of extension teaching. Doubtless it may have to be changed in details as our work proceeds. We have here outlined it at some length because of the fundamental necessity of presenting at the outset some comprehensive analysis of the problems which we are set to investigate.

RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

[Here follows the summary results of the survey of 5,014 institutions, agencies, and organizations relatives to activities in extension teaching.]

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This preliminary survey of agricultural extension teaching in the United States seems to lead to the following conclusions:

(1) The fact that only 6 percent of all the persons addressed reported extension work of any character shows the field that is opening up in this line of educational effort. On the other hand, the fact that 317 agencies of various sorts are at work is indicative of a splendid beginning, particularly when we add to this the immense amount of farmers' institute work now being done.

(2) Nearly all of the institutions are feeling their way. The scattered nature and unorganized character of the work are obvious and significant. Only a few institutions have organized departments of extension teaching. The work thus far has grown out of the needs of the farmers and the desire of the younger institutions to win the regard of the farmers as well as to instruct them. All these efforts have been severely limited by the financial resource at hand and the small amount of time at the disposal of employees of the institutions. **The survey also disclosed, or rather emphasized, the well-known fact that the agricultural experiment stations are doing an enormous amount of extension work, not only through the printed bulletins and the mass of correspondence of stations officials, but also through demonstrations, lectures, and many other lines of effort.**

Absolutely no criticism can be offered of the spirit in which this work is done or of the good efforts produced, but it may be asked, **Why should the experiment station longer burden itself with extension teaching? Why should it not turn over all of the duties just enumerated to other hands, and thus free itself, in time, in money, and in energy, for concentration upon the gigantic problems of genuine research?**

(3) Our correspondence has brought out the most encouraging fact that the country people universally appreciate what has been attempted in agricultural education on their behalf, and most encouraging of all is the evidence that the information already given is merely a stimulus to a demand for further systematizing, perfecting, and expanding along those lines of effort. Apparently also an increasing use is being made of agricultural literature. Even the children in the schools are now reading about farming and are taking an intense interest in agricultural study, both in town and country schools.

(4) **It seems evident to the committee that the time has arrived for a much more complete organization of extension teaching in agriculture.** Only a few institutions have thus far attempted any such organization. But the work is so important, and so much of it, although in a rather desultory way, is being accomplished, that the need of concentrating, systematizing, coordinating, and developing the more important aspects of

extension teaching, particularly in our land-grant colleges, becomes clearly apparent.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Your committee would recommend --

(1) That each college represented in this association organize as soon as practicable a department of extension teaching in agriculture, coordinate with other departments or divisions of the agricultural work, with a competent director in charge and, if possible, with a corps of men at his disposal.

This department should take on, just so far as possible, all phases of extension teaching now performed in other ways. Your committee hopes at some future time to suggest a scheme of organization and effort which would be applicable to most institutions. At present, however, it merely advises this initial and all important step - that of having an official whose chief business it will be to foster, to systematize, and to organize for the institution all the phases of extension it cares to assume.

(2) If in case of any agricultural college, this step is at present impracticable, we would recommend most strongly that the college appoint a faculty committee on extension teaching in agriculture. This committee can be of great assistance to your own committee in further investigating conditions and methods of extension teaching in the respective States. Further than that, each one of such committees should make a careful study of the problem in its particular State, with special reference to the feasibility or organizing definitely a department of college extension.

(3) We request that, if sufficient funds are available, the Office of Experiment Stations print a report, at as early a date as convenient, which shall embody in more detailed form the results obtained in the present investigation through the enquiries sent out by that Office. We believe that the facts collected should be issued in printed form and that this publication should be placed in the hands of the officials of all the institutions and agencies which are now doing or which ought to do extension teaching in agriculture. To that end we would advise a large edition of this pamphlet for wide circulation by the Department of Agriculture.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Kenyon L. Butterfield
Charles R. Van Hise
Charles F. Curtiss
Andrew M. Soule
W.M. Hayes

B.W. Kilgore

RESOLUTION REGARDING AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK BY THE OFFICE OF
EXPERIMENT STATIONS

[K.L. Butterfield introduced a resolution which was debated, revised, and adopted as follows.]

Whereas we believe that the Office of Experiment Stations of the Department of Agriculture should be given an adequate appropriation for the distinct purpose of investigating, in a much more thorough manner than is now practicable, the details of the various forms of agricultural-extension teaching already in vogue, of assisting the different institutions to organize this form of work somewhat comprehensively, and of widely disseminating information and suggestions relative to new developments in this most important form of agricultural education, Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association favor an appropriation by Congress which will enable the Department to carry out the work suggested.

APPENDIX G

AAACES Proceedings 1907 page 24

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION WORK

The following report of the standing committee on extension work was presented by K.L. Butterfield of Massachusetts, chairman:

At the last meeting of the association your committee gave the results of a rather superficial but somehow wide survey of the whole field of extension work as at present carried on in the United States under various auspices. In this report your committee has endeavored to give a more detailed statement in regard to the extension work done by the land grant colleges. Necessarily the account from each college is very brief.

We have now had a view of the general field and a closer look at the immediate problem as it affects the colleges represented in this association. We are prepared with a point of departure for a more careful discussion of methods of work and forms of organization, and this discussion we hope may be presented in the near future.

As last year, we desire to express our appreciation of the cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture, and particularly of the efficient and sympathetic services of Prof. John Hamilton, institute specialist in the Department, who has

been acting as secretary of the committee, and to whom the burden of preparing this report has very largely fallen.

In December, 1906, a letter was sent out to the presidents of the land-grant colleges calling attention to the recommendations of the standing committee on extension work as presented at the meeting of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations at Baton Rouge, requesting that any action taken in the direction of carrying out these recommendations by the institutions addressed be reported to the secretary of this committee. The letter was accompanied by a copy of recommendations, number 1 and 2 of which are as follows:

(1) That each college represented in this association organize as soon as practicable a department of extension teaching in agriculture, coordinate with other departments or divisions of the agricultural work, with a competent director in charge, and, if possible, with a small corps of men at his disposal. This department should take on, just so far as possible, all phases of extension teaching now performed in other ways. Your committee hopes at some future time to suggest a scheme of organization and effort which would be applicable to most institutions. At present, however, it merely advises this initial and all-important step, that of having an official whose chief business will be to foster, to systematize, and to organize for the institution all the phases of extension teaching it cares to assume.

(2) If, in case of any agricultural college, this step is at present impracticable, we would recommend most strongly that the college appoint a faculty committee on extension teaching in agriculture. This committee can be of great assistance to your own committee in further investigating conditions and methods of teaching in the respective States. Further than that, each one of such committees should make a careful study of the problem in its particular State, with special reference to the possibility of organizing definitely a department of college extension.

Forty-two colleges, representing 39 States, replied giving the extent of work of this character already undertaken, and in some instances presenting also outlines of organization for future effort in this direction.

The following summary of these reports indicates in a general way what each institution is doing along extension lines. The reports, for convenience, are arranged in alphabetical order according to states.

[The individual state reports are not shown here but are contained in the Proceedings.]

APPENDIX H

AAACES Proceedings 1908 page 39 [bold face added]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION WORK

This report was submitted by C.F. Curtis, of Iowa, for K.L. Butterfield, chairman of the committee.

Your committee desires, first of all, to emphasize with all possible vigor the pressing need of organized work at the agricultural colleges of this country, by means of which the colleges may more completely reach the working farmers. It is true that the dissemination of information about agriculture has been carried on for many years by the colleges of agriculture and the experiment stations, and that it has been of untold value in stimulating our agricultural production and enlarging our country life. Our former reports have shown that this work is widespread and is assuming large proportions. Nevertheless, your committee is free to assert that **the present scope of dissemination work among farmers is entirely inadequate.** There are tens of thousands of farmers who do not take agricultural papers; probably not 1 farmer in 25 ever attends a farmers' institute; there is a comparatively small amount of consecutive study of agricultural literature among farmers; there is need of more effectively reaching the young farmers at home and in the rural schools. As a plain matter of fact, we are not today, either directly or indirectly, reaching the great mass of the tillers of the soil with educational processes that may be regarded as even fairly efficient. We are doing a large work, but we are not doing work that fully meets the problem. **We must go to the farmers in their homes and communities -- they will not come to us. We must show the farmers how -- the farmers who do not read agricultural literature nor attend farmers' institutes.**

Furthermore, the work of disseminating agricultural information is at present not only inadequate in amount, but it is also desultory and unorganized. There is no State in the Union that has a thoroughgoing system of extension teaching, compactly organized, adequately manned, covering the working forms of extension teaching, and designed actually to reach out a hand to the larger proportion of the men and women and youth of the farms. Your committee believes that the time has come when this problems should be met squarely, and that **steps should be taken at once by all our colleges to organize properly equipped departments for this type of work.**

It is hardly necessary to argue that work of this kind is one of the functions of the agricultural college, whether a

separate institution or a branch of a university. **The agricultural college is the natural source of information about new things, the natural clearing house for the knowledge of the best practices in agriculture. Therefore extension work in the agricultural college is logical.**

Furthermore, the people themselves are beginning to demand a larger amount of extension work. They are asking for help. They wish to be led to new levels. **So that this type of work in an agricultural college is inevitable.**

Extension work in the agricultural college also gives point to experimental work and, indeed, invigorates resident instruction, **because contact with the real problems of the working farmer and with the great issues of country life vitalizes the work of research and inspires instruction. Thus extension work performed by an agricultural college is at once logical, inevitable, vital.**

Your committee desires, therefore, to repeat the substance of two recommendations made in its report last year and two years ago, neither of which recommendations has been acted upon by more than a very few of the institutions belonging to this association. These recommendations were substantially:

First, That each college represented in this association organize, as soon as practicable, a department of extension teaching in agriculture coordinate with other departments or divisions of the agricultural work, with a competent director in charge, and, if possible, with a corps of men at his disposal.

Secondly, That in case any college is not prepared to take this step immediately, it should appoint a faculty committee on extension teaching in agriculture, which should make a thorough investigation of the desirability and feasibility of organizing in that particular college at an early date a recognized department of extension teaching.

We would like to call renewed attention to these recommendations, and ask the members of this association if the time has not arrived when this great work should be properly recognized in the administration of the institutions belonging to this association.

We desire to record our belief that extension teaching should, at the very beginning, be put on the broadest basis, and that in the work of the extension department of the agricultural college there should be fully recognized the economic and social phases of agriculture, and also that great untouched field for educational work - home life on the farm. We will never reach the heart of the rural problem until we at the land-grant colleges and experiment stations are prepared to be of assistance to the farmers and their families along the higher reaches of their

own lives.

We believe the association should definitely recognize the place of extension teaching in the scheme of agricultural education. The men at present in charge of extension work in the various States are beginning to feel the need of coming together to discuss the problems which are already of mutual interest and are coming to have the belief that their work should be more fully recognized by us. They have already called an informal meeting to discuss their problem. They feel, and feel rightly, that their task is an organic part of the institutions here represented. **Your committee therefore recommends that this association take the proper steps to organize a permanent section of this association, to be known as the "section on extension work."**

Your committee in its first report made a brief preliminary survey of the various means of disseminating agricultural information now in vogue in this country. In the second report there was given a somewhat careful resume of the extension work performed by the land-grant institutions of the United States. In preparing both of these reports your committee had, and acknowledged, the substantial assistance of the United States Department of Agriculture, through its Farmers' Institute Specialist, John Hamilton. Your committee still believes that there should be a much more exhaustive study than has yet been made of methods of extension teaching in this country and abroad. We also believe that the United States Department of Agriculture can assist in organizing and developing extension work without in the slightest degree robbing the States of their proper and effective initiative in this work. It is our impression that the Department of Agriculture at the present time does not have an appropriation for the use of the Farmers' Institute Specialist adequate for the purpose either of acquiring information or of developing illustrative material and methods. **We believe, therefore, that for the sake of encouraging extension work itself, Congress should appropriate a much larger sum than it now appropriates for the purpose named.**

It is the belief of your committee that **the chief means of stimulating the proper recognition and adequate organization of extension work in agriculture in our land-grant colleges is a Federal appropriation for the work.** We are quite aware of the objections that may be made to this proposition - that we already have too much Federal supervision; that the Federal Treasury is inadequate to the demands made upon it; that it is becoming too easy to rush to the Federal Government whenever money is desired for any public purpose; and that initiative should be left to the States. But there are fundamental reasons, so it seems to your committee, why we have a right, and, indeed, a duty, to ask

Congress to appropriate money for this purpose. **Extension work in the land-grant colleges differentiates itself sharply from research work on the one hand, and from the instruction of resident students on the other.** There is little chance for argument upon the proposition that the organization of resident instruction through the Morrill and Nelson Acts and the organization of research and experimentation through the Hatch and Adams acts is chiefly responsible for the progress in agricultural education that has been made during the past few decades. It is true that a few individual states had recognized their obligations and opportunities before any of these acts were passed. But what brought these types of work into well-organized form, and what put them on a substantial foundation, was the Federal appropriation. **We can now think of no argument that has ever applied or does now apply to Federal appropriations for agricultural colleges and experiment stations that does not equally apply to extension work, which is organic and vital in the development of the functions of the institutions which we represent.**

We would not advocate a large appropriation for this purpose. **We would suggest that the proposed law should make an appropriation of, say, \$10,000 a year from the federal Treasury to each land-grant college for the purpose of carrying on extension work in agriculture, and that the act be so framed that, after this appropriation has been made, there shall also be an appropriation, based on some per capita standard, made to the same institutions for the same purpose on condition that the States themselves appropriate equal amounts.** Thus we would have effected a stimulus for well-organized extension work in every land-grant college in the United States. State initiative would not be destroyed, but rather stimulated. It would remain with the States themselves to determine how far they would care to go. In any event it would not be a heavy drain on their own treasuries.

May we call the attention of the members of this association to what is, perhaps, a fanciful idea, but which is also a rather suggestive one? In 1862, the federal Government made its first munificent grant to the agricultural colleges. In 1887, twenty-five years later, it established its first formal aid for research and experimentation, which has revolutionized our agriculture and our agricultural education. **May there not be some point in the plea that, by the time another quarter century has rolled around, we should see another Federal appropriation for this third great phase of agricultural instruction which must be performed by agricultural; colleges - extension work?** When we come to celebrate in 1912, as we ought, the fiftieth anniversary of the passage of the first Morrill Act, and the twenty-fifth

anniversary of the passage of the Hatch Act, shall we not also be able to rejoice in the fact that there has been made and that there is in operation a fairly liberal Federal appropriation which shall stimulate and direct the energies of our agricultural colleges in an endeavor to carry out to the great masses of our farmers some of the privileges and inspiration and knowledge that originate in the stations and colleges?

A practical suggestion of a minor nature, although one that is really important, is that **the Federal Government should extend the franking privilege to the land-grant colleges for publications that are not primarily advertising in character.** It is a well-known fact that many of the bulletins of the experiment stations are not reports of experiments, but are monographs or compilations. These publications are franked. Your committee believes that what is now done practically should be done avowedly. The United States Department of Agriculture also has the privilege of franking any form of publication. **One factor in the successful development of extension teaching must be the larger dissemination of printed information, and this can hardly be done unless the franking privilege is granted to the extension departments of the land-grant colleges.**

Your committee does not wish to rest under the imputation of having presented a report which shall seem to lay down a scope of operations of future committees, but there is one phase of the work of this committee which has impressed itself so strongly that we feel it incumbent upon us to state our views on the subject.

During the past year your committee has given considerable study to three fundamental considerations with respect to the development of extension teaching. The first is an outline of the field of extension work, including the definitions of terms and a description of the forms of work; the second is the administrative organization of the work, both within the institution and with respect to the field machinery; and the third is the relationships of the extension work in agriculture at the land-grant colleges to other agencies for the popular dissemination of agricultural information and to other educational institutions. These three lines of thought, together with minute and special study of the manifold methods of carrying on extension work, are, in the judgement of your committee, subjects of the most careful study of this standing committee in the future. This is peculiarly true of the subject of the relationship of extension work. We do not believe there can be a thorough appreciation of the function of extension teaching unless we understand its place in the general scheme of agricultural education. We must determine its relationships to the work of the experiment station, to the work of college instruction, to the short courses of the college, to the work of other colleges, universities and normal schools,

and to secondary schools of agriculture, to the voluntary organizations and enterprises, such as the agricultural press, the grange, the various agricultural associations, and the rural work of the Young Men's Christian Association, etc. What shall be its relation to the United States Department of Agriculture, to the various boards of agriculture, to the work of the various State bureaus and commissions? It is exceedingly important that the function of our great system of farmers' institutes to the general scheme of extension teaching shall be considered, and if possible decided.

In the judgement of your committee, these are not academic questions. They go to the very root of the purpose and character of extension teaching. They are fundamental considerations. The members of your committee have given some attention to these questions during the past year. They have tentatively formulated their views and come to a substantial agreement. For various reasons it seemed best at this time to present for your consideration a few definite recommendations, which we believe to be the basis for the early organization of this work in all of the institutions belonging to this association. At the same time we believe thoroughly that there should be a comprehensive study of these larger phases of the work. Only by the assistance of the United States Department of Agriculture can this committee hope to make a proper study of the details of methods. Some progress can be made in the near future in outlining the work of extension departments, and perhaps in defining terms. As soon as the department of college extension are actually organized the questions centering about administration will become pressing and will need the attention of your committee. But it is perhaps chiefly in the realm of the relationships of extension teaching that especial care should be exercised. **Your committee therefore recommends to the association that there be appointed a joint commission, organized in some such manner as the commission appointed to study the relationships of the agencies doing research or experimental work in agriculture, to study the fundamental relationship of the institutions and agencies designed to disseminate agricultural information among the people; or, if this does not seem best to the association, we urge strongly that your standing committee on extension work be given specific authority to study this subject and to report upon it at some future time.**

Your committee in closing, wishes to summarize their present recommendations as follows, presenting them to the association for such action as may be deemed wise:

- (1) We recommend that each institution represented in this association organize as soon as possible a definite scheme of extension work in agriculture.**

(2) We recommend that the association organize a section of the association to be known as the "section of extension work."

(3) We recommend that the association favor increased appropriations for the United States Department of Agriculture for the purpose of making investigations into all phases of the work of disseminating agricultural information, and of assisting the States in every practicable way to organize the work under the best auspices.

(4) We recommend that the association place itself on record in favor of a moderate Federal appropriation to be made to the land-grant colleges for the purpose of carrying on extension work in agriculture under a plan which requires the States also to make appropriations for the work.

(5) We recommend that the association request Congress to extend the franking privilege to bona fide extension publications issued by the land-grant colleges.

(6) We recommend either the appointment of a joint commission representing the various agencies interested to report on the proper relationships of the extension work in agriculture to be carried on by the land-grant colleges to other agencies and institutions performing a similar service; or, if the association think it a wiser plan, we strongly urge that specific authority be granted by the association to this standing committee on extension work to make a study of this subject and to report on it at a future meeting of the association.

As a final word, may we once more express our firm belief in the fundamental importance of an immediate organization of extension work in agriculture under the auspices of the land-grant colleges. We are convinced that the most pressing need in the development of our agricultural industry, and in the enlargement of our country life in America, is the wider diffusion of the knowledge we already possess. Shall we longer delay to render that full service which will be so far-reaching in its effects?

Respectfully submitted.

Kenyon L. Butterfield,
Charles R. Van Hise,
Charles F. Curtiss,

Andrew M. Soule,
W.M. Hays,
W.C. Latta,
Committee

Sections 1 and 3 and the last part of section 6, beginning "we strongly urge," were approved. Section 2 was postponed indefinitely. Sections 4 and 5 were, after debate, referred to the section on college work and administration as required by the constitution in case of administrative matters, and were not again reported to the convention.

APPENDIX I

AAACES Proceedings 1909 page 34 [boldface added]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION WORK

The report of this committee was presented by K.L. Butterfield of Massachusetts, as follows:

I. SECTION ON EXTENSION WORK

Your committee repeats its recommendation of a year ago, that **there should be organized in this association a section on extension work.** It is believed that such a section would accomplish the following results:

(1) It would at once elevate the extension work of the land-grant colleges to the place where it belongs -- **a line of endeavor coordinate with that of research through the experiment station and that of teaching through the college courses.**

(2) It would immediately suggest to all the land-grant colleges **the supreme desirability of organizing extension work in a way commensurate with its dignity and with the need for the work.**

(3) It would bring into the ranks of this association the active managers of extension work, who have already formed an organization of their own. We need these men for the good of the colleges, for **extension work can not safely be separated from the other work of our institutions.**

Objections have been raised to the formation of such a section. Some of these are discussed briefly:

(1) Even if desirable, the time is not ripe for it.

It seems to the committee that we are fully ready for the organization of such a section, simply because the time is ripe for a complete recognition of this field of work and for its thorough organization. That this association is the proper body to take cognizance of these facts and to give the initiative to the movement admits of no debate, in our judgement.

(2) It would separate important discussions from the main program of the association.

Your committee believes that extension subjects are not likely to be discussed adequately in the main program of this association. It has many other things to discuss. Especially in the initial stages of extension work it is important that details be threshed over and over again by the workers themselves in order that fundamental principles

may be worked out from the chaff and eventually displace mere empiricism. We see no more reason why a section on extension work will result disastrously to our main program than is the case with other sections. It is not the function of your committee to outline methods of procedure for the annual meeting of this body, but we venture to suggest that sections designed respectively for the experiment stations, for the college, and for extension work may well discuss the details of all problems which arise in the work and administration of those particular phases of our institutional work, and that the main program may well be reserved for the discussion of the larger implications of our field of thought and activity; in other words, for the study of agricultural education in its larger aspects, and for the consideration of the problem of coordinating these lines of work, and of relating them to the general movement for educational progress.

(3) It would raise the question of eligibility to membership in the association of managers of extension work. The easiest solution of this difficulty is to make these men definably eligible to the association.

II. NATIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR EXTENSION WORK

Your committee also renews its recommendation of a year ago, in favor of **a national appropriation for extension work, made under such conditions that state aid shall be absolutely requisite in order to secure any substantial amount from the federal treasury.** Later in this report your committee will outline more fully its reason for this recommendation.

III. FRANKING PRIVILEGE

The committee also renews its recommendation of a year ago for the **granting by Congress of the franking privilege to bona fide extension publications.**

IV. EXTENSION DEPARTMENT IN EACH COLLEGE

Your committee has recommended for three successive years, and now repeats the recommendation, **that there be organized in each land-grant college a thoroughly equipped plan for extension work.** The colleges are gradually falling into line with this plan, but the movement is making slow progress.

We are more than ever impressed with the necessity of developing the thorough organization of the work and with the crying need for the work itself. Nearly every land-grant college

is doing work of this character, but in most cases it is unorganized, chaotic, without large plan, and, as a rule, we venture to say, grossly inadequate to the needs of the working farmers of the respective States.

It has been suggested that your committee outline a practical plan by which this organization could be undertaken. Without going into any detail, your committee makes the following suggestions:

(1) That **every land-grant college appoint a director of extension work** who shall give all of his time to this line of endeavor.

(2) That sufficient salary be paid to secure a man who is well equipped for the place, and that he be given substantial funds at the outset.

(3) That, whenever possible, he be given assistants, either one or more men who can give all of their time to extension work and act as "field agents", or have at his disposal the partial time of men who are connected with the college or station staff.

(4) That the first work to be done should be that of organizing those methods of extension work which are already in vogue at the college. Nearly all the colleges have large correspondence with farmers, send out publications which are in the nature of monographs on practical subjects, give lectures before granges and other local organizations, and hold demonstrations. We would advise that all the work be unified and put, so far as the administration is concerned, into the hands of the director of extension work. It may be desirable temporarily to have the short winter and summer courses offered by the institution placed under the same management, although, strictly speaking, these enterprises are not extension work. **It is exceedingly important that men assigned chiefly to extension teaching, while immediately responsible to the director of that work, shall also have equally close connections with those teaching departments of the institution in which their special subject naturally lies.**

(5) We would then go so far as to suggest that those activities of the experiment station which are not primarily connected with research or experimentation, but which are really designed to give popular dissemination to general agricultural information, and which so burden the time and energy of most of our station workers, should as rapidly as possible be given over to the general direction of the director of extension work.

(6) Finally, and most important of all, we would urge upon the director of extension work and the administration of the institution the prime necessity of getting into the public mind a thorough understanding of what extension work is. It is not a scheme to advertise the college. It is not a plan to trap students for the college, or even to get boys and girls interested in agricultural schools and colleges generally. **It is fundamentally a means of teaching the people out of school about agriculture and country life in all its phases. It is an educational proposition. Its aim should be to reach every farmer and his family.**

V. A CAMPAIGN FOR RURAL PROGRESS

There is another phase of this movement for disseminating popular information about agriculture which has a very direct bearing upon the extension work of the agricultural college. It has become evident that while the work of our experiment stations, colleges, and farmers' institutes, in preaching the need of better methods of farming, and in seeking to discover and impress the great fundamental principles of agricultural production upon the people, is a work absolutely essential to agricultural progress, nevertheless **we have heretofore placed the emphasis too exclusively upon the business of farming and have not sufficiently emphasized the social or human aspect of the problem.**

Furthermore, the various institutions engaged in work on behalf of our agricultural industry or rural people have labored very much by themselves. There has been a very slight measure of cooperation between rural church, country school, grange, club, agricultural college, and library.

There is now a clear thought that these two defects in our agricultural propaganda must be remedied. **Without lessening in the slightest degree our efforts for more scientific farming, we must emphasize as never before the development of a better personal and community life in our agricultural districts** and we must attempt in some way to bring together those various institutions and agencies designed to serve rural life which have hitherto worked apart.

A very suggestive pattern is found for this work in the new movement for "city planning". The idea of city planning originated with landscape gardeners, and was designed for the beautification of our cities; but the movement has already grown far beyond any question of aesthetics, and embraces a consideration of the whole range of moral and social life. It is exemplified in the "Boston 915" movement, which is attracting so much attention in the east, and which is nothing more nor less than a definite propaganda for the unification of all interests in that great city on behalf of a broad-gage campaign for urban progress, not only industrial and aesthetic, but moral and social.

Now the counterpart of this city planning may be expressed in the term "a campaign for rural progress." For several years this idea has been gaining ground in some States, and a number of conferences on rural progress have been organized. Three New England conferences on rural progress have been held in the city of Boston, and representatives from all of the New England States and their agricultural colleges and experiment stations, state granges, state boards of agriculture, state departments of education, state federations of churches, and other bodies have been present. There has been admitted to membership in this conference a list of about 70 institutions and organizations in New England, representing all possible phases of agriculture and

rural life - technical, industrial, economic, educational, social, and religious. We have here, then, a type for a new movement in rural life, which is nothing more nor less than that of bringing to bear upon the development of the agricultural industry and the rural community the work of all those institutions and individuals that are concerned with the problem; and not only so, but of having withal a definite plan and goal for all this broad work.

Now, this idea of a campaign for rural progress is tied up intimately with the idea of the proper development of extension work in the land-grant colleges, because **the function of extension work in the land-grant college is not only to impart knowledge, but also to give the college leadership in agriculture and country life.** It seems to your committee as if the mention of these two great ideas - that American rural society is to plan its future, and that **the agricultural college shall be the great organ of knowledge and leadership** on behalf of this planning -- suggests without further argument the prime importance of a great campaign for rural progress and the need for entering upon it at once.

VI. FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE

Your committee has already stated its recommendation for federal appropriations for extension work. In closing its report, your committee desires to outline with extreme brevity, the character of legislation which it thinks desirable and the reasons for it. In the first place, we desire to mention a few general arguments for federal aid:

(1) It would stimulate the complete organization of extension work in our agricultural colleges.

(2) It would call attention to the importance of extension work, both in the college and among the people at large.

(3) It would give the movement a national character and significance.. This is worth a good deal, because the work at once becomes a national concern, and not merely a question of state pride or efficiency.

(4) It would thus attract agricultural college students to the opportunity for a new career. Your committee believes that the proper development of extension work in our agricultural colleges means a new occupation for hundreds and perhaps thousands of well-trained men.

(5) Government supports a national system of agricultural colleges and experiment stations. This money, however, is not available for extension work, although extension work from our point of view is fully coordinate with the work of the college and station.

VII. A PLAN FOR A PROPOSED NATIONAL APPROPRIATION
FOR EXTENSION WORK

(1) **Appropriate \$10,000 a year** from the National Treasury to each State and Territory, for extension work in agriculture and rural life.

(2) Provide that at any time, after two years have elapsed from the date any State or Territory has accepted this appropriation and has actually organized extension work in connection with its land-grant college, there shall be available from the National Treasury, **in addition to the amount named above, an amount of money, for each State and Territory, for the same purpose, equal to the amount appropriated by the legislature of the state or Territory, for this purpose;** provided, that the additional appropriation to any State or Territory shall not exceed an amount equal to 1 cent per capita of the total population of that State or Territory as shown by the last United States census.

(3) **This appropriation should be given specifically to the land-grant colleges and only to them.**

(4) **Require each college to organize a "department" or "division" of "school" of extension work, i.e. to organize the work as a definite part of the institution.**

(5) **Confine the work for the present to agriculture, domestic science, and other phases of rural life.**

(6) **Define extension work broadly and yet closely. Define agriculture and rural life so as to include instruction and aid in any phase of this field - in subjects technical and scientific, concerning business management, home making, sanitation; and economic, social, and moral subjects. Indicate that extension work is for adults and youth and children, and for people in towns and cities as well as in the open country.**

(7) **Extend the franking privilege to bona fide extension publications, and permit the use of federal appropriations for printing such publications.**

(8) **Also appropriate annually a substantial sum, perhaps \$25,000 to \$50,000 to the United States Department of Agriculture, for investigation into and experimentation with methods of popular education in agriculture and rural life, in this country and abroad, for distributing the results of such investigations and making demonstrations thereof.**

ADVANTAGES OF THE PLAN PROPOSED

(1) **This plan would give the program for extension work immediate national significance.**

(2) **There would be no delay because of a failure of the legisla-**

ture to act, and the work on at least a small scale could be started in each State.

(3) It provides sufficient money to put the poor, backward, or small State on a good footing with respect to the work.

(4) It enables the States to develop the work as rapidly as seems wise to them.

(5) It makes the United States Department of Agriculture a clearing house for methods of extension work, and keeps it in close touch with the work in all the States and Territories.

(6) It gives adequate breadth and scope to the whole scheme, and prevents States from leaving out important phases of the work.

(7) If later needs warrant, the [per capita amount can be increased without other change in the law, and extension work in mechanic arts and in general agriculture subjects can be added by simple amendment.

(8) The amount of money immediately required is not large, and in fact, when the act is in full operation will not draw heavily on either national or state treasuries.

(9) It divides the responsibility between national and state governments and completes the circle of national aid for the land-grant colleges on principles already recognized in the two Morrill acts, in the Nelson Act, in the Hatch Act, and in the Adams Act.

(10) It recognizes and supports the great movement for making more fully available to the mass of working farmers the results of the research and experimentation of the stations organized under and fostered by the Hatch and Adams acts, and the organized teaching and inspiration of the agricultural colleges supported by the Morrill and Nelson acts.

VIEWS OF THE COMMISSION ON COUNTRY LIFE

The position of your committee with respect to the development of extension work and the appropriation of federal funds to assist the States in carrying on this work finds substantial support in the report of the Commission on Country Life. This commission had unusual facilities for securing the opinion of the farmers of the country with respect to the chief needs of the time in the development of agricultural and rural life, as well as a unique opportunity to draw conclusions with respect to the fundamental principles of an advanced movement on behalf of American agriculture. We therefore desire to quote from that part of the report of the commission, as presented to the President, bearing upon the development of extension work on a national scale:

"We find a general demand for federal encouragement in

educational propaganda to be in some way cooperative with the States. The people realize that the incubus of ignorance and inertia is so heavy and so widespread as to constitute a national danger, and that it should be removed as rapidly as possible. **It will be increasingly necessary for the national and the state governments to cooperate to bring about the results that are needed in agricultural and other industrial education.**

"The consideration of the educational problem raises the greatest single question that has come before the commission, and which the commission has to place before the American people. Education has now come to have vastly more significance than the mere establishment and maintaining of schools. The education motive has been taken into all kinds of work with the people, directly in their homes and on their farms, and it reaches mature persons as well as youths. Beyond and behind all educational work there must be an aroused public sentiment; to make this sentiment is the most important work immediately before us. The whole country is alive with educational activity. While this activity may be all good, it nevertheless needs to be directed and correlated, and all the agencies should be more or less federated.

"The arousing of the people must be accomplished in term of their daily lives or of their welfare. For the country people this means that it must largely be in terms of agriculture. Some of the colleges of agriculture are now doing this kind of work effectively, although on a pitiably small scale as compared with the needs. **This is extension work, by which is meant all kinds of educational effort directly with the people, both young and old, at their homes and on their farms; it comprises all the educational work that is conducted away from the institution and for those who cannot go to schools and colleges.** The best extension work now proceeding in this country -- if measured by the effort to reach the people in their homes and on their own grounds -- is that coming from some of the colleges of agriculture and the United States Department of Agriculture. Within the last five or ten years the colleges of agriculture have been able to attack the problem of rural life in a new way. **This extension work includes such efforts as local agricultural surveys, demonstrations on farms, nature study, and other work in schools, boys' and girls' clubs of many kinds, crop organizations, redirection of rural societies, reading clubs, library extension, lectures, traveling schools, farmers' institutes, inspections**

of herds, barns, crops, orchards, and farms, publications of many kinds, and similar educational effort directly in the field.

"To accomplish these ends we suggest the establishment of a nation-wide extension work. The first, or original, work of the agricultural branches of the land-grant colleges was academic in the old sense; later there was added the great field of experiment and research; now there should be added the third coordinate branch, comprising extension work, without which no college of agriculture can adequately serve its State. It is to the extension department of these colleges, if properly conducted, that we must now look for the most effective rousing of the people on the land."

Respectfully submitted.

Kenyon L. Butterfield
C.R. Van Hise
W.C. Latta
C.B. Curtiss
Andrew M. Soule
W.M. Hayes
Committee

The recommendations contained in the report were referred to the section on college work and administration for consideration. Later the section reported its approval of the report with the understanding that only the general idea of a federal appropriation was considered and the report was adopted.

Page 72. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING EXTENSION WORK

K.L. Butterfield. The committee on extension work in presenting its report to the association instructed the chairman to move the adoption of the report. There are three distinct recommendations in the report that would seem to require the action of the association. All these, I may say, were recommended last year. The first refers to an amendment to the constitution providing for adding to our association a section on extension work. The other recommendations are, **first, that Congress be requested to grant the franking privilege for bona fide extension publications; and second, that the association endorse the idea of asking Congress, as soon as it may seem wise, for a federal appropriation for extension work.**

The committee asks to have the report adopted with the understanding that such action need not commit the association to an endorsement of every word or item of the report. The commit-

tee has outlined in its report a plan for a proposed bill in Congress to cover this matter of the appropriation. Undoubtedly different individuals in the association will differ widely as to the details of this bill. But this outline was presented as embodying, in the judgement of the committee, the principles which ought to underlay such a bill. It was the hope of the committee that the association might feel like adopting the report because of the very definite recommendation which it makes and because of the main idea with regard to the scope and character of a federal appropriation.

The first recommendation of the committee to be considered is that there shall be organized in this association a section on extension work. We went over this matter carefully a year ago and since then have had it under advisement as a committee. We have consulted with a large number of men who are interested and especially the men who are now undertaking the extension work. We come to this association at this time with a renewed and unanimous recommendation for the new section.

page 78

K.L. Butterfield. I do not want to take up the time of the section, because the arguments have been brought out very clearly by those who have spoken so far. But I want to call attention to two things. The difficulties mentioned are recognized by the committee. We recognize that there is a certain anomaly, perhaps, in establishing a section of extension work when we have so few extension workers, and when the work is so new; and we recognize other difficulties such as President Fellows spoke about. But we feel these are minor things that can well be swept away because of the larger interests at stake. There will be some conflicts. But **the fundamental thing that we contend for is the recognition of the extension work as coordinate with these other two lines of work.** That is the real heart of the matter, and that is the real reason why we are so earnest in presenting this question to the association. It has been suggested that we wait a little to see the drift of things. That is precisely what we do not want to do. We want to give to the present extension work the help that will come out of its recognition. It has been suggested that the administrative officers of the extension work will be subordinates; that may be true in some institutions as the work starts, but fundamentally the administrative officer of the experiment station is on precisely the same footing.

So, waiving these minor considerations, the question at issue really is, in my judgement, just what place we are willing to concede to the section work, as a growing phase, and a phase that is soon to be of the utmost significance, of the work of the land-grant college. We contend that the time is here when that

recognition should be given. We admit that at first the work may be rather weak and the attendance may be small, but we believe that in two or three years after such a section is actually organized the work will be thoroughly on its feet. And nothing will do more to put it on its feet as a section and a department of our work than the organization of a section. If that is done a large number of men will be here next year, and in future years that number will be larger; if not, I shall be very much disappointed. The committee feel that **these objections, many of which are real, may well be swept aside in order to give recognition to extension work as coordinate with those other two lines of work.** That is the question at issue. It should be decided now for the sake of the work of the college.

{The recommendation of the committee that a separate section on extension work be formed was referred with approval to the general session of the association.}

K.L. Butterfield. The second recommendation of the committee is one that was made a year ago and has not yet been acted upon by this section or by the association, namely, that Congress be requested to grant the franking privilege to bona fide extension publications. I may say in this connection that it seems to feel that this recommendation is in a sense attached to the general idea of a federal appropriation, but it is not necessarily so, and may well be discussed as a thing by itself.

{ The recommendation was approved. }

page 79

K.L. Butterfield. The third recommendation of the committee is similar to that made a year ago, namely, that we state as the policy of the association that we are in favor of a federal appropriation for extension work. It is not in the minds of the committee that this is a propaganda that should be pushed with undue haste before Congress, but I think all of us feel that it is something that ought to be acted upon by the association at this time.

Your committee believes thoroughly that the Federal treasury should be asked to assist in supporting extension work. We have already, by recommending the organization of a section, recognized what has come to be the common mind among us, I believe, that really this extension work is coordinate with the other lines of work. Now, we feel that it ought to be so recognized by Congress and by the public. The fundamental principle, as I understand it, of the Morrill acts and of the various appropriation acts, as the Nelson Act, is that of federal aid supplemented

by state support. We ask that the same principle precisely be applied to this coordinate branch of the work of extension. It seems to us that it is a fundamentally correct position and argument. Furthermore, we think the time has arrived when it should be taken up because of the diverse ways in which the states are going at the work, and that the same things which have given us a certain measure of uniformity and standardization among the land-grant colleges, and in the work of the experiment stations will result from a federal act which defines extension work, and which immediately, in the public mind, gives it a certain scope and dignity. **The work is important enough to have national character, national direction, national significance.** We are quite aware that a good many States are taking up the matter, and it may be argued that they will all do it eventually. But I should reply that is precisely the history of the experiment stations. I am sure it would have constituted no valid argument against the Hatch Act, but rather would have been in its favor, to say that after twelve or fifteen States had organized experiment stations the thing was put on a national basis and given national support, and that immediately the whole country was alive with research work. We feel the same thing will come about here because essentially the same propositions are at stake.

In our outline of the proposed plan we are not at all tenacious about any parts, but have endeavored to recognize certain principles that we regard as sound. In the first place, we have suggested an appropriation of \$10,000 a year direct to each State from the Federal treasury. That is not a large amount, and it will immediately, when the bill is passed by Congress and goes into operation, put the extension work into every land-grant college in the country, and this the whole work will be nationalized. Otherwise there will be a good many States that would not take up this work at this time. Further, this \$10,000 will be ample to carry on the work in some States for several years. Then again we suggest that the States which wish to carry the work further may do it by money from the state treasury, assisted from the Federal Treasury up to a certain limit determined on a per capita basis.

In reply to a question by J.L. Snyder, of Michigan, President Butterfield stated that **the proposed bill had been framed with the idea that the funds were to be turned over to the college to be administered through the proper administrative officers of the college.**

On motion the matter was referred to the general session of the association with approval of the general principle involved in the recommendation.

The report of the committee as a whole was then adopted.

APPENDIX J

Paper Delivered by Butterfield at the Annual Meeting of the AAACES, 1913 pages 154-158 (boldface added)

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES IN THEIR EXTENSION WORK AND SUGGESTIONS FOR MEETING THEM

By K.L. Butterfield

I found some difficulty in selecting the problems to bring up for discussion. I chanced the other day to see a questionnaire that had been sent out by a committee of the extension section, and judging from that there are 114 problems confronting our extension services. Manifestly there must be some choice at the outset.

It would seem to me that the type of problem which probably needs as much thought and discussion now as any other, is that of relationships. It is really a part of that large question of coordination in our agricultural activities which the Secretary of Agriculture mentioned in his address at this convention. So I have chosen, as a general theme under this title on the program, the relationships of the extension service.

One of the first relationships of the extension service is to the experiment station. Of course the field of the research man and the field of the extension man at first thought lie rather widely apart, although everyone will at once admit that in the last analysis the effectiveness of the institution to the working farmers will be measured very largely by the efficiency with which these two do their work, and work together; because in the long run the research of the station must be put at the disposal of the working farmer.

There is, however, a point of relationship somewhat more immediate and obvious, and that is in the line of what some of us are calling, for want of a better name, the agricultural survey work. There is a class of problems - investigational problems - that at first thought might seem to belong to the extension men, the investigation of economic conditions, that really belong to the experiment station. **Has not the time come when the stations should take on research work in the economics and social field in agriculture as well as in the conventional scientific fields? Shall we not follow up the desired enlargement of the functions of the agricultural college to cover the whole field of agriculture and country life, by organizing the research or investigational work of the whole moral problem on an adequate basis?**

If that is done, it immediately raises questions in connection with the field work of the extension men, who, as President Waters stated, ought to be doing a type of research work consist-

ing, largely, of a study of the actual situation, each in his own line - farm management, agronomy, community life, or what not. **Such work should be organized and definite, and, if possible, take the form of community studies. Thus the extension men will assist the communities and neighborhoods to study themselves.** What ever the problems of the local community, the farmers collectively should so far as possible work those things out for themselves, **but should have the assistance of the extension men to bring in the investigational phase.**

Another relationship is that of the extension service to college teaching. I do not hold with President Waters that the extension man should teach a college course. It is theoretically sound that the research man should do a little teaching and a little extension work, that the teacher should do a little research and a little extension work, and the extension man a little research and a little teaching; but there are practical difficulties in the way of carrying out the scheme, and these difficulties, I think, are perhaps greatest in the case of the extension man, although that is a debatable question. **At any rate, the practice must be, in the main, that the chief work of the research man is research, of the college teacher, teaching, and of the extension man, extension service.**

At the same time, this practice will raise significant questions. Imagine an institution organized on a departmental basis, and a strong man at the head of a given department, whose work heretofore has been that of college teaching. Perhaps he has graduate students, is a superb teacher, feels that teaching is his function. Then comes the demand for extension work in that particular department; two men are hired to give most of their time to meet this call. Now it may be that this department head is also a good extension man, but whether he is or not, as human nature goes, some very practical, vital questions are sure to arise if this strong virile man stays most of the time on the college campus, while his department is represented practically all of the time, to the farmers of the state, by younger and less experienced men. This department head who desires to keep his head above water, but who cannot give large amounts of time to research, to teaching and to extension work, who must specialize, will have serious questionings as to what is to be his real work. Shall he enter largely upon extension work for his own sake, his own reputation - because the farmers demand the very best, and want him - or shall he stay largely on the campus? I think no categorical answer can be given to such a question. It all depends on the man, on the institution, and on the demand for the work. But it does indicate - and I bring it forward simply for that purpose - a difficulty in relationship that has to be worked out.

Another relationship, important in many states and critical in some, is the relationship between the extension service and other public supported agencies, like the board of agriculture, the board of education, the board of public health. There is one fundamental principle that must ultimately be accepted, namely, that the agricultural college through its extension service is the main agricultural agency of the state. There are limitations to that point of view> I appreciate the fact that where as system of agricultural education in the public schools is being developed, either in existing schools or special schools, questions will arise that may sometimes seem to belong to the college and sometimes to other state agencies, like the board of education. But even there the principle holds, namely, that **the extension service work of the college of agriculture is an educational work; that the work of other state-supported agencies is essentially administrative work.** If we can accept this principle, I think we will solve most of these difficulties in the relationships between the college and its extension service, and other state supported agencies. If we do not accept it, we shall be in perpetual chaos, and in the longer run the bigger dog will win the day.

We concede that there ought to be in every state a strong department or commissioner of agriculture, and affirm that the functions of this state-supported agency are administrative and not educational; but we cannot always make the sharp distinction. Some things have gone on so long that we cannot change them; but in the main this agency should be charges with the gathering of statistical data and should administer appropriate laws for the protection of farmers. If a state is to stimulate agriculture in any way through prizes, or take the leadership directly in developing agriculture, as in irrigation or in forestry, in reclaiming waste state lands, then as a rule such work may be done advantageously as an administrative matter through the state department of agriculture. Although historically the state department clearly possesses the prerogative of disseminating agricultural information, under the present day conditions such work should be left to the extension services of the agricultural college.

Another relationship that thus far has not given much trouble, but is raising some fundamental questions, is the relationship of the extension service to voluntary associations in agriculture. Within the next few years we will be obliged to define somewhat clearly the functions of Government, both national and state, in the development of our agriculture and country life. The agricultural college is part of the government. I have endeavored to define the work of administration and educational work within a state. But now take the whole government-supported machinery. What shall be the relationship to voluntary associa-

tions of farmers? The principle here is this, that in general the state ought not to do anything that the people can do for themselves, either in their individual or in their collective capacity. There is a qualification to this in the sense that the Government is the people doing the people's work, and consequently the people of the state have the right to insist on appropriations that shall make available to all the people the work of public paid experts in agriculture; but for many reasons we should not allow ourselves to come to an organization of our agriculture and country life that atrophies the activities of individual farmers or of individual farmers' organizations; but on the contrary, where it may be necessary temporarily for government agencies to go a long way in stimulating new activities in the part of individuals and institutions and organizations in our agricultural work, the deliberate aim should be to turn over all activities possible to voluntary agencies.

Now I propose an academic definition or limitation of the work of Government, just for the purposes of discussion. I think that the government - the state Government, the national Government through its different agencies - may investigate any question that has a bearing upon the problems of agriculture and country life. There may be some, but not many, limitations as to the scope, the field of investigation. The government agencies should attempt to interpret these investigations so that the people may understand their meaning, and then it becomes the duty of these agencies to inform the people as to the facts and principles that have been discovered in terms that they can understand. It is also competent for the government to advise individuals and groups of individuals as to the application of these principles to their daily work and life, insofar as the people are ready for advice from that quarter. It is also not going too far for the Government to attempt to demonstrate that these principles may be applied, and how they may be applied, all along the line of agriculture and country life. But the Government may not participate in the farming business; it should not try to run the individual farmer's business for him, nor the collective business of the farmers, nor the neighborhood life of the community.

Here we must draw a somewhat sharp distinction. I know that the county agents are being called upon to do much work in connection with collective buying and selling. **I think we will get into trouble if men paid from public funds become business agents for farmers.** We at least ought to agree, whether we agree on this limitation or not, on the line beyond which it is not competent and wise for Government to go. This is a very vital and critical relationship of the extension service.

There is also the relationship of the extension service of the State Agricultural College to the United States Department of

Agriculture. It seems to me that this relationship, as defined by the tentative agreement between our executive committee and the Department, is not open to very serious criticism, unless it be the criticism that it does not cover the whole case. I understand, if I read correctly, that this definition is intended to cover work to be done under the Lever bill, if it becomes law, and as such there is not much to say in criticism. But as the Secretary said in his address, you cannot bottle up the Department of Agriculture as an investigational institution any more than you can bottle up a college of agriculture as an investigational institution; and dissemination of information about agriculture and country life is just as legitimate and just as much expected in the case of the Federal Department as it is in the case of the college.

There always must be, everyone desires that there should be, much dissemination work on the part of the United States Department of Agriculture that is not covered by the Lever bill. Hence there is just as much need for the working out of principles that shall govern the relationships of the state extension work and the dissemination work of the Department of Agriculture at that point, as there is in working out the terms of agreement under the Lever bill. I offer no special suggestion along this line, although it seem to me that the great function of the Federal Department in dissemination should be that of a great central clearing-house; that it should be a leader of leaders, a teacher of teachers; that the great aid it can render is in bringing to bear the advantages that the department men have in getting hold of problems that are being worked out over a wide area, on a regional, a national, or a world scale; bringing the benefit of that experience to bear on the problems within a given state, which means close cooperation with the forces that are working in that state. I am aware that the people of the United States have come to look to the Department for immediate information. I do not know how many hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of letters it answers yearly. We cannot gainsay that the farmers desire to get information therefrom. It has earned a great prestige along that line. But at the same time I raise the question whether the long look ahead should not contemplate the solution of the local problems almost wholly through the state agencies, and the utilizing of departmental dissemination work in connection with the larger aspects of the question. I wish emphatically to say that the need of working out a clear principle of cooperation and of delimitation between the department and the state extension services is just as significant for this general work which is not at all covered by the Lever bill, as it is in working out relationships under the Lever bill.

The last relationship that I shall discuss here today is that of the extension services to privately supported agencies.

No endowed or privately supported agency ought to try to cover ground that is already being effectively covered by government work. Money given by a great corporation should either be given in support of public agencies or private organizations without restriction, or be made available for the help of communities that desire to cooperate with the Government.

Our tentative agreement with the Department says "that no outside cooperative arrangement for maintaining extension service shall be made with any commercial body, excepting as commercial body may wish to donate funds to be administered in extension service exclusively by the colleges of agriculture in consultation with the Department." This ought not to be interpreted or construed so as to prevent financial cooperation between agricultural colleges through their extension service and local bodies, such as county organizations, boards or railways within the state, where they all work together under the direction of the college of agriculture on some agreed project or plan. (see footnote following)

Other problems of relationship may exist. I have simply endeavored to express my ideas as to those which are pressing on us more perhaps than we realize. At first thought they may seem to be theoretical. Some will say "We will consider these things as we come to them." But as the Secretary said, all sorts of schemes are broached nowadays in the interests of better agriculture and country life. These need coordinating, but they cannot be coordinated successfully except on some basic principle. We have before us in extension work, indeed in college administration, no more important problem than to try to decide in the next few years the groundwork on which may be based a correlation of labor that shall be both scientific and practically efficient, with reference to the relationship of the state college of agriculture to other public supported agencies within the state, and the relationship of state supported agencies to federal agencies, the relationship of all to privately supported agencies; and then, finally, the way in which, in the community, the county, the State and the Nation. the whole problem of agriculture and country life can be integrated, solidified, and made effective as a great national piece of development.

[The paragraphs in bold face italic above are an apparent reaction to the somewhat unusual clandestine arrangement between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the General Education Board (funded by Rockefeller) that supported Knapp's demonstration work in the South.]

APPENDIX K

From Library of Congress collection of KLB papers

RURAL SOCIOLOGY AS A COLLEGE DISCIPLINE

In order to define the field of rural sociology it is necessary to outline the rural problem in such a way as to indicate the main lines of thought and types of subject matter that must be presented by an educational institution which designs to serve the needs of agriculture in whole or in part.

The Rural Problem

We may for this purpose, therefore, make an analysis of the rural problem under five heads:

1. The first is the technical aspect, the question being, "How can the individual farmer most effectively and economically utilize the laws of nature in the growing of plants and animals for human food?" From the standpoint of the farmer, this may be called "farm practice"; from the standpoint of the teacher, it embraces all of those technical subjects in the fields of agriculture, such as dairying, agronomy, pomology, etc. that help answer the question.
2. The business aspect, which involves the question, "How can the individual farmer so organize the factors of production - land, labor, and capital - on his farm, so adapt farm practice to his particular branches of production, and so dispose of his products, as to yield to him the largest net return, while still maintaining the integrity of his land and equipment?" This represents the individual farmer at work on his particular farm, trying to make a living from it, under the necessity of following the best farm practice, and equally under the necessity of selling to advantage and of managing the business in a economical way. The term "farm administration" may well be given to this field of study.
3. We come now to what may be called the scientific aspect of the farm question, in which this query is raised, "How can we learn more of those laws of nature which concern the growth of plants and animals for human uses, how apply these laws to the procuring of an increased food supply, and how at the same time conserve the natural resources upon which the food supply depends?" If there is such a thing as "agricultural science", it develops in the attempt to answer this question. This field is, at present, covered by the various physical and biological sciences, such as chemistry, botany, zoology, etc., and their offshoots - like entomology

- when developed on the economic side.

4. The industrial aspect of the farm question calls for an answer to this question, "How can farmers as a class secure the largest financial success while giving to consumers an adequate food supply and conserving soil resources?" This is the subject matter of "agricultural economics" and has to do with all those large industrial questions which involve groups of farmers, farmers as a class, and the relationships of the farmers to other workers and to the nation as a whole.

5. The community aspect. Here we approach those questions that have more to do with the ultimate ends of life, with the welfare of the people as the great consideration, and in which the question is asked, "How can the people who farm best utilize their industrial and social environment in the development of personal character, best cooperate for the common welfare, and so best organize permanent institutions which are to minister to the continued improvement of the common, or community, life?" This is the field of "rural sociology." It is simply an application to the people who live under rural conditions.

Rural sociology is, therefore, concerned with the way in which farm people live together in their neighborhoods and as a class.

It has to do with the reactions of human character under rural environment. It includes a description of the associated efforts that minister to the common desires, needs, and purposes of farm folk.

It covers the problem of "better living", of "country life" as a whole.

It emphasizes the large needs and methods of the common life of rural people.

It involves the question of the permanence of a satisfactory rural civilization and of the social agencies, or institutions, necessary to such a civilization.

The Field of Rural Sociology

In order to make the boundaries of rural sociology still more definite, it may be well just here to make a brief analysis of the subject so far as it relates to the general types, or classes, of material that are to be studied.

1. The rural people themselves. What is their status? What have been the movements of rural population, for what causes, and with what results? Why have the cities grown at the expense of the country? We must understand also the social conditions of rural people, whether and how they differ from

the urban residents as to race, families, health, crime, illiteracy, morals, temperance, defectives and dependents, insanity, etc. Does the rural environment produce a special series of characteristics? If so, what is the rural mind? In what way does the rural environment influence habits, customs, recreation, family life, individual traits, individualism itself, public opinion, superstition, leadership? What are the influences of nature, of the isolated mode of living, of class segregation, of special types of farming, of tenant farming, etc.?

2. We must also study the social institutions of rural life, how they are organized, how they differ from similar institutions in the cities, their special needs, their adaptability to rural conditions, family life itself, the schools and means of education, including the rural school, agricultural schools and colleges, extension teaching, libraries, the church and its allies, such as the Sunday school, the young people's societies, the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A. We must study the associated efforts among the farmers, including clubs and societies, and the general organizations like the Grange and the Farmer's Union. We need to know the workings of government in their application to rural life and needs, including the national and state governments, but more particularly the local government in the rural communities; and we also need to study as a special field the general application of both common and statute law to rural affairs.

3. We cannot very well consider the rural problem in its social aspects without becoming convinced that the teacher of rural sociology should also be to some degree a propagandist. The rural problem itself is so significant and vital, the need for cooperative planning is so apparent, that it becomes necessary to develop a program for rural betterment, to indicate the means by ... so that this work constitutes a distinct phase of rural sociology as a college discipline.

General Statement of the Farm Problem

Before going farther it may be well to make a general statement of the farm problem in order to indicate the significance of rural sociology as a subject of study, and also to show how the point of view of the student and teacher of rural sociology should include every phase of the problem and should relate the social to all the rest:

"The American rural problem is to maintain upon the land a class of people who represent the best American ideals - in

their industrial success, in their political influence, in their intelligence and moral character, and in their general social and class power."

The Place of Rural Sociology as a Subject of Study

Having analyzed the field we may now indicate a little more intimately the special reasons why rural sociology should become an organic part of the course of study in an agricultural college. These remarks cannot be applied fully to the study of rural sociology as a part of the general courses in sociology in a college or university, and they are given here chiefly for the sake of making clear, if possible, the place which rural sociology ought to occupy in the scheme of agricultural education. We must discuss the principles underlying a college vocational course in agriculture.

1. A vocational course should lay the foundation for technical, or professional, skill and efficiency.

2. A vocational course should indicate to the pupil how social relationships bear on one's work, how social and economic forces aid or hinder him as an individual.

3. A vocational course should show, conversely, how a person, by proper pursuit of his vocation, may and ought to make it a means of service to his fellow men, and should thus indicate that the social motive must be present in an adequate pursuit of one's life work.

4. A vocational course should show the pupil how to use his vocation as a means of personal growth for culture, intellectual, and moral.

From the standpoint of an agricultural vocational course of college grade, in which the college directs its efforts toward training for all the main agricultural vocations, such as farmers, professional agriculturists, teachers, investigators, rural social engineers, and so on, the social relationships of agriculture must be taught. Only in this way can the social character of the agriculturalists work be fully appreciated. Furthermore, the real rural problem must be understood and the need of rural community welfare and progress be appreciated, and applications of rural leadership enforced, or else the social motive is likely to be absent. And finally the wonderful power of the rural vocation to contribute to one's personal growth and culture needs to be emphasized. Undoubtedly this power may be imparted through the technical subjects of study. Nevertheless technical agriculture and farm administration, and even agricultural sciences, have more or less of an individual point of view. It is only when a man studies the industrial and social relationships of

agriculture that he begins to appreciate his environment as a worker, a citizen, and a man - and may we not define culture as appreciation of environment?

Of course when rural sociology is pursued not as part of a vocational course, but simply as a phase of social science, in a college or university, the excuse for giving it lies rather in the significance of the rural question as a part of the general social problem. While the ratio of rural population to total population is constantly decreasing and will continue to decrease indefinitely, nevertheless the total rural population will increase slowly. Today nearly fifty million of the rural people in the United States are living under the rural environment. Consequently the welfare of these people and of the communities in which they live must be a vital concern to the student of the social question.

Courses in Rural Sociology

It may be asked what courses should be offered. In the college or university course, or in the agricultural college where it is not expected to develop rural sociology as a special department, two courses may be given. The first, a descriptive course, described by the title "The Rural Community". It need not necessarily be preceded by a general course in sociology, although undoubtedly that would be an advantage, but it should purpose to bring the student into touch with actual conditions and to interpret those conditions, both individual and institutional, in the light of the larger need of country life.

The second course, whatever its title, should discuss the social aspect of the rural problem. It should attempt an analysis of the entire problem and indicate not only the unity, or integrity, of the rural question, but also the supreme significance of the social welfare phases of it, and the fundamental importance of the rural question as a phase of national life.

In an agricultural college which means to make a good deal of the social aspect of the teaching of agriculture, the work in rural sociology will necessarily be somewhat highly specialized. Each instructor will of necessity work out his own problem, but there is suggested here a list of courses that might be developed.

I. Rural Sociology (proper)

1. The Rural Community - a general descriptive course.
2. The Development of the Rural Community
3. The Rural Problem
4. The Rural Family
5. The School and the Rural Community
6. The Church and the Rural Problem

7. Farmers' Associations
8. Rural Government
9. Rural Law
10. The Social Psychology of Rural Life
11. The Social Status of the Rural people
12. Social Aspects of Current Agricultural Questions

II. Agricultural Education

1. Elementary Agriculture
2. Secondary Agriculture
3. History of Agricultural Education
4. Organization of Courses in Agriculture
5. Administration of Agricultural Institutions
6. Extension Teaching in Agriculture
7. Agricultural Research

There are two further phases of this subject of rural sociology as a college discipline that must not be left out of the question. The first is the need of investigations; the second, the need of a propaganda.

Investigations should be an organic part of the class work in rural sociology. Community surveys are being undertaken under many auspices, and there are standard blanks for the purpose which can be easily utilized in class work. But a department of rural sociology should also participate, through its teaching force, in a comprehensive and thoroughly scientific study of all the social phases of rural life. We may have thorough-going agricultural surveys made under government auspices, or by privately endowed agencies, or by various voluntary associations. Either in cooperation with these or alone, the department of rural sociology should not fail to make investigational work a matter of large concern.

The same is true, at least in the agricultural college, in the organized movement for the betterment of agriculture and country life that may be represented by the phrase "a campaign for rural progress", or in more sober terms, "the development of the rural community." The college has a responsible leadership in stimulating a constructive development of the rural community. It should emphasize the community-idea, enlarge upon the need of community ideals, assist in the arrangement of a constructive program of community building, help in an institutional division of labor by which the function of the various rural institutions is determined, and the program for each one of them developed. Conferences on rural progress, plans for local community betterment, participation in a state-wide movement for the federation of rural social forces, are all parts of the legitimate work of a department of rural sociology in an agricultural college.