A HISTORY OF THE
UTAH EXTENSION SERVICE, 1888-1950

by
Karen Juchau

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
History

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah
1968
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express appreciation to the members of my graduate committee, Dr. S. George Ellsworth, head of the committee, Dr. Gary Huxford, and Miss Lucile Pratt for their help and suggestions in preparing this paper.

For his assistance and kind cooperation in making available materials from the Special Collections Division of the Utah State University Library, I express my thanks to A. Jeffrey Simmonds, Special Collections Librarian.

I also extend a special feeling of heartfelt appreciation to my parents without whose moral support and backing this project would never have been completed.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. BACKGROUND AND BEGINNINGS OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. BEGINNINGS AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF EXTENSION WORK IN UTAH</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. EXTENSION WORK DURING WORLD WAR I</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FARM BUREAU</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. PROJECTS</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. DEPRESSION AND NEW DEAL</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. WORLD WAR AND CHANGE</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plan of Extension Service organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT
A History of the
Utah Extension Service, 1888-1950
by
Karen Juchau, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1968
Major Professor: Dr. S. George Ellsworth
Department: History

A Utah State Agriculture Extension Department was created by the Utah State Agricultural College in 1907 to be supported by state appropriations. Its purpose was to bring the information being gained by the College Experiment Station, and other knowledge applicable to agriculture, to the rural population of the State in order to improve the quality of Utah agriculture and the conditions of the farm population. The program began with college instructors holding Farmers' Institutes and schools and expanded into a state-wide system of agricultural and home extension work carried on by specially appointed county agents in each county. The purpose of the agent was to demonstrate to the farmer improved farm methods and help in any way the situation of the farm family.

In 1914, the Smith-Lever Act was passed by the Congress of the United States which appropriated federal funds for county agent work. This made the extension program a joint government undertaking with funds appropriated by state, federal, and local governments. This also linked the Extension Service to the Federal Government through the United States Department of Agriculture and in times of national
crisis it was called upon to assist in putting government programs into effect.

The Utah Extension Service can be said to have rendered valuable service to the people of Utah. It has provided information, has been available for consultation in farm and home problems, and has helped unite the rural population by encouraging farm bureau organizations, cooperative associations, and community projects. Through programs involving both adults and young people it has, in one way or another, either directly or indirectly, affected the lives of most Utah citizens. It has become involved in every facet of farm living including economic, social, and political. The object of the Utah Extension Service has been improvement and progress through extending education.
CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND AND BEGINNINGS OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Through the years, education has been expected to play many roles, but ultimately its purpose has been to impart knowledge, to give to the people the information society felt was essential, whether it be the simple memorizing of tribal folklore or extensive training in specialized fields. Formal learning in Western Civilization was not always a concern of the majority. Kept alive by monastic orders in the early Middle Ages and restricted to the wealthy or wellborn in later years, education did not concern and was not concerned with the masses of people—the peasants or the laborers.

By the nineteenth century the concept that man must be educated to keep up with the rapidly changing world was being widely accepted in the United States. In order to survive in a diversified economic situation, people must be trained for the work in which they were to be engaged. Giant strides had been made in science. This information could be applied to the everyday professions and be of special service to the agriculturalist whose position was becoming more and more affected by competition and the fluctuation of the world market.

A movement to improve agricultural conditions and educate the agriculturalist began as early as the late 18th century. In Europe in 1791 an agricultural school was opened at Ternova, Bohemia. In Hungary agricultural schools were established in the late 1700's
with the Georgicon Academy at Kezthely, founded in 1797, considered to be one of the finest in Europe.¹

Societies for the promotion of agriculture in Europe began even earlier. In France proceedings of the Academy of Agriculture of France were first published in 1761. The first society in Germany was organized in 1764, and the Empress Catherine of Russia established the Free Economical society with a large experimental farm near St. Petersbury in 1765. Other societies were organized in Scotland, Ireland, and England during the same period.²

The Highland Society of Scotland, organized at Edinburgh in January 1785 became a society for all Scotland. A royal charter for this society was obtained in 1787 together with its first parliamentary grant of 3,000 pounds, the interest on which was to be spent for essays, inventions and improvements in agricultural crops, etc. Its first volume of "prize essays and transactions" was published in 1799. The Transactions issued in 1824 record the institution by the society of itinerant lectures on veterinary medicine, illustrated with demonstrations, and of experiments with salt as a fertilizer and feeding.³

In America the beginning of agricultural education came with the formation of privately organized agricultural societies and clubs. The first of these, the Philadelphia Society was organized

² Ibid., 6.
³ Ibid., 6.
in 1785. It had as its objectives "to bring about local organizations and to disseminate agricultural information through their publications, newspaper articles and lectures." In 1792 the New York legislature granted funds to Columbia College to establish a professorship in natural history, chemistry and agriculture. Samuel Latham Mitchell was appointed to fill this position becoming perhaps the first professor in America concerned directly with agriculture. Professor Mitchell was the guest lecturer at various agricultural society and club meetings, thus setting a precedent for close ties between the colleges and universities and the independently organized society.

Agricultural societies sprang up in New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire and Virginia having such illustrious backers and leaders as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and John Marshall. States granted these societies charters and legislatures encouraged the development of county and local societies which became numerous in the early half of the nineteenth century.

To the agricultural societies we owe the holding of fairs not merely for the sale of animals or farm products but for educational purposes. Usually these

---


2 True, Agricultural Education, 10.

3 True, Extension Work, 3.

4 True, Agricultural Education, 13-17.
took the form of competitive exhibitions with prizes but sometimes there were addresses on agricultural subjects. A notable early instance of this was the address of John Lowell at the fair held by the Massachusetts Society at Brighton in 1818. This address was published by the society.  

By 1852 there were an estimated 300 active local and county organizations in 31 states and five territories.  

The movement for the advancement of agriculture grew with the establishment of State Boards of Agriculture, the first being established in New York, January 10, 1820. New Hampshire followed suit in December 1820, Ohio in 1839, and others in following years. These State Boards of Agriculture gave advice to the local societies and clubs and board members were often chosen from the county societies. Money to run the boards and societies was appropriated by the state legislatures.  

With the development of the State Boards of Agriculture in the 1830's, 1840's, and 1850's, another movement to carry information to the farm community got under way. Lyceums had become a popular form of mass education and when the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture was formed in 1852 a committee reported the possible advantages of the lyceum lecture method. This idea led to a three or four day series of meetings which came to be called farmers' institutes. These programs were an important part of the extension program through the latter part  

---

8True, Agricultural Extension Work, 3.  
9True, Agricultural Education, 23.  
10Ibid., 24-27.
of the nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth.\textsuperscript{11}

Officials of the Federal Government also began to recognize the importance of preserving and disseminating agricultural information. In 1838 Henry L. Ellsworth, the first Patent Commissioner, began to ask Congress to appropriate money for gathering agricultural information and for collecting and distributing various kinds of seeds. In 1839, $1,000 was appropriated and the Agricultural Division of the Patent Office was established to carry on these activities. The work remained in the Patent Office until May 15, 1862 when President Abraham Lincoln signed the act creating the United States Department of Agriculture, with bureau status and headed by a Commissioner of Agriculture.\textsuperscript{12}

The agricultural movements until this time had been mostly private ventures with some state or county participation. Simultaneous to the above movements had been the move for establishing agricultural schools to teach methods of agriculture and the mechanic arts. Most schools of the early 19th century were oriented toward classical learning with emphasis on Latin and Greek literature. Practical minded men were beginning to think school should also perform a more useful function. As with other movements, the one towards, establishing agricultural and industrial schools began with the

\textsuperscript{11}True, \textit{Agricultural Extension Work}, 5-14.

establishment of private schools, some of the first being the Gardiner Lyceum in Maine and the Cream Hill Agricultural School in Connecticut.¹³

Simon De Witt was one of the first strong advocates of public agricultural colleges. Some states including New York and Massachusetts established state agricultural colleges but the financing of these institutions proved difficult.¹⁵

In 1848, John S. Skinner, editor of various agricultural journals, petitioned Congress for state subsidies to be used in founding agricultural and mechanic arts colleges. But it was Jonathan Baldwin Turner who came up with the idea of giving land grants to the states for the support of Agricultural colleges. Railroads were being subsidized; why not colleges? In March 1852 the Illinois legislature sent to Congress a set of resolutions requesting land grants.¹⁶

It was soon evident that mere resolutions and memorials could accomplish little. What was needed was an advocate in the ranks of the Congress itself. Justin Smith Morrill became that

¹³ True, Agricultural Education, 36-38.
¹⁵ True, Agricultural Education, 40f.
¹⁶ Nevins, 19.
advocate. In 1857 Morrill introduced the first college land grant bill but was unsuccessful in obtaining the passage of such a bill until 1862 when it was signed into law by Abraham Lincoln. In this act the Federal Government agreed to donate 30,000 acres of public land to each state for each congressman representing that state. Proceeds from the sale of this land was to be used for the establishment of at least one college. The purpose of the college as stated in the act was

... to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.

Later it was recognized that in addition to the college, further investigation in the field of agriculture was needed. To facilitate this need a bill was passed in March of 1887 establishing experiment stations in connection with each of the land grant colleges. The stations were established

... in order to aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture, and to promote scientific investigation and experiment respecting the principles and applications of agricultural science.

---

17 True, Agricultural Education, 95f.


The experiment station was also charged with publishing bulletins
to be sent to each newspaper of the state describing experiments,
their results, and how the results could be applied or put to
practical use on the farm. 20 Apparently it was hoped that through the
newspaper media the discoveries and new information gained by the
experiment stations could thus be passed on to the public. Two years
after the passage of the Hatch Act creating the Experiment Stations,
the Department of Agriculture was raised to cabinet status and the
experiment station work was put under the direction of the Office of
Experiment Stations as a branch of the United States Department of
Agriculture. 21

20 Nevins, 21.

21 Benedict, 105.
CHAPTER II
BEGINNINGS AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF EXTENSION WORK IN UTAH

The Morrill Act of 1862 and all background movements in agriculture are important to the story of Utah's extension work. Much that was done in Utah had been previously tried in other states and Utah was able to benefit much from the experience gained by them. Extension work in Utah has been exclusively carried out in connection with, and under the direction of, the land grant college located at Logan. This was not the case in many other states where extension work was first carried out through State Boards of Agriculture, or privately organized farmers' organizations supported by county and local funds. Utah shared the experience of several other states of the west and mid-west, however, and her development of programs, none of which appear to be original, roughly parallels similar developments in other states. Because of the tie between the Agricultural college of Utah and the extension programs, Utah is indebted to Justin S. Morrill for the part he played in the establishment of these colleges.

In 1888, eight years before attaining statehood, the Utah Legislative Assembly passed a bill providing for the establishment of an agricultural college. Section 12 of that law states:

The course of instruction shall embrace the English language and literature, mathematics, civil engineering, agricultural chemistry, animal and vegetable anatomy and physiology, the veterinary art, entomology, geology and such other natural sciences as may be prescribed, technology, political, rural and household economy,
horticulture, moral philosophy, history, bookkeeping and especially the application of science and the mechanical arts to practical agriculture in the field... ¹

In 1886 a Board of Trustees was appointed for the new college. In addition to directing the college, they were responsible for setting up an experiment station to carry out experiments and conduct research into those problems of particular importance to the agriculture of Utah.

The first meeting of the newly appointed Board of Trustees was held June 29, 1888, and Governor Caleb W. West was elected as president of the Board. Twenty-five thousand dollars had been appropriated for the school's establishment and Cache County and Logan City had agreed to donate 100 acres of land for the new college.²

The college opened its doors September 4, 1890, with an enrollment of 22 students. By the end of the year the enrollment had reached 139 of which 106 were male and 33 female. Five major courses were first offered: agriculture, mechanic arts, civil engineering, domestic arts and business.³

¹ "An Act to Establish an Agricultural College and an Agricultural Experiment Station in Connection Therewith," Laws of the Territory of Utah (Salt Lake City: Tribune Printing and Publishing Co., 1888), 218.

² Report of the Board of Trustees of the Agricultural College of Utah, 1898 (Salt Lake City: George C. Lambert, 1890), 1f. These reports were published under the direction of the Utah State Agricultural College until the year 1930. From 1930 to 1948 the volumes are bound under the title U.S.A.C. Biennial Report and are typewritten carbon copies in the archives file of the Special Collections Division of Utah State University Library. The year 1930-1932 has no page numbers. To avoid confusion these reports will hereafter be referred to simply as Board of Trustees' Reports.

³ Board of Trustees' Reports, 1896-1897, 9.
With such a small enrollment, it was evident that the knowledge being gained through the experiment station was reaching a very few. By 1896, the idea that the real function of the college, that is, "...to place within the reach of the masses of the people an education in subjects pertaining to agriculture and mechanic arts..." must be implemented in ways other than just the college classroom had become dominant.

In that year the Utah legislature passed a bill authorizing the Board of Trustees of the Agricultural College to hold institutes in various towns and counties of the State "...for the instruction of the citizens of this State in the various branches of agriculture." Those in attendance at these institutes were to be presented with the results of the most recent investigations in theoretical and practical agriculture and classes were patterned after the earlier institutes held in other states.

Shortly after the introduction of the Farmers' Institute the demand for more information became great. The Farmers' Institutes were conducted by members of the college faculty who volunteered to speak on subjects in which they had special training or knowledge. The idea was that one Institute be held in each county, but in the first years, 1897-1900, this proved impossible due to the limited

---

Ibid.

funds and limited time of staff members who were also full-time instructors at the college.

The first general Farmers' Institute was held in Provo, Utah, February 23-27, 1897. Mayor Lafayette Holbrook, in his welcoming address, praised the efforts of the college and expressed a need for experts to meet personally with the farmers and give "scientific benefit to the multitude." He went on to say that the United States was a nation struggling in competition, and that no business was more menaced by this competition than agriculture. Therefore, the people needed to take every advantage afforded them, and it was of great importance that they should become acquainted with the scientific principles of farming. It was for this purpose that the Farmers' Institutes had been provided.6

The lecturers at the Institutes were to be concerned with the needs of the local people and the talks of the first Institute centered around horses and what to feed them, sugar beet culture, proper irrigation, and causes of various plant and animal diseases. The farm wife was also included in these meetings and subjects of special interest to her were covered. "Home and Its Surroundings" was the chosen topic of Mrs. L. C. Foster, speaker at the first Institute. She also spoke of "Cooking as A Science." Women were

warned about the importance of proper diet and cautioned about the growing problem of over-eating.\textsuperscript{7}

In addition to the speeches, the Institute instructors were to encourage the establishment of local farm organizations with the idea of getting the farmers involved. Success along these lines was scanty and Farmers' Institutes were more often sponsored by various commercial clubs than by local farmers' organizations.

The proceedings of the Farmers' Institutes were published biennially and were distributed free of charge to interested persons. People were also invited to write letters to the college concerning their special problems.

The first and largest problem faced by the promoters of the new "take the college to the people" idea was apathy. Few farmers attended these first meetings. This movement was a relatively new idea to many farmers and being a government sponsored program, even though a state government sponsored program at this time, rather than a program instigated by the farm population itself, it was necessary to "sell" the idea to many farmers and show how improved agricultural education could improve their economic and social position. As word was spread by those who did attend the meetings, plus the effective advertising of news articles, mail notices, and church announcements, the interest increased. By the school year 1901-1902, 43 cities

\textsuperscript{7}First Annual Report of the Utah Farmers' Institutes (Logan, Utah Smith, Cummings and Co., 1897), 98.
in 11 different counties were being visited by the Farmers' Institutes and the demand for the Institutes could not always be met. 8

The beginnings of an Extension Department can be seen in the Farmers' Institute Committee organized in 1902. Formed for the purpose of organizing and correlating the Farmers' Institutes now being held throughout the State, committee policy was to hold as many meetings as possible. But two major problems were encountered. Although the state had appropriated $1,500 for the Farmers' Institutes in 1896, by 1903 the expenses of the Institutes could not be met with this amount, and the Board of Trustees urgently requested the State Legislature to appropriate more money.

The second problem was the extra load put on college professors who were asked to help and participate in the Institute program. To somewhat alleviate this problem, the idea was introduced of having the farmers themselves speak and give demonstrations. The farmer chosen must have been successful in some phase of agriculture and he was asked to explain his methods and results to his fellow agriculturists. 9 Women were also encouraged to start their own women's clubs and organizations to study "the home side of farm life." 10

By 1905 the movement for bringing new and better methods to the farmer had mushroomed to the extent that the need for an organization of larger scope and ability was realized. At the meeting of the Board of Trustees' Reports, 1901-1902, 30.

9Board of Trustees' Reports, 1903-1904, 47-49.
10Board of Trustees' Reports, 1901-1902, 38f.
Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations held in November 1905, a resolution was adopted to organize a Department of Extension Teaching in Agriculture to better facilitate the distribution of agricultural information.¹¹

In 1907 an Extension Department was first established at the Utah Agricultural College. Its purpose was to more effectively organize the different college agencies already involved in extension teaching. Its program was to include lectures, institutes, conventions, correspondence, and publications. The magazine Rocky Mountain Farming was begun as the official organ of the Extension Department and was published monthly with the purpose of furnishing up-to-date and important information relating to both the farm and the home.¹²

Previous to 1907 the work of extending education to the people had been under the direction of the Experiment Station. Now that a new department was organized, the two were to become partners in a joint effort. The Experiment Station was to discover new information pertinent to the farmers' needs; the Extension Department was to see that the farmers obtained this information and that they were educated to its use to practical value.

Lewis A. Merrill was appointed first superintendent of agricultural extension work. It was under his supervision that the Extension Department developed from a simple Farmers' Institute program to an

¹¹Board of Trustees' Reports, 1905-1906, 43f.
¹²Ibid.
organized division offering varieties of courses. L.A. Merrill graduated from the U.A.C. in 1895 and had done post-graduate work at Iowa State College and also at the Ohio State University Graduate School of Agriculture. Previous to his appointment as superintendent, L.A. Merrill had served as Professor of Animal Husbandry at Brigham Young University at Provo, Utah. In 1904 in cooperation with Dr. Widstoe, President of U.A.C., he established the Desert Farmer (later Utah Farmer) an independent publication dealing with problems of Utah farmers which proved very valuable to the Utah agriculturalist.13

That Professor Merrill was dedicated to his work is evidenced by his own personal testimony.

My greatest ambition: To make the work of the Extension Department of the Agricultural College known to, and appreciated by every farmer and farmer's wife in the State of Utah and to make the position of our beloved "Alma Mater" so strong in the hearts of all our people that the benefits I derived from that Institution may be participated in by the thousands of ambitious young men of our state... 14

The Farmers' Institutes were reorganized into a state system of institutes with a branch in each county. This type of local organization would make more effective use of farmer participation. Each organization was to have a constitution, by-laws, and officers.

14 Ibid.
The local officers could then make arrangements for any institutes to be held, handle any details such as where the institute would be held, publicity, and decide on topics to be discussed. This would relieve the college lecturer of the organizational work and make his position at the institute that of advisor and guest speaker.

During 1907-1908, twenty-five institutes were held for two or five day periods. During this year 288 sessions were conducted with a total attendance of 26,926. Ten counties were not visited with institutes for lack of sufficient funds. Annual appropriations were coming from the Agricultural College funds in the amount of $1,000, from state funds in the amount of $1,500 and the counties were contributing $530. The cost of the department had been greater than the total amount appropriated and using the argument that other surrounding states were expending much larger amounts for their Extension Services, the plea was again sent to the Legislature for more funds.15

In addition to lack of funds for the Farmers' Institute, there were other problems. One was the overload placed on faculty members who were asked to work in the department. As early as 1905, complaints were being made by the superintendent that it was impractical for faculty members to devote large portions of their time to the work, and with the money available, full time help was impossible.16 More

---

15Board of Trustees' Reports, 1907-1908, 31.
16Ibid.
money was finally forthcoming when the legislature in 1909 appropriated $5,000 a year. Still the cry went forth for more funds and more employees. 17

By 1909, a growing dissatisfaction with the Farmers' Institutes was beginning to manifest itself. The lectures lacked the direct involvement of the farmer. More and more farmers were turning to the weekly schools. Begun as an experiment as early as 1902, the weekly school was first tried in Ephraim, Utah, but was not expanded then for lack of funds. By 1908 the value of the school as a teaching device had become apparent and the program was expanded and given the name Farmers' and Housekeepers' Schools. The schools were held for one week periods with two meetings held each day for men and one for women with a joint session held in the evening. The schools were so popular that it became the goal of the Department to hold at least one yearly in each county. 18

Tuition for the Farmers' and Housekeepers' Schools was one dollar for men and fifty cents for women. The schools were sponsored by the local farmers' organizations or, more often by various commercial clubs. When the sponsor could guarantee an enrollment of 150 people, the College would arrange for faculty members to conduct the classes. Men of prominence in the community were also

17 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1903-1904, 47.
18 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1909-1910, 58.
asked to participate in the instructional area of the school. Subjects were similar to those of the Farmers' Institutes, but class assignments and participation could be used to greater advantage.\textsuperscript{19}

The Extension Department was now trying in other ways to bring the knowledge gained by the Experiment Station to the people. The younger generation as future farmers and housewives should also be considered in this training program. The Department worked for and encouraged the teaching of agriculture and homemaking as part of the high school curriculum.\textsuperscript{20}

Borrowing an idea used successfully in Iowa, the Department ran a demonstration train to every town adjacent to the railway lines in 1908. The train contained cars carrying exhibits and lectures for the first train centered around potato culture and orchard heating to prevent frost. Interest in the demonstration train was encouraging and the trains ran regularly for the next several years.\textsuperscript{21}

By 1910, 265 weekly school sessions were being held with a total of 47,835 people attending. The state was appropriating $5,000 annually. Still directors of the Department felt that the accomplishments were not adequate. Merrill, in his 1910 report to

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
the Board of Trustees, again pleaded for more funds. Higher salaries were needed so extension work could become a full rather than a part-time proposition. Merrill also suggested the need for the appointment of an assistant director and one or two other men who could devote their entire time to the department, spending winters conducting schools and meetings and summers visiting the farmers on their farms, seeing and working with the problems first hand. He also recommended that a traveling instructor be appointed who could devote his full time to the Farmers' and Housekeepers' Schools.  

Professor Lewis A. Merrill resigned as head of the Extension Department in 1909-1910 after seeing tremendous growth in the extension work. His successor, Elmer G. Peterson, reorganized the department into seven distinct divisions each having its own director or head. The divisions were: Farmers' Institutes and Schools, School Cooperation Associations, Improvement Associations, Farm Demonstration, Correspondence Studies, News, Trains, and Fair Exhibits. 

The first division under the new organization was the Farmers' Institutes and Schools with Professor John T. Caine III as superintendent. By 1912 the Institutes had largely been replaced by the Farmers' and Housekeepers' Schools, but sensing that the Institutes had played a large part in making the people of the state aware of the problems in agriculture and awakening interest in the college sponsored programs

---

22 Ibid.
for agricultural betterment, the Institutes were still being used as a starter program in communities where the more expanded program was not yet workable due to limited staff.\(^{23}\)

The Farmers' and Housekeepers' Schools were being expanded. There appeared some evidence that interest from the individual farmer was dwindling and that advertising campaigns needed to be inaugurated.\(^{24}\) The schools moved from county to county and were still being held for one week. The schools were then considered to be the ultimate form of the extension instruction and by 1914 the Extension Department during that year could claim that 59,945 people had been instructed by the schools.\(^{25}\)

The second division of the Extension Department was labeled School Cooperation. In addition to encouraging the teaching of agriculture in the high schools, it was recognized that a program directly involving the young people in agricultural work was necessary. In cooperation with the county superintendents and principals of the high schools, Professor James C. Hogensen organized Boys' Potato Growing Clubs throughout the State. In the first year, 1,020 boys enrolled in these clubs whose object was to teach them better methods of potato production. Each boy was to raise one-half acre of potatoes.

\(^{23}\) Board of Trustees' Reports, 1911-1912, 44-48.

\(^{24}\) Ibid.

\(^{25}\) Board of Trustees' Reports, 1913-1914, 89.
according to specified instructions and prizes were to be awarded at the county fairs for the best crop yields. By 1914 the work had expanded so that both boys and girls were participating in club work. There were garden clubs, bread making clubs, poultry clubs, sugar beet clubs, canning clubs, flower garden clubs, and sewing clubs with a total enrollment of 19,235 in 1917. State champions were selected at the State Fair and awarded a free trip to Washington, D.C. to club conventions being held there. This program later became the 4-H program still in strong operation within the state.

The third division of the Extension Department was the Improvement Associations. First organized in September of 1912, it was the function of the department to "correlate with women's clubs, church organizations, and with all other women's organizations for the betterment of the state and especially the rural communities." It was the specific function of the association to introduce into these organizations a "systemized course of study in Home Economics." It was later thought advisable to organize special study groups usually called Home Economics Associations. These were organized in order that everyone could take part rather than limiting participation to already organized church and civic ladies' clubs. Any organization

---

26. Board of Trustees' Reports, 1911-1912, 46f.
27. Board of Trustees' Reports, 1913-1914, 91.
28. Board of Trustees' Reports, 1911-1912, 46.
could still follow the outlined program and foremost among organizations interested in this work was the Church of Jesus Chirst of Latter Day Saints Relief Society. 29 By 1914 there were 44 separate clubs organized in 14 different counties with a total membership of 1,399. Plans were made for conducting contests among the clubs in the areas of home decoration, planning and efficiency. 30

The newest innovations of the Extension Department came with the creation of a new department generally known as the Farm Demonstration Department. At the turn of the century experiments in this sort of extension work were carried out in Louisiana by Dr. Seaman A. Knapp of the U.S.D.A. as a private project. The philosophy behind this kind of extension work was one of showing the farmer correct farm methods rather than trying to convince him through lectures or printed materials. "What a man hears, he may doubt. What he sees, he may possibly doubt. But what he does himself, he cannot doubt." This philosophy of having the farmers cooperate with a trained agriculturalist in experimenting with new and improved methods on their own farms, took root and grew in the Southern states quite apart from the agricultural colleges and without government support. Northern farmers were skeptical of the idea and it grew only gradually in scattered counties until advocates of the program gained enough support to begin agitation for a bill providing

29Hereafter referred to as the L.D.S. Relief Society.

30Board of Trustees' Reports, 1913-1914, 99.

31Benedict, 152.
for a nationwide system of publically supported agents to carry out this type of extension program.32

The earliest experiments in this type of extension work in Utah were begun in 1911 before such a bill was adopted. The experiment Station was charged by the State Legislature with conducting investigations into underdeveloped sections and instructing them to "... conduct in such localities, demonstrations for the purpose of teaching the settlers the correct method of soil tillage, irrigation, crop production and other agricultural practices ... "33 The work began in the Uintah Basin in 1911 with L.M. Winsor being assigned as the first county agent, not only in Utah, but in the western states.34

In 1913 the Farm and Home Demonstration Law was passed by the legislature appropriating $6,000 (to be increased each year by $2,500 till the total reached $25,000) for the placing of a farm and home demonstrator in each county. County funds up to $2,500 were also to be used for this purpose. These demonstrators were later known as county agents.

The job of the farm demonstrator was more than that of a teacher. Making his headquarters in the county to which he had been assigned, it was his duty to investigate the individual problems of his area.

32 Benedict, 153f.
33 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1911-1912, 44.
and deal with them. He was to contact personally the farmer on his farm and try to bring to him the benefits of his experience with the other farmers in the state, or the experiences of the Experiment Station. He was to act as an advisor. Subjects the agent should be especially concerned with were irrigation, conservation, soil fertility, animal husbandry, reclamation, and the organizing of local farm organizations. Three men were employed full time by 1913 and work was being carried on in seven counties. By 1914, eight full time agents were at work.35

County agents soon found that their problems were multiple. Hans A. Christiansen, first county agent in Beaver county spent his first four months "getting acquainted" and trying to explain why he was there. He found the farmers of the area "fairly well-to-do," but the methods being used he described as of a "frontier exploitive nature" and complained that the local farmers had not learned much of the methods of scientific agriculture and were slow to accept them. A fair held that year was a total failure for lack of interest.36

Agents were instructed to encourage and assist in setting up local farmers' organizations. Agents found this task very difficult

35Board of Trustees' Reports, 1913-1914, 63.

36Hans A. Christiansen, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Beaver County, 1914." County Agents' Reports referred to in this and subsequent footnotes are unpublished, typescript copies and contain page numbers only in certain instances. There are available in the Special Collections Division of the Utah State University Library.
due to apathy and discord among farmers. One of the biggest problems was disputes over water rights. Mr. Christiansen tried unsuccessfully for four years to bring this problem of irrigation and water rights to some sort of cooperative understanding within his county. 37

Joseph P. Welch, agent for Millard County complained of a "spirit of neglect" among the farmers and a "desire to be left alone." 38

Hog cholera epidemics plagued many areas of the state in 1914, but in several instances farmers refused to report cases fearing hog destruction and distrusting vaccines. In several counties, however, the epidemic and the veterinary work done by the agents plus their evident concern for the farmer opened the door for cooperation with the farmers in other areas.

Slowly but surely projects were introduced. Dairy organizations were set up to test cows for productivity in order to eliminate unproductive members of the herd. Individual farmers were persuaded to experiment with new methods, or new crops, or dry farming, or rotation. When the experiment was successful, other farmers were taken on excursions to the area to see first hand the success of their fellow farmer.

Farmers often had to be shown that a project would yield immediate profits before they would be willing to adopt the project.

37 Ibid.
H. A. Christiansen had been "preaching" crop rotation but was not getting any response. He had been trying to persuade the farmers to raise potatoes as an alternative to grain crops and alfalfa. When he discovered that potatoes would be a highly valuable cash crop, having a ready market in northern California, however, farmers were willing to try raising potatoes as a project. After persuading the farmers to import potato seed from Sevier County, he found upon receiving the seed that much of it was rotten or had shrunk. Reports Christiansen, "The farmers did much complaining and the county agent did not know but what he might get transportation out of the county any time with a rotten potatoe shower." 39

But there were successes, too. Robert H. Stewart was "able to pull off" the first joint county fair of Carbon and Emery counties. It was a huge success, being attended by people from all parts of the state and Colorado as well as Utah's own Governor Spry. 40 And Joseph P. Welch reported excellent cooperation in Millard county and found that "local church officials have encouraged farmers to work with the county agents, and have shown much interest in the work." 41

By the end of 1914, the county agents could report a total of


2,206 individual farmers visited, 219 farmers cooperating in projects with the county agent, and 3,766 acres of land being cultivated under the agent's supervision. The work of the county agent as outlined was comprehensive and the job to be undertaken a large one, but steps were being taken to make the farm demonstrators a major part of the Extension Service.\(^2\)

Home demonstration agents worked with the farmers' wives and occupied the same relation to her as the county agent occupied to the farmer. She was to work with the women in such areas as food preparation, home economy, hygiene and family care. Amy Lyman was the first home demonstrator and began her work in 1913. From July 28, 1913 to July 31, 1914 she traveled some 3,920 miles by rail, auto, and horse and buggy, visiting 788 housewives and addressing 228 meetings with a total attendance of 6,917.\(^3\)

Soon county agents were asking that home demonstration agents be appointed to their county claiming that "in some cases the wife knows more about the farm than the husband" and that the home demonstration agent could have much influence.\(^4\)

Another division organized within the Department was the Correspondence Studies with Professor George B. Hendricks in charge.

\(^2\) Board of Trustees' Reports, 1913-1914, 52.
\(^3\) Ibid., 87
\(^4\) Hans A. Christiansen, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Beaver County, 1915."
In 1912, 14 correspondence courses were offered through the Extension Service. 45

The Department of News operated in publishing six special circulars of various departments, publishing current college news in Salt Lake, Logan and Ogden papers, advertising for special meetings and conventions and doing special write-up features. 46

The Extension Department was also active in fairs and exhibits and the demonstration trains. In the year 1913-1914 demonstration trains ran 1,800 miles making 66 stops and providing meeting places for 22 lectures with a total attendance of 30,479. There were 22 fairs held in 1914, for a total of 65 days. Members of the Agricultural Extension Department staff served as judges and sponsors at the fairs. It was felt that fairs and demonstration trains did much to stimulate interest in the extension work. 47

And so the extension work grew, penetrating every facet of farm and community life. By 1914 the Department could claim 20 full time workers, nine part time workers, and 11 faculty assistants or advisors.

The year 1913 saw the organization of another unit of the Extension Department, the Board of Chairmen. One citizen from each county who was considered to be in touch with the community affairs and interests

45 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1911-1912, 52.
46 Ibid.
47 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1913-1914, 100f.
was asked to serve on the new Board. The duties of the Board members consisted of acting as advisor to the Extension Department, giving advice on such things as the kinds of institutes which would be most beneficial, problems of special interest to farmers in their county and how the Extension Department could best serve their county's needs. Response to this new Board was reported to be favorable and early reports indicated that local cooperation did much to integrate the program with the farm community. However, the life of the Board proved to be relatively short-lived and with the introduction of county agents and local farm bureau organizations it faded out of existence. It was, however, one of the first steps taken in the attempt to place the extension program and local planning of extension work in the hands of local community leaders; a policy which was followed with more success, though under a different organization, at a later time.

The work of the extension service was growing rapidly. The strain placed on members of the faculty has previously been discussed. Practical experience not only in Utah but in other states as well, was proving that the best results were being obtained when an extension agent could be placed in each county to demonstrate the better farm methods. But the story was an old one--not enough funds. The money appropriated under the State Farm and Home Demonstration Law of 1913 even with the help of county funds was not sufficient to establish a statewide program.

48 Ibid.
Agitation for help from the Federal Government in aiding demonstration work had begun as early as 1909 but it was 1914 before an acceptable compromise could be agreed upon by Congress. This compromise was known as the Smith-Lever Act, due to combining the features of two separate bills, one introduced by Asbury F. Lever of South Carolina into the House of Representatives and one by Hoke Smith of Georgia presented to the Senate in 1912.49

In its final form the bill was to provide each state with $10,000 of Federal funds annually and "additional amounts on the basis of its rural population, from a fund of $600,000 at first, increasing by $500,000 annually for seven years and thereafter continuing to a total of $4,100,000." The "additional" amounts must be offset by appropriation by the State Legislature or by contribution "provided by state, county, college, local authority or individual contributions from within the State."50 The bill also provided for cooperation between the colleges and the U.S. government by stipulating that all programs and projects be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. A director of cooperative agricultural extension work was also appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and an Office of Extension work was created in the Department of Agriculture. 51

49 True, Agricultural Extension Work, 100.


51 Ibid.
Though the Office of Extension Work was a Federal Government agency, its sole function in the extension program at this time was to encourage states to develop extension programs through their Agricultural Colleges, accumulate information which might be helpful to the state programs, and see that federal money appropriated for the work was being put to proper use. Programs were left up to the individual states and instructions sent out were few. Not until the New Deal legislation of the 1930s involved the Federal Government more directly in farm life were programs dictated and put into operation by the Federal Government through this office. In 1915 a States Relations Service was set up by the Department of Agriculture. The Office of Extension Work, the Office of Home Economics, and the Office of Experiment Stations were to be part of this new Service whose object was to coordinate activities of these offices with their counter-part in the various states.

The boost given to the extension program by the passage of the Smith-Lever Act is obvious. The three basic units of government—federal, state, and county—were now to cooperate in what had become a major undertaking—the spreading of practical farm education to the agricultural community.

After the passage of this act extension work in Utah expanded rapidly. By 1917 it was reported that every one of Utah's 29 counties were being served by a county farm demonstration agent and at least half the counties were being served by home demonstration agents.

Between 1914 and 1917 several departments were added and others reorganized. The Community Service Bureau was organized in 1916 with Frank R. Arnold as professor in charge. The purpose of the Bureau was
"to give help and advice to Utah towns and villages with regard to community celebrations, club work, and school life." The Bureau operated in five general areas. The Play Service offered advice for the selection and production of plays. The Club Service suggested and distributed courses for study or topics for discussion to women's clubs or other interested organizations. The Debate Service offered outlines for debate topics and the Library Service sent out pamphlets and loaned books by mail to those requesting such service. The Community Service offered suggestions and outlines on how to start libraries, or pioneer museums, and "of ways of celebrating Christmas and other holidays in common." 52

In 1915 the demonstration work was divided into a Farm Demonstration Department, dealing specifically with the male members of the farm community, and the Department of Home Management Demonstration concerned primarily with the problems of the farm women. Each Department was to have its own state leader with Robert J. Evans as first state leader in farm demonstration, and Gertrude Mr. McCheyne, first state leader in home demonstration. 53

To assist the state leaders and demonstration agents the Extension Department also created offices of state specialists. For example, there was to be a state specialist in dairying, one in irrigation management, soil control, livestock breeding, dry farm management, home economy and others. These specialists approved

---

52 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1915-1916, 67.
53 Ibid., 61, 62.
programs outlined by the county agents, offered help and suggestions, made visits and gave guest lectures. They also helped coordinate the programs of the college with the demonstration and extension work.

During this time the boys and girls club work was given the official title of Junior Vocational Work. The work was carried on through cooperation with the school authorities of various school districts. Two districts had hired one person to work full time in Junior Vocational work, while six districts had part-time help and several had follow-up workers. In many districts club work was part of the regularly required school work.

In consequence of an agreement between the United States Department of Agriculture and the State agricultural college a new branch of the Extension Service was organized called the Farm Management Demonstration Department. The farm was coming to be recognized as a business enterprise. As such, proper farm organization and administration became vital. The object of the Farm Management Demonstration Department was to collect data from various representative farms with the object of promoting record keeping. Record keeping would thus become the means of showing profit and loss and could show the farmer what areas needed improvement and where money was being wasted in unprofitable farm practices.

---

54 Ibid., 61-12.
55 Ibid., 63.
The method used was one of survey. The Farm Management Demonstration Agent, Edgar B. Brossard, or the State Leader of County Agents, Robert J. Evans, spent a week or ten days with each County Agent and assisted him in taking records of individual farms. The object was to have as many farmers fill out the record books as possible in order to demonstrate their effectiveness. Each record book completed was calculated and tabulated by the State Leader of County Agents and the individual county agents. Records were then returned to the cooperating farmer with suggestions for changes based upon the facts revealed by the analysis of the business. In the first survey 367 records were given out of which 41.7 per cent were tabulated. Regular Farm Record books were prepared and given to farmers at various farm meetings with instructions on how to use them. It was hoped that each farmer would analyze his own business and check up on it as did other business men.

Six counties were chosen in which to place demonstration farms. An area was chosen because it was typical of the climate, soil and general type of agriculture to be found in the area. On these farms were to be demonstrated the proper methods of farm management, thus serving as an actual example for the farmers in the area.

---


57 Ibid., 8.

58 Ibid., 11.
Edgar B. Brossard also set about analyzing each individual county and published a pamphlet of suggestions giving what he considered to be the facts of the farming possibilities in the individual county. He then offered some suggestions regarding profitable farming in that county based upon the records analyzed.

Not all farmers in Utah were enthusiastic about the farm management project. Many thought that record keeping was a waste of valuable time. Some farmers resented the farm account books as an invasion by "outsiders" of their private business and personal accounts. Robert L. Wrigley, agent for Cache county, reported only three farmers completing their books in 1916, only one of whom would allow the agent to help him check and tabulate the records. Mr. Wrigley felt it useless to put the books out if the farmers did not want them. 59

The farm management project thus met with varied success, depending on the individual agent and farmer until after World War I.

In 1916 another boost was given to the farmer by the Federal Government to be administered with the cooperation of the Extension Division. In this year a Federal Farm Loan Board consisting of five members was organized to supervise at least twelve Federal Land Banks. The Land Banks in turn would lend money obtained by the sale of tax-exempt bonds. In order to be eligible for credit,

the farmers must be organized into credit cooperatives called National Loan Associations. The county agent was to be the catalyst in forming the loan associations. This work was interrupted by the emergency work of World War I though some agents did report the establishment of associations in 1916 and 1917.

The Extension Division has been viewed as a rather one-way street with information being dispersed downward from the Agricultural College to the farm communities through extension workers. But much practical experience was being gained in the counties by the demonstration agents and the farm cooperators. The information gained in one county or by one farmers' organization or women's club might easily be of value to another. For the purpose of sharing these experiences, stimulating new ideas, and gaining more information by attending meetings, a series of yearly conferences were introduced.

These conferences were given the name Farmers' Round-up for the men's section and Housekeepers' Conference for the women. Everyone was invited to attend. The first Round-up and Housekeepers' Conference was held in the Main Building of the Utah Agricultural College at Logan. The conference lasted from January 26th to February 7, 1911.

Also held at the college during the same week were the State Dry Woodrow Wilson, "President Wilson's Address to His Fellow Countrymen," President Wilson's Great Speeches (Chicago: Stanton and Van Vilet Co., 1918).

Farmers' Convention, State Poultrymens' Convention, State Dairymen's Convention, State Poultry Show, State Bee-keepers' Convention and a meeting of the Utah Development League. Having all conventions convened at the same time made possible the coordination of various activities and promoted inter-farm organization relationships. 62 A registration fee of one dollar was charged for each person which admitted him to all lectures for the entire week. State railway lines cooperated, with the Denver and Rio Grande and the Salt Lake Route offering round-trip fare for the price of a one way fare and the Oregon Short Line charging one and one third fare for round trip. 63

A month before the Round-up was to be held all Home Economics Associations and other interested groups were sent a program leaflet outlining the program and speaker of the coming conference. The presidents of the Associations and such L. D. S. Church groups as the Relief Society, the M.I.A. and other federated clubs were urged to try to send one delegate to the convention. 64

Programs for the Round-ups usually included an address by the Extension Division staff and college personnel, usually instructors in agriculture or home economics, though occasionally a speaker from


other college departments might be included. Lectures were also given by the commercial interests such as the speech entitled "Cooperation of Factory and Farmer" given by T. R. Cutler, Manager of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Company at the first Round-up in 1914. Occasionally a member of the U.S. Department of Agriculture would address the meeting.65

Each day's program centered around a certain topic of discussion. For example, Tuesday might be Sugar Beet day, Wednesday Irrigation day, Thursday Horticulture day, and so on. This setting aside of certain days for certain topics was not followed in every Round-up but varied depending upon the convenience and suitability of its use.

The Round-ups were not confined completely to business. In the programs are found such interesting activities as a reception for farmers and housewives with music, dancing and refreshments. Delegates were invited in the evenings to listen to music, dramatic readings, skits and blackouts.66 Guides were provided to conduct tours of the college grounds and buildings after classes in the afternoon.67

Subject emphasis at the conference varied from year to year depending upon the needs for that particular year, or the particular program being emphasized by the Extension Division. The Housekeepers'  

66Ibid.
Convention of 1914 centered on the child as illustrated by a few titles of speeches given: The Home Beautiful, A Factor in a Child's Life; Care of the Expectant Mother; Care of the Child's Teeth; What shall Children Read; Teaching the Source of Life at Home and in School; Madame Montessori and Her Methods of Training Young Children; and others of similar nature. Other years the subjects varied and topics discussed included food and food preparation, home decorating, clothing styles and construction, and homemaking as an art. 68

Farmers' Round-Ups and Housekeepers' Conferences were held at three separate locations once each year. One was held at the Agricultural College at Logan, another usually at the Branch Agricultural College at Cedar City, and the other changed locations being one year at Salina and other years in Richfield. In 1917 four conferences were held, with one each at Logan, Salina, Cedar City and Ogden. Extension Division workers and leaders would travel to the conferences and topics were similar at each gathering with the exception of perhaps more emphasis being put upon the particular needs and problems of the locality in which the conference was being held. 69

The Round-Ups and Conferences were well attended and were looked forward to by the people as a social as well as educational event. They

68 Ibid.
69 Ibid.
were disrupted with the coming of World War I and had to be completely cancelled during the influenza epidemic of 1919. When the gatherings were reinstituted it was under the name of Farmers' Encampment, with similar objectives, though designed more as a leaders' convention.

From the time of the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 to the United States' entrance into World War I, the Extension Division grew and developed in many areas. Experimentation was the watchword and the testing of new ideas laid the groundwork for the organization and programs that came to dominate the work in later years. By 1917 the work had been introduced into all areas of the State and in most instances was established on a firm foundation. This foundation and close relationship with the people of Utah was to hold it in good stead through the trying days of emergency which were to come. That the Division weathered this storm, adjusted to new demands, and proved versatile in the face of change is due to the dedicated work done by these early leaders and workers and by the good relations that they had been able to establish with the farmers of Utah.
CHAPTER III
EXTPENSION WORK DURING WORLD WAR I

In 1917 the regular work of the Extension Department was drastically interrupted by the entrance of the United States into World War I. Food production had fallen off in 1916 and one of the major problems faced by the country upon entering the war was one of supplying our allies and armed forces with adequate food and fuel. Some members of the Extension Services and demonstration teams were taken by the selective service, thus causing some chaos and disorganization in the various departments throughout the country.

On April 16, 1917, President Wilson made an appeal to the nation. In this address he stressed the need for greater food production:

I take this liberty, therefore, of addressing this word to the farmers of the country and to all who work on the farms: The supreme need of our own nation and of the nations with which we are cooperating is an abundance of supplies and especially of foodstuffs. The importance of an adequate food supply, especially for the present year, is superlative. Without abundant food, alike for the armies and peoples now at war, the whole great enterprise upon which we have embarked will break down and fail. The world's food reserves are low. Not only during the present emergency but for some time after peace shall come both our own people and a large proportion of people in Europe must rely on the harvests in America. Upon the farmers of this country, therefore, in large measure, rests the fate of the war and the fate of the nations. May the nation not count upon them to omit no step that will increase the production of their land or that will bring about the most effectual cooperation in the sale and distribution of their products? The time is short. It is of the most imperative importance that everything possible be done and done immediately to make sure of large harvests. I call upon young men
and old alike and upon the able-bodied boys of the land to accept and act upon this duty to turn in hosts to the farmers and make certain that no pains and no labor is lacking in this great matter.

The Government of the United States and the governments of the several States stand ready to cooperate. They will do everything possible to assist farmers in securing an adequate supply of seed, an adequate force of laborers when they are most needed, at harvest time, and the means of expediting shipments of fertilizers and farm machinery, as well as of the crops themselves when harvested. The courses of trade shall be as unhampered as it is possible to make it and there shall be no unwarranted manipulation of the nation's food supply by those who handle it on its way to the consumer. This is our great opportunity to demonstrate the efficiency of a great Democracy and we shall not fall short of it!1

President Wilson thus stated the problem and outlined the goal to be achieved. By way of further encouragement he assured the agricultural population that:

... the men and the women who devote their thought and their energy to these things will be serving the country and conducting the fight for peace and freedom just as truly and just as effectively as the men on the battlefield or in the trenches.2

To coordinate the drive for greater production President Wilson appointed Herbert C. Hoover, former director of the Belgian Relief Commission, to head a special food commission. The Congress cooperated

1 Wilson, 26-28.

2 Ibid., 25,26.
on August 10, 1917, by passing the Lever Act. This act prohibited hoarding of needed supplies or manipulations of markets or transportation facilities. The president was given the power to requisition foods, feeds, and fuels, or any other commodity necessary for the "common defense." He was also authorized to purchase and store such products as wheat, flour, meal, beans and potatoes with the stipulation that the commodities be purchased "at a reasonable price." 3

As head of the Food Administration, Hoover set high minimum prices to stimulate the production of wheat and pork, managed the distribution of foodstuffs, and conducted educational campaigns to encourage people to conserve food, to observe meatless and breadless days and plant gardens in vacant lots.

Utah took the call of the Administration seriously and set out to put the program into effect. Shortly before the outbreak of the war, the Utah Legislature had established the Utah State Council of Defence for the "purpose of putting the agriculture of the state in a position to meet any emergency which might arise." 4 After the passage of the Lever Act, Congress also set up a Federal Food Administration for Utah to coordinate activities of the Federal Food Administration and other agencies. Also established was a Production Division to stimulate growth of staple foods. 5

3U.S. Statutes at Large, XL, Part 1, 276f.
4Board of Trustees' Reports, 1915-1916, 98.
5Ibid., 99.
At the Utah Agricultural College a leaflet was published in May of 1917 containing a speech to the women of Utah by Elmer G. Peterson entitled *Preparedness Through Cooperation Economy*. Dr. Peterson, former Director of Extension Services, was now president of the College. His place in the Extension Department had been taken by John T. Caine III in 1916. In his speech to the women of Utah, Dr. Peterson declared that America was "launched upon a war of righteiousness" and that the women of Utah would be called upon to sacrifice for the war effort. Economy was urged and every woman's organization was asked to form an Economy Committee to help carry out measures to "insure avoidance of material waste in any form."  

Women were also encouraged to raise gardens and poultry, to use cheaper cuts of meats and substitute bean and cheese dishes for meat. Honey was recommended as a substitute for sugar and graham flour in place of white flour for making bread. Nor was economy to stop with food. Mass meetings were to be called for the remodeling of clothing.

---


7 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1917-1918, 49.

8 Peterson, "Preparedness Through Cooperation Economy."
Women were also encouraged to form Red Cross Societies to help in preparing bandages and to learn the elements of first aid. 9

The Extension Department workers often were forced to drop other projects to carry on the emergency work. Some idea of the scope of these activities may be seen from the following questionnaire sent to every extension agent, who was to answer all thirteen questions and submit a special report of emergency work done in their counties. This series questionnaire, sent out in 1917 was called "Special Supplementary Report, 1917 (War Work of County Agents)."

1. When war was declared what did you and your farm bureau do to meet the new conditions?

2. What expansion did you make of your farm bureau or what new organization did you assist in effecting to meet war conditions?

3. What ag. census or other surveys did you make or assist in making?

4. How was the farm labor situation determined and what steps were taken to meet it?

5. What steps were taken to secure or hold an adequate supply of farm seeds and fertilizers?

6. What was done in connection with supplying or completely utilizing farm power, either horses, cattle or tractors?

7. Describe any special food production campaigns undertaken?

9Ibid.
8. Describe any food conservation campaigns such as canning, drying etc.

9. What assistance was rendered in securing farm credit.

10. Treat specifically any assistance rendered by county agent or farm bureau in connection with securing information relating to agriculture for any State or Government Agency, such as the State Ag. College, various bureaus of the Department of Ag. State Dept. of Ag., State or County Council of Defense, Food Administration etc.

11. Give any other ag. conditions brought about by the war and tell what steps were taken to meet them.

12. What part was taken in the Red Cross work, Liberty Loan Campaigns or other patriotic campaigns since the beginning of the war?

13. What are the most important ag. problems in your vicinity as affected by the war and what are your plans for meeting them next year?¹⁰

Various farm demonstration agents reacted in a variety of ways and in some counties the work was undertaken with a zeal. The department eventually found it necessary to appoint eleven additional field workers to assist in the various programs. Salt Lake and Davis counties each required two additional field workers because of the "hearty response and insistent demands."¹¹


Work was carried out in the following general areas: the planting of extra fields or waste areas into wheat or sugar beets; the planting of family gardens with the goal of providing the family with as much of their own food as possible; the conserving and preserving of food stuffs; the raising of additional farm animals such as chickens and hogs; support of the war by buying Liberty Bonds and Savings Stamps; seeing that farmers could obtain sufficient seed to plant and that no field was lying idle for lack of seed and to see that each farm found enough labor to harvest his crops. Work was carried on as far as possible through the New Farm Bureau Organization. Only recently begun and still not in operation in many counties, these organizations were just beginning to be organized and were only nominally operative. (A full discussion of the origins and organization of these Bureaus is given in the following chapter.)

In Salt Lake County, emergency work was undertaken with enthusiasm. When war was declared the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was holding its semi-annual conference in Salt Lake City. Mr. J. W. Paxman, the state specialist in dry farming, suggested that the President's appeal for increased production of foodstuffs be brought to the attention of all the membership of the church by having the church presidency offer prizes. Extension Director John T. Caine III mentioned this suggestion to A. W. Ivins, an apostle of the L.D.S. Church, and Trustee of the U.A.C., who in turn took the suggestion to Joseph F. Smith, president of the church.
As a consequence of this suggestion the church offered $1,000 as first prize, $500 second prize and $250 third prize for the best five acres of wheat grown.\textsuperscript{12}

Heber J. Webb, county agent for Salt Lake County found that the best method for encouraging the federal government programs was to merge the local farm bureau with the ecclesiastical wards of the L.D.S. church. County commissioners mailed a letter to all Mormon bishops requesting names of those who could and would make use of vacant lots and waste places for the planting of what came to be called "victory gardens." President Wilson's appeal was read by bishops in ward meetings. According to Mr. Webb "the response came like a rushing army mainly through the Mormon church organization which is unsurpassed. Farm Bureau members are mostly affiliated with said church so when they received the same call that the bishops did they worked so voluntarily and harmoniously that amazing results were achieved."\textsuperscript{13}

Other counties also found the L.D.S. Church organization to be active in promoting the programs. Washington county agent, David Gourley reported the church authorities active "... church yards were plowed up and planted into beans and other food crops."\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14}David Gourley, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Washington County, 1917."
In addition to encouraging the planting of gardens, the people were asked to preserve enough of their own garden produce to supply their family needs for the winter. The home demonstration agents were most influential in this work. These agents established community canning centers where people could bring their garden produce to bottle or can. The agents were able to obtain 350 steam pressure canners for this purpose. Community Centers were established in high schools and churches and several counties were able to report enough home canning to last through the winter. 15

In Washington county where much fruit was grown, the agent helped organize public storage places for fruit. Committees were formed to handle any fruit which the growers themselves could not handle in order that the fruit might not go to waste. 16

Housewives had been especially encouraged to engage in emergency war programs. In addition to preserving food they were asked to use up surplus potatoes which were apparently more abundant than other basic food stuffs such as wheat and flour. Sugar was also scarce and home demonstration agents encouraged the use of sugar substitutes. Recipes were distributed to housewives giving tasty

---

15 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1917-1918, 71.
ideas for left-overs, potatoes, sugar substitutes, fruits and other foods which were not hard to come by.

Johanna Moen, Assistant Professor of Domestic Art at U.A.C. sent out, in cooperation with the Extension Division, a pamphlet entitled Practical Economics in Food and Clothing containing recipes for left-overs, for potatoes and inexpensive foods plus suggestions for the making repairing and remodeling of clothing to help Utah women economize.\(^\text{17}\) Gertrude McCheyne, State Home Demonstration Leader, prepared a pamphlet on fruit and vegetable preservation with illustrations of the type of home cooker best suited for certain products and recipes for canning with the least waste.\(^\text{18}\)

In preparing her program leaflet for the Home Economic Associations, Gertrude McCheyne asked the women to make the following pledge:

I Pledge Myself -
To preserve an extra amount of vegetables, fruits, meats and eggs, and in event of a larger surplus than I can handle to notify the chairman of our committee.

To serve beans or eggs in place of, but not with, meat and to serve meat not oftener than once a day.

To increase the use of the whole grain or graham flour in the community by purchasing it for my table.


To produce all of the foods possible and to confine home consumption, as far as possible, to foods produced on the farm.

To have no waste, either of food or clothing. Planning meals in advance, also careful purchasing of wearing apparel, care and remodeling of the same, all means to this end.

To try keeping an expense account for two months at least as a means of checking expenditures (the U.A.C. Extension Division will furnish a sample two months expense sheet.)

To study through correspondence, or class work in a women's organization, some branch of nutrition.

The woman's name was signed at the bottom of the pledge indicating her willingness to comply.19

Some of the housewives were not exactly overjoyed at the prospect of doing without. Home agents especially complained about trying to persuade them to use sugar substitutes in canning since some women were convinced that substitutes would cause the fruit to spoil. The women were also not amenable to making over their old clothes. The women said they had always made things over and were not about to be shown any new methods of remodeling. The home agents applied a little "psychology" by simply telling them that often their clothes looked made-over. It took expert advice to give clothing that not made-over look. This, plus the inducement of financial savings, aroused the women's interest and soon remodeling was a major undertaking at the community centers.20


20Board of Trustees' Reports, 1917-1918, 72.
Some agents were so successful in arousing the support of the members of their communities that Vigilance Leagues were formed. In the league, women members pledged themselves to watch for violations of the food law of the National Food Program. Mostly these committees were used to contact people who were unable to find or to use food substitutes.21

In the area of increased production the crucial crops seems to be wheat and sugar. In all counties, agents did their best to encourage increased acreages of these two crops plus the raising of more livestock for increased meat supply. Juab county was typical. County Agent H. V. Woodbury started a campaign for the planting of more spring wheat. He reported that in the neighborhood of 10,000 bushels of grain were produced on the extra acres planted.22 Almost all other counties in Utah reported an increase in grain production. Many counties reported increased acreages of sugar beets and potatoes. The Beaver county agent reported his county as having produced four times the amount of wheat asked of them.23 Wasatch county reported a 400 acre increase.24

Counties trying to increase livestock production reported that the government guarantee of minimum prices helped "wonderfully."

21Ibid., 70


23Hans A. Christiansen, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Beaver County, 1918."

Both Juab and Cache counties started large sheep herds and Utah was reported as the only state in the intermountain area to increase hog production with Wasatch county leading the way having had a 75 percent increase.

Another emergency problem was that of obtaining seed so that no available acre of land should remain idle. The State Conservation Commission appropriated $1,950 to be used for purchasing seed. The county agents distributed this to people recommended by the local Board of Directors. This was done on a loan basis with the loans being covered by crop mortgages and notes. In Utah county alone 56 farmers were aided. In Wasatch county, the agent found an excess of potatoes and wheat seed and sent out lists to other agents giving the names of farmers who had good seed to sell.

Because of the combined influences of the Selective Service and the new war industries, farm labor shortage threatened to become a problem. Each county was urged to form a Farm Labor Board to obtain labor or channel those needing work to appropriate places of employment.

---


26Board of Trustees' Reports, 1917-1918, 74.


Counties usually appointed one person "sometimes a lady easily accessible to the public—e.g. a post mistress or one having telephone connections with the neighboring districts." She would then register anyone needing employment and place them on farms.  

Other organizations volunteered to help out. A sugar beet company in Salt Lake county organized camps for boys who thinned and weeded beets. These boys came from Salt Lake City. The State Council of Defense organized 528 "town" boys into the Boys' Working Reserve of the U.S. Department of Labor. When an area needed additional help they applied to the State Council of Defense and the needs were usually met, though some agents complained that fellows sent out from the city were "often misfits."  

Another project given to the farm agent was that of encouraging the sale of Liberty Bonds and War Savings Stamps. Most agents reporting for that year indicate that work along these lines had been done and that people were, in the main, supporting this cause. Each county was assigned a certain amount of money to collect through the sale of war bonds. Only one county reported the actual amount assigned or collected. Archie L. Christiansen, agent for Tooele county,  


31 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1917-1918, 47.

proudly reported that his county had been assigned $679,465 but he had been able to subscribe $1,182,236 making an over-subscription of $502,771. As Mr. Christiansen says in his report, "This is a record of which Tooele County can be justly proud." 33

The extension agent also became involved in the Selective Service. If it was determined that a boy was needed badly on the farm he could be deferred. Agents were often asked to help determine if the request for farm deferrment was a legitimate request. A. W. Ivins, advisor for the Kane county Draft Board also asked that questionaires to be distributed through the county requesting additional selective service information. These questionaires were processed for the purpose of securing furloughs or rather rejecting the request for furloughs that were asked for when they were not deemed necessary for the agricultural labor production. Most often it was found that the families of the soldiers were requesting the furloughs claiming that the boys were needed at home. 34

On the more humorous side, Emery County agent Orson P. Madsen reported that a call had come from the War Department for aid in obtaining horses in the county suitable for cavalry and artillery purposes. In response to this call considerable time was spent in locating suitable

33Archie L. Christiansen, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Tooele County, 1918."
34Hugh Hurst, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Emery County, 1917."
animals until "about three cars of horses were lined up and ready for delivery. About that time word was received that the government had discontinued buying directly from the farmers. "This," said Mr. Madsen, "left the farmers much disappointed and the agent embarrassed." 35

There were other minor problems such as a railroad-car shortage which was taken care of, a shortage of coal to run the threshers, and a shortage of fruit containers for marketing fruit. Through the cooperation of the county agents, state agencies, and commercial and church organizations the problems were eventually taken care of.

In his biennial report to the College Board of Trustees, Extension Division Director John T. Caine III expressed his feeling that Utah's response to the call for national conservation had been gratifying. Utah had increased her food production and conservation beyond that called for by the national program. Caine attributed this success to the organized work of the Extension Division field forces. 36

In this time of emergency the Extension Department was the obvious agency to carry the program to the people. Already organized with agents in almost every county, the department also had established close ties with other farm organizations, was familiar with the potential of farm land in their areas and was acquainted and had worked with the individual farmers. The demonstration agent was

36 Board of Trustees; Reports, 1917-1918, 47.
acquainted with facilities for carrying out food preservation projects and through local women's organizations and civic clubs could mobilize sentiment behind the work. And while mobilization of labor and war production was slow and often wasteful, the Extension Department can be given a majority of the credit for mobilization of America's farmers and the large increase in agricultural production.
CHAPTER IV
ORGANIZATION OF THE FARM BUREAU

Increased production programs and emergency work were just getting into full swing with methods of organization being improved and problems being ironed out when the fighting halted. The end of emergency programs and demands for war production and conservation left the Extension Division in rather a deflated state. In many counties home demonstration work had begun with war emergency workers and under the stimulation of "win the war" enthusiasm. Farm Bureaus had been merged with church organizations and organizational lines of responsibility were hazy.

People in Utah generally lost interest in the extension work as farm prices remained high due to the demand from European markets. The strain of conserving resources was now over and farmers, along with the rest of the nation, wanted a return to "normalcy."

Another blow to the extension work came with the withdrawal of some $51,000 in emergency funds from the federal government. This necessitated the discontinuance of several positions in the Extension Division which had been made possible through these emergency funds. Many county agents resigned with the end of hostilities leaving several counties agentless and giving the Extension Division the problem of trying to replace them knowing that some of the counties would have to be without an agent because of lack of funds. Other offices were discontinued, such as the state specialists in poultry, in hog production,
in veterinary science and in irrigation. The Farm Help specialist also had to be released.¹

Amid the problems of reorganization and reorientation of the program, an epidemic of influenza further interrupted efforts to carry on. Public meetings were discouraged in order to prevent as much as possible the spread of the epidemic. The Farmers' Round-Up and Housekeepers' Conferences were discontinued.² Farm Bureau meetings were impossible, thus preventing the planning of projects for the year. Many women's organizations and farmers' associations were disbanded.³

This, therefore, seemed to be the time to make major changes in the Extension Division organization and orientation in its relationship to the farm community. One of the major changes came in the reorganization of the Farm Bureau. Though this organization has been mentioned previously, it would be well at this time to go back to its origins and purpose for being and discuss its growth and relationship to the extension work program.

When county agents were first appointed in Utah in 1913 they were instructed to encourage the formation of local farm organizations which were to cooperate with the agent in planning projects which would be of most value to the people of the area. Taking the name being used

¹Board of Trustees' Reports, 1919-1920, 54.
²Ibid., 54.
³Vere L. Martineau, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Salt Lake County, 1921."
by similar organizations in other states, these local organizations came to be called Farm Bureau organizations.

Agents sponsoring the farm bureaus often had a very difficult time getting a continuous organization in operation. They were, at this time, an organization only for the men. Meetings were irregular. One year the bureau would be attended enthusiastically. The next year the bureau simply would not get off the ground. An organization would be established in an area for a year or two and then fade out of existence, or begin an ambitious program and fail to carry it out. It seemed most successful in and around larger communities where the people were more concentrated in towns and villages and less successful in the very scattered rural areas where it was perhaps most needed. Before the war there were but seven organized county farm bureaus in the twenty-nine counties.¹

During the years 1918 to 1923 there was a large drive made by the Extension Division and the county agents to promote the organization of local and county farm bureaus. One of the major changes adopted in the new program was the inclusion of women and young people in the organization. This made the bureau a "family organization with all members of the family involved in the program."⁵ The local organization was to be divided into two sections. The Home Section was

¹Board of Trustees' Reports, 1915-1916, 42.
⁵Board of Trustees' Reports, 1917-1918, 69.
organized for the housewives and the Girls Jr. Vocational program and worked in cooperation with the county home demonstration agent and the state food and nutrition, clothing, and home management specialists. This new section of the farm bureau caused the disbanding of home economics associations as they were simply absorbed into the new program.

The Agriculture Section of the farm bureau program was for the men and the boys' section of the Jr. Vocational Work. This section worked in cooperation with the county agricultural agent and the various state agriculture specialists of the Extension Division. The county agents, while acting as promoters of the farm bureaus were not to hold any positions and were to act mainly in an advisory capacity.

For the most part a typical local organization was brought together in the following manner. The county agent, acting as a promoter, contacted many of the farmers of the community soliciting support for the bureau. If enough interest was shown a meeting would be scheduled. Publicity for the meeting was published in local newspapers and spread by personal contact of the agent and other interested supporters. Anyone who had any interest in promoting and improving agriculture was invited to attend.

At this first meeting officers were elected consisting of

6 Vere L. Martineau, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Salt Lake County, 1921."

7 Ibid.
a president, vice-president, secretary-treasurer, and two directors who
together formed an executive committee. It was then decided in the
meeting what farm projects would be of most benefit to the community.
The variety of these projects was innumerable. A partial list of the
most commonly undertaken projects included work in improving such
things as soil, grain, alfalfa, potatoes, sugar beets, orchards,
dairy herds, poultry, and livestock.8

The project was, or was supposed to be, confined to a few definite
features which could be accomplished within the year if each member
donated a little of his time to the work. Each project was put under
the direction of a volunteer project leader who worked with those
members of the bureau who signed up for his particular project.9

Working in conjunction with the county agent, the project leader and
project workers would then draw up a detailed outline of the project
program. This would be sent to the state county agent leader who
would turn it over to the state specialist best qualified to offer
advice for the project. The specialist would offer criticism, suggestions,
and possible changes and return it to the state leader who would then

8Vere L. Martineau, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Salt Lake
County, 1925."

9Board of Trustees' Reports, 1919-1920, 87,88.
approve the project and return it to the agent and the project leader and the program could commence.\textsuperscript{10}

The presidents of all local or community farm bureaus met as a county board of directors and elected officers for the county farm bureau organization. This board of directors elected a president, vice-president, and secretary. These officials, plus the county agricultural agent and home demonstration agent made up the personnel of the County Farm Bureau Executive Committee.\textsuperscript{11}

Such projects as had been adopted by a majority of the local bureaus became county projects. A county project committeeman was placed in charge to correlate activities of the local project leaders.\textsuperscript{12} Each county project leader and all corresponding local project leaders formed the county committee for each line of work.\textsuperscript{13} Any other problems too broad for community action became county projects.

The county farm bureaus were then affiliated in a State Farm Bureau. All presidents of the county farm bureaus served on the board of directors for the state organization.\textsuperscript{14} The board of directors

\textsuperscript{10}Board of Trustees' Reports, 1915-1916, 42.

\textsuperscript{11}Vere L. Martineau, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Salt Lake County, 1919."

\textsuperscript{12}Board of Trustees' Reports, 1919-1920, 87,88.

\textsuperscript{13}Vere L. Martineau, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Salt Lake County, 1919."

\textsuperscript{14}Board of Trustees' Reports, 1919-1920, 87,88.
for the state organization chose from among its members officers similar to the county officers which formed the State Executive Committee. The board of directors also made the president of the Agricultural College, the Extension Director and the County Agent Leader advisory members of the State Executive Committee thus tying the organization closely to the College and the Extension Division and making correlation of activities possible.\textsuperscript{15}

The State Farm Bureau Organization was in turn affiliated with the American Farm Bureau Federation. This nation-wide organization was established in March of 1920, as a result of the calling together of delegates from various state organizations who felt such a federation would be beneficial to the nation's agricultural needs.\textsuperscript{16} The national organization was to be the voice of America's farmers. Objectives for the organization included functioning in the economic, legislative, and economic spheres pertaining to the interest of the farm population.\textsuperscript{17}

The relationship of the Farm Bureau organization on all levels-county, state, or national-to the Extension Division was one of mutual cooperation, but with neither organization responsible for the activities, actions or policies of the other. In Utah, however, the

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., 54.

\textsuperscript{16}True, Agricultural Extension Work, 162.

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., 163.
county agent found this organization to be the best tool for the implementation of the extension programs. The individual farmer of Utah and other states had, by 1920, a variety of sources for help and information. Put into chart form, the picture appeared as shown in Figure 1 on page 67.18

The blueprint of an organization and how it should function is one thing, the actual functioning of the organization sometimes proves to be something else altogether. Even though the county agent was simply to help and advise the local farm bureau organization, it is obvious he must have the organization there to advise. And so he became the principal agitator and advocate of the bureau in order to better carry out his program. This, in many cases, led the people to view the bureau as "belonging to" the county agent. Some resentment was shown toward this drive to organize. Membership dues were necessary, and some farmers saw this as another fee to pay for which the benefits were uncertain. Hans A. Christiansen, county agent for Beaver county, suggested a different approach to the bureau organization and in so doing outlined some of the typical problems faced by the agent.

It is believed by the writer that farm bureaus should be organized before the agent begins work and should then be accepted on its approval as their expert and that they must assist in the choosing of projects and doing the work. This gives the farmers the right attitude toward the bureau. They feel that it is their organization and that it does not

Figure 1. Plan of Extension Service Organization as found in Utah Extension Service Circular, New Series, Circular No. 7, (1927), p. 4.
belong to the county agent. This attitude gives them more confidence in the organization and more initiative to act for themselves.

The farm bureau in Beaver county was organized by the county agent and he has felt the lack of initiative on the part of its officers. However, it is getting stronger each year as the work progresses. As one farmer replied when asked to join the farm bureau, "I'll wait till it does something." 19

With the passing of the years, however, the farm bureau organizations came to be another mainstay in the framework of rural Utah society. As more people recognized its value and effectiveness there seemed to develop a hard core of members who supported its programs and participated actively in its activities. Many others, however, were fringe members, joining some years if it seemed beneficial and not joining other years if either dissatisfied or unconvinced of any benefits to be gained. In Utah, as in the nation generally, it did not represent a cross section of all farmers, but tended to include those who, because of its educational nature, were more progressive and better educated and informed.

One very colorful aspect of the farm bureau movement during the 1920s was the publication in many counties of the Farm Bureau News. These three to four-page papers published either monthly or bi-monthly,

19 Hans A. Christiansen, "Annual Reports of Extension Work in Beaver County, 1918."
depending on the individual county, contained items of interest to the farmer and his family. Usually edited by the county agent, the paper explained farm bureau and extension programs, gave helpful hints, and announced forthcoming activities, advertised merchandise of interest to farm families, and in the words of one county agent, "... [gave] the gist of the agricultural work going on in the county and at the same time [preached] the needed farm gospel."²⁰

Publishing the county farm bureau news helped draw attention to bureau and extension work. In many communities bureau-sponsored activities such as the annual summer Farm Bureau picnic and winter banquet became one of the major social events of the season.

The Bureau became one of the major organizations cooperating with the Extension Service and did more than any other organization or agency to promote agricultural improvement not only economically, but in social and political areas as well.

²⁰Ibid.
CHAPTER V
PROJECTS

To discuss in detail the numerous projects undertaken by the various county agents over the years the Extension Service has been in existence is beyond the scope of this paper. To give some idea of the variety of these projects, however, this chapter will present in detail some samples from counties throughout the state.

Dairy improvement

Most counties followed in some respect the same general outline for projects that were carried out year after year. For example, in counties where it was applicable a dairy project was implemented. The object of the total program was to improve the individual dairy herd and to increase profits made by herd owners. In early years the emphasis was on cow testing. The dairist kept a record on each cow including how many pounds of milk she produced monthly and the percentage of butterfat per pound. A record was also kept to determine how much feed was consumed by the cow. If it could be determined that feed for the animal was costing more than it was producing, the farmer could then sell the cow.

To further improve the dairy herds, agents encouraged the importation of pure-bred bulls. Several counties formed pure-bred

---

1Information not specifically footnoted in this chapter can be obtained from any county's "Annual Report of Extension Work" between the years 1925-1942.
bull associations to make the cost of purchasing and maintaining the expensive stock a community project and thus share the expense. Agents also helped in arranging for testing of the dairy animals for diseases such as bangs and tuberculosis.\textsuperscript{2} With the advent of local milk processing plants and cheese factories, farmers were given instruction on how to improve dairy barns to meet grade A standards. Feed and improved pasturage were also regular topics of discussion. In almost every county having an agricultural agent, dairy projects have been one of the major yearly projects.

\textbf{Crop improvement}

Another major project carried out yearly by a number of counties was classified as crop improvement. This included the improvement of seed and the encouragement by agents to farmers to plant certified seed. Crops usually included in the improvement program included grain, potatoes, sugar beets, and alfalfa. Demonstrations showing increased production due to improved seed variety and treated seed were carried out. Farmers sometimes visited the experimental farms of the Utah Experiment Station to see first-hand improved methods for cultivating, irrigating, or harvesting. Crop rotation was stressed in the years between 1910 and 1925 as a means of preserving soil fertility and improving crop production. Many county agents included in their reports photographs showing the improvement being made in crop production.

Agricultural economics

Other projects of continuing significance included livestock feeding which involved beef, sheep, and hogs. Agricultural economics, with the keeping of farm records, was also of major importance though it does seem this project suffered more than many of the others. As late as 1935 the Extension Division was still working on methods of getting unified economic information to the farmer and ways of persuading him to make use of this information. The Cache county experience is typical. Cache county had been selected as the county in Utah to cooperate with an economic program instituted by the United States department of Agriculture. Professor T. R. Cutler, instructor at the College, had attended meetings in Washington, D. C., where he was instructed on how to proceed with the work. He held several meetings in Cache county hoping to stimulate more economic discussions among the rural people. The results are best stated by county agent Robert L. Wrigley who helped conduct the meetings.

The discussions were fairly well attended and when the people were there they took part in them and appeared interested but in too many sessions it was a new crowd out each time. The people had other engagements that kept them away, so that on the whole they were not as successful as they should have been. ... the people were not sufficiently interested in the work to make an effort to be present. I believe, however, that there is a great need for a lot of this kind of work. Farmers need to think further into these economic problems which are so vital to their future.  

---
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Horticulture

Horticulture was another major area for extension program work. Greater involvement was shown in the northern counties including Utah, Salt Lake, Weber, Box Elder, Davis, Wasatch, Washington, and Cache though the work in these projects was carried out with minor emphasis in other areas. The work included orchard management with proper selection of trees and larger variety of fruits stressed as necessary elements for fruit production. Demonstrations were given on proper pruning methods. Disease in fruits was also a major problem and farmers were instructed on the control of fruit blight and insects which often damaged crops.

In 1927, in Salt Lake county, "spray ring" organizations were set up for the purpose of hiring spraying equipment to spray the orchards for pests and disease. This was again a community cooperative effort which would prove a financial saving. Spray machines and equipment were purchased by Salt Lake county for the machine operators at wholesale prices.5

Cooperative marketing

Between 1915 and 1920 a strong move was inaugurated to organize farmers into cooperatives for the purpose of buying and selling. The advantages in group marketing and purchasing were obvious and county

agents often became involved as the main instigators of such movements. This movement often caused resentment and misunderstandings in the early years of experimentation on the part of the processors and already established "middle-men." An example from Washington county serves as an illustration.

In 1917, county agent David Gourley organized a fruit growers association in Washington county. Then in cooperation with county agents from Beaver and Iron county, he canvassed those two counties for orders to provide a market for the Washington county fruit. Fruit inspectors were appointed to inspect the packs and packing and to see that the fruit was shipped properly. Several large trucks were engaged to haul the fruit to the markets.6

In the words of Mr. Gourley, "The results were encouraging, but not satisfactory from any point of view."7 Mr. Gourley listed six reasons for the failure of the enterprise: 1) some of the people who had peddled for a living started to under-sell the market, thinking the movement was intended to hurt their business; 2) the peddlers caused an unrest among the fruit growers and buyers by false reports that the markets in Iron county were not organized and that the people of Washington county would not have the fruit and if they did they could not deliver it; 3) the fruit ripened about the same time and was


7Ibid.
forced on the market all at once, glutting the market; 4) the people were afraid to obtain containers, not having been able other years to market their fruit; 5) the market of Iron county went to pieces due to excessive amounts of fruit at once and the lack of money being placed with the orders, insuring the taking of the fruit when delivered; 6) the money not being placed with the order left the people open to the low prices of the peddler and they had to stand by their market. 8

Left with fruit and no money or markets, Mr. Gourley encouraged some of the growers to use the ripening fruit now falling to the ground to fatten pigs for market. "It was found that only a small amount of grain was necessary to finish off the pigs." 9

The role of the county agent in establishing cooperative marketing associations was later defined as being advisory. It was felt that this would eliminate the misunderstanding between the Extension Division and the local processors and suppliers. 10 Most of the organizing was later instigated by the farm bureau organizations. County agents acted in an advisory capacity to county sugar beet associations, canning crop growers associations, egg producers associations, county horticulture societies, fruit growers associations, milk producers associations, poultry producers cooperatives, fair boards, the Utah

---

8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 True, Agricultural Extension Work, 164, 165.
Dairy Association, the Utah Poultry Association and many other organizations whose purpose it was to aid the farm economy and the rural population.

Cooperation with processors

County agents often acted as mediators between the Farm Bureau organization and the processors, arranging meetings and instigating cooperation for the benefit of farm producers. In 1918, for example, county agent Robert L. Wrigley set up a meeting between Mr. Anderson of the Anderson Brothers Canning Company of Morgan, Utah, and the farm bureaus of Smithfield and Hyrum. It seemed Mr. Anderson wished to locate a pea factory in Cache county but needed a guarantee of at least 400 acres of peas plus a site for the factory before making a final decision on the project.\(^{11}\)

The farm bureaus of the two towns met separately and each appointed a committee to procure the acreage and a site for the plant. The county agent assisted in canvassing the areas and after much effort Smithfield secured a little over 400 acres and Hyrum 360. Both were able to get a good site. Mr. Anderson decided to put the plant in Smithfield because there was more acreage and a greater number of producers there. The competition between the two farm bureaus for

\(^{11}\)Robert L. Wrigley, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Cache County, 1918."
the location of the plant made them "real live organizations for at least a while" and brought in many new members.\textsuperscript{12}

Road building

Another extension project involved road building in the Uintah Basin area. As early as 1921, the county agent had listed this as a major, long-term project. Transportation between Vernal and Salt Lake was very difficult and rates for the shipping of cattle and farm products were high.\textsuperscript{13} "Good roads" days were held and local committees were appointed by each district to cooperate with county officials (mainly the county road supervisor) in conducting and supervising any donated work being done on the roads. People of different sections of the area cooperated and the project was put under the direction of a civil engineer.\textsuperscript{14}

While some improvement was certainly made at this time it was not until 1932 that a major route connecting the area with Salt Lake City was undertaken. At first there was much opposition to making changes. Merchants and farmers were opposed to disturbing trade relations which had been established with Price and contacts that had been made

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{13} Board of Trustees' Reports, 1930-1932.

\textsuperscript{14} J. H. Wiltwer, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Uintah County, 1917."
with the road commission. But as the advantages of a shorter year-round highway to Salt Lake was explained barriers disappeared. The people of the Uintah Basin presented a united front which resulted in Strawberry road being declared the route for the Victory Highway, Federal Aid Project # 40.\(^{15}\)

The completion of this project made shipping by truck possible and reduced travel time to Salt Lake City from three days to ten hours round trip. Farmers were now able to raise many more varieties of products since the lower shipping rates now made them profitable. Trucking now became a major transportation method in the area.\(^{16}\)

\(\texttt{H-H Club work}\)

The Boys' and Girls' Club work changed considerably during the 1920's and 1930's. To trace here these changes in detail is impossible but the work grew to be one of the major undertakings of the Extension Division. Taking the name "H-H Clubs," a name first introduced by O. H. Benson and O. B. Martin, employees of the United States Department of Agriculture,\(^{17}\) the program was slowly removed from the jurisdiction of the local school districts. A program of volunteer leaders, trained at leadership classes held at the Utah State Agricultural College, in cooperation with the extension agents organized and conducted the work.

\(^{15}\)Board of Trustees' Reports, 1930-1932.

\(^{16}\)Ibid.

\(^{17}\)True, Agricultural Extension Work, 186.
Programs were outlined in projects similar to the main extension programs including dairy, beef, various crop products, and poultry for the boys, and for girls, sewing, cooking, home management, and child care.  

Many volunteer leaders became dedicated 4-H club workers giving freely of their time to help promote the work. Sometimes club project work became a family undertaking with the mother or father and older children being club leaders with younger children and neighbors enrolled. One example of dedication is told of a Salt Lake county mother of twelve children whose older daughter led three different 4-H clubs. The mother made available for club meetings and work the large basement of their home. In addition she found seven girls in the neighborhood who were too young to be enrolled in regular club work and brought them into her home, laid out a certain amount of club project-type work for them to accomplish, and when fair time came, had them exhibit the napkins, dishtowels, etc. they had made along with the regular members. Helping prepare these little girls for club work was a satisfying summer experience. In October the thirteenth child was born to this mother.

A mother of 4-H club members in Salt Lake county wrote a tribute to the program. In describing the benefits of the program she included the exchange of ideas through association, the training the members were

---

18 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1926-1928, 134.
getting in practical duties of everyday life, the pride in having accomplished something useful themselves, and the leadership ability gained while serving as officers of the clubs. This testimony also reflected the general good feeling of the people of Utah for the 4-H program and the appreciation for the agents and leaders who donated their time.20

Community improvement

Another project undertaken by the Extension Service was one of clean-up: clean-up homes, yards, vacant lots, farm yards, and churchyards. In Wasatch county the general clean-up campaign was undertaken with the slogan, "Junk Your Junk And Clean Up." Each family was to get rid of any debris, repair fences, and help clear school and public grounds. Five things were to be remembered:

1) haul off your machinery and dead Fords; 2) put barnyard manure on the fields; 3) keep cattle off the streets unless someone is with them; 4) plant trees and shrubs; and 5) plant a garden on a vacant piece of your lots.21

Part of the project included home and yard beautification. Agents cooperated in planting trees along the streets of towns and encouraged the planting of lawns and flower gardens. In Weber county a contest sponsored by the farm bureau was held and prizes were offered for the best carried-out yard beautification project.22

20 Ibid., 11.


Somewhat related to home and farm beautification was the various pest eradication and control programs. In various counties at different times, the grasshopper became one of the major pest problems. Many methods were used to destroy this traditional Utah pest, but it was not until insect sprays were put to use that the problem became less frequently mentioned in the county agent reports as a major project.

Other pests which extension workers were concerned with included gophers, ground squirrels, mice, rats, sparrows, and weeds in right of ways and fields. Eradication was usually done with the help of poison bait and traps. Weeds, of course, were destroyed by burning or by plowing them under.

Politics

The county agent sometimes became involved in local political squabbles if the debate affected the rural people. For example, in 1921 Mountain States Telephone Company filed a petition with the Public Utilities Commission asking permission to increase rates in and around Salt Lake City. The farm bureau with the cooperation of the Extension Service took immediate action. Fourteen local meetings were held and it was decided that, since the company had operated successfully during the war at lower rates, an increase was unfair. The bureau members then voted to have their telephones removed if rates were increased.
A committee was selected to attend the hearing before the Public Utilities Commission and protest. The movement was effective and there was no raise in telephone rates.23

In another incident in Salt Lake county, the county agent called the County Farm Bureau and the County Civic League together to register a protest against an increase in taxes on farm lands while other property taxes remained unchanged. From 600 to 1,000 people appeared before the Public Utilities Commission and enough pressure was applied that a joint committee was appointed to work on modifications of the tax program.24

During the Depression agents helped prepare petitions asking county commissioners to extend the date for paying taxes on farms. Petitions were prepared in the extension offices and sent to Farm Bureau presidents who were to obtain the required signatures. In most cases these petitions were successful thus giving the farmers some lee-way in making their tax payments.25

Not all projects were serious. The Extension Service also sponsored outings, and special event programs. An Arbor Day program was held on April 15, 1925, in Salt Lake county. The object, of course,

23Vere L. Martineau, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Salt Lake County, 1921," h0, hl.
24Ibid.
was to promote the planting of trees. Speakers at the program included such illustrious men as Senator Reed Smoot and Governor George H Dern. 26

In Uintah county a Uintah Basin Pageant was staged to commemorate the twentieth year of Extension Service in the area. Five-hundred whites and Indians participated and music was furnished by the 38th U. S. Infantry band from Fort Duchesne. It was estimated that 20,000 people were in attendance. 27

Excursions were also common. Usually buggy or car caravans were used to visit farms which demonstrated some improved farm method. In Cache county in the winter of 1917, a party of dairymen met in Richmond where they traveled by sleigh to visit five or six different herds in the valley. Sandwiches and buttermilk were served to the group at the Commercial Club. "After a little speech making [they] visited a few more herds, then left Richmond on the P. L. & I. Railway at 5:30 P.M." 28

Home economy

Extension programs for women centered on home living. This included the making or remodeling of the family clothing, proper diet and


27. Board of Trustees' Reports, 1930-1932.

nutrition for the family including the attractive preparation of foods, child care and development, home health and sanitation, and home improvement for beauty and efficiency. Home management became a major project at certain times with emphasis on economizing and budgeting as did the project for mind improvement embodied in the drive to interest the farm family in reading good books.

The making or remodeling of the family clothing supply was stressed largely during the 1920s and 1930s as an economy measure to try to keep some of the very scarce cash at home. Women were instructed in the construction of dress forms and patterns, in elementary dress making, remodeling adult clothing for children, and millinery. The remodeling of hats became a craze between 1925 and 1930, capitalizing on the artistic instinct of the farm wife. Ingenuity and inventiveness went into the remaking of old hats and extension reports are full of "before" and "after" pictures showing the "remarkable" changes which, of course, were made more advantageous because of the money savings involved.29

Nutrition

Proper nutrition for the family has been stressed by the extension home economists from the very first. Menus showing balanced diets and proper eating habits were distributed through various women's

organizations, published in bulletins and stressed in speeches. Classes were held at the Housekeepers' Conferences and demonstrations were given on food preparation and attractiveness.30

Proper nutrition was often tied closely with child care and home health. As early as 1919 surveys conducted showed that 90.0 percent of the children "inspected" were defective in accordance with normal height-weight measurements, with 64 percent being underweight.31 Projects were immediately undertaken in most counties to do something about this problem. One method was to induce the child to play a nutrition game in which a chart was made showing the child's actual weight and the desired weight. A red ball indicated the progress the child was making toward the desired weight. Testimony of this program's effectiveness came from an agent who reported that one child was so proud of his achievement, that "... one evening at the village picture show, the youngster spied the Home Agent and during a tragic hush in the scream drama called lustily across the room, "0, Mother, there is Miss ____! Miss ____! I age two figs and drank milk for breakfast and I am two pounds more!'"32

Another method of improving children's diets came in the drive for the school hot lunch program. In some counties it was found that school lunches prepared at home were frozen upon arrival at the school because

31Board of Trustees' Reports, 1919-1920, 101.
of the ride in the wagon to the school building. In one county the Farm Bureau women raised funds to hire a woman to cook and serve one hot dish at school. This project was used as a model by other counties and soon the projects were taken over by the local school boards.33

Contests were held to pick the most nearly perfectly healthy child. A handbook was written by the nutrition specialists on food for the adolescent girl which was distributed to all L.D.S. girls between ages 14 and 18 at the request of the M.I.A. General Secretary, Clarissa Beesley.34 In Cache and Box Elder counties, Izola Jensen, district home agent, held a contest to pick the healthiest girl. The girls were thus encouraged not only to eat properly, but also to wear proper clothing and shoes and follow good habits of personal hygiene.35

In 1931, the nutrition agents concluded that children were not getting enough milk. A "Milky-Way" project was begun to encourage farm wives to see that there was not "too much milk going into the can and not enough into the child." 36 The mother was encouraged to see that each child received at least one quart of milk a day to help keep the

33 Board of Trustees; Reports, 1919-1920, 104.
34Rose H. Widstoe, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Salt Lake County, 1921."
35Board of Trustees' Reports, 1930-1932.
36Ibid.
child's weight up. On one encouraging circular the question was asked, "If you do not weigh all that you should weigh, are you all there?" 37

Proper selection of children's clothing, especially shoes, was also stressed. Styles and colors were to be chosen for their suitability to the child and with the objective of "... helping the child to adjust socially." 38 Selection of toys for suitability to age, value, and educational merit was also a part of the child care and development program. 39

Home health and sanitation

Home health projects were one of the Extension Division's major undertakings. In 1922 Director Robert J. Evans pointed out the problem when he reported

Many of the counties are sparsely settled and many miles from a physician. The women depend upon patent medicine to cure all ills. They have been handicapped by lack of knowledge, by remoteness from sources of relief, and in many cases are following old customs and traditions that to them seem the only way. 40

A home health and nursing project was begun in 1920 which was supported by state funds. Local agents and leaders were to arrange group meetings and hold demonstrations in their homes. Eight major

39 Ibid.
40 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1921-1922, 199.
health problems attacked by this program included: 1) alimentary tract and elimination; 2) treatment and prevention of colds; 3) use of hydrotherapy in the home as a preventative and a corrective measure; 4) posture and dress in relation to health including shoe fitting; 5) first aid; 6) pre-natal care; 7) hygiene of the hair, skin, teeth, and feet; 8) pulse, temperature, and respiration, and recognition of danger signals.\(^{41}\)

Home sanitation often centered on the eradication of flies. In 1915, there were found fifty cases of typhoid fever in the Roosevelt-Duchesne county area. The county agent, M. L. Harris, took up fly eradication as a major project, sending to Washington, D.C., for slides dealing with the subject of fly control. A large meeting was held and literature distributed which supplied information on the connection between the house fly and typhoid fever. The city council was induced to pass ordinances making it unlawful to keep filthy corrals or "privies." The constable was to inspect the outhouses and any which were not fly-proof were tipped over or torn down. Mr. Harris reported that as a result there were no cases of typhoid fever in that area the next year.\(^{42}\)

The fly eradication program became a state-wide undertaking. The Extension Division published and distributed bulletins intitled the Life of the Fly, Kill the Fly, and Diseases Carried by the Fly. Posters

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 196.

\(^{42}\) M. L. Harris, "Annual Report of Extension Work in Duchesne and Uintah Counties, 1915."
were put in public places and exhibits were put up in store windows, one showing a model of a properly screened outhouse. One of the project leaders, Mrs. G. F. Smith, improved upon government instructions for making wire fly traps. Actual tests proved this trap would catch double the amount caught by other traps. The trap was demonstrated and came to be used throughout the state. Yet it was not until the use of D.D.T. and other spray killers were introduced that fly eradication ceased to be a yearly project in many counties.

**Home reading project**

Home reading became another major project of the women's department of the Extension Division. Lottie K. Esplin was appointed first home reading specialist in 1932. The idea behind the home reading project was to make the farm home not only a place to grow food stuffs, but a place to "train character and personality." The project first began with an emphasis on the selection of children's reading material. A class was organized at Corinne in 1927 which discussed behavior patterns from literature, the effects of fairy stories in training the imagination, of the novels of George Eliot and Victor Hugo, and the poetry of Tennyson and Browning.

---
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Classes in home reading were subsequently given at the Adult Leader's Training schools and at the local Housekeepers' conferences. In three years the work had grown from one class in Corinne to 76 classes in fifteen counties with 19 county and 72 community leaders. Books for the classes were purchased by appropriations from county commissioners, library boards, women's clubs, Farm Bureaus, Relief Societies, and individual families and by 1932 a total of $1,502 had been spent on this project and approximately 13,643 Utah citizens were participating.

During the Depression years much emphasis was placed on home economy. Housewives were encouraged to keep home account books similar to the farm account books. Budgets were outlined and helpful suggestions given on how to save money on home needs. The home demonstration agent was also active in county fairs, organizing, judging, and acting as an advisor to 4-H club leaders.

Many volunteer leaders of various projects were trained in extension programs and policies and often were able to instigate programs on their own. One interesting incident was related of the Dry Fork area of the Uintah Basin in Eastern Utah. Because of extreme isolation and the Depression the people were existing well below a normal standard of living and there was much resentment toward "outsiders." Then a person moved into the community who had had experience with extension work.

46 Ibid.
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She was able to break down the barriers and get meetings organized in an old school. She brought in a dentist periodically as a community project and tried to stay in touch with extension leaders of the county. The Extension Service became about the only source of outside information into this isolated area.\textsuperscript{48}

The number of these projects and details of their success and failure is limitless. During the early years and the 1920s, and even early 1930s, the Extension Division and the staff of workers and volunteer leaders worked quite closely with the people. Having no outside sources of information such as radio or television, or even telephone, and few but local newspapers, this funnel of new information coming from relatively well-trained and concerned people helped unite the farm communities and improve their working conditions.

During these early years the Extension Division was the only government-supported agency dealing directly with the farm community. Even at that the division could hardly be called a federal agency since both the state and county governments were involved in appropriating funds for its support. In 1933 the Division received a total of $154,633.67 of which $89,753.67 were federal funds, $61,000.00 were state funds, and $3,900.00 were county appropriations.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid.
With the coming of the Depression and new government programs the Extension Division took on a different role. More and more the work became involved with federal government programs and rather than advising the farmer directly, the agent became the advisor to other agencies which were working with the farmers or to directors of government projects. The day of the real experimentation and inventiveness seems to somewhat terminate with the introduction of the government farm programs under the New Deal.
CHAPTER VI
DEPRESSION AND NEW DEAL

As early as the year 1922 the ugly word "depression" begins to appear in the reports of the Extension Division and the county agents. With the close of the war and the restoration of competition from other countries for the world food market, prices for farm products declined sharply. Interesting, perhaps, is the fact that the drive for greater production during the war caused a surplus just as the war was over and products could not be sold on the world market.

People who had been working with the farmers in Utah began slowly to show concern. During the early years of the 1920s there was a marked optimism. Reference to hard times appear infrequently and an almost false sense of well-being, or at least hope, is reflected in most of the reports. The farm and the rural way of life were idealized as the most desirable. Some concern was shown regarding the number of young people leaving the farm and campaigns to induce people to remain on the farm were instigated.

In 1922, E. G. Peterson, President of Utah State Agricultural College, expressed some anxiety about the decline in farm prices and his fears concerning the degeneration of the rural population. If conditions continued with many young people leaving the farms for more lucrative employment in the cities and in the other states, President
Peterson felt that Utah would lose the "intelligent farm population" and the land would "revert to a peasant and inferior population."¹

The years between World War I and World War II were trying years for the American farmer. Especially frustrating were the '20s when the rest of the nation's economy was booming, while farm prices continued to decline. Something needed to be done. On the national level legislation was introduced in the form of the McNary-Haagen bills which if passed would, in effect, establish domestic price levels for farm products and involve the government in marketing farm products and setting quotas for certain basic agricultural commodities. The emphasis was on decreasing production. Had these bills been passed the Extension Service would have been involved in carrying out these government programs. But many people, including many farm groups, were opposed to this form of government involvement and the plan was either defeated in Congress or vetoed by President Coolidge though revised and presented five different times.²

The other solution to the farmers' problem presented during this time by various farm groups was better and more complete organization of marketing cooperatives. As advisors to the Farm Bureau the extension agent encouraged this movement though the Extension Service as such could not actively participate in the organization or act as promoters.

¹Board of Trustees' Reports, 1921-1922, 6.
²Benedict, 207-230.
of such associations. Many were formed during this time, but as often as not farmers were unwilling to join and the movements showed varying success.

Farmers tended to turn to the traditional answer to their problems; if prices are lower, produce more crops. This simply drove prices lower and while agents optimistically continued to demonstrate better production methods and farm economy, the situation only worsened.

During the biennium 1926-1928 attendance at meetings diminished. Emphasis was shifting from the mass meeting in which an expert or agent lectured or demonstrated to an assembled group, to the idea of training schools where volunteer leaders could be trained in certain special areas and then return to their counties to become project leaders or in other ways pass on the information. This trend began during World War I when special county agent conventions were called to coordinate the agent's work. During the next ten years other convention-type meetings were begun. District conferences were held where the state specialists discussed their specialty with the demonstration agents and county leaders. Special training schools where all extension staff members were instructed by representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture were begun.

The 4-H Club Leaders' Training School was held to coordinate volunteer leaders and to explain and coordinate programs. Of similar

---
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nature was the Adult Leaders' Training schools adopted for the purpose of training local and county project leaders. Most of these schools were held at the Agricultural College in Logan. This project of extending the leadership responsibilities to members of the community had been working out relatively well during the years 1921 to 1926. But as conditions for the farmer worsened, attendance at these meetings declined.\(^5\)

With the collapse of the stock market in 1929 the bottom fell out of farm prices. Conditions for the farmer which until that time had been seen as a passing slump which could correct itself, now became worse with no prospects of becoming better. In his annual report to the Board of Trustees for the College, President E. G. Peterson stated the problem as follows:

> We are suffering now a serious decline in prices of agricultural products. Following the collapse of the stock market late in 1929, the ag-problem has become increasingly acute until now, in the early fall of 1930, the prices are so low in a number of our basic products that the whole question of "agricultural relief" needs consideration.\(^6\)

In 1931, President Peterson announced the reduction of all salaries and department expenses.\(^7\) Extension staff members resigning at this time were not replaced and money usually appropriated for the work was diminished.

\(^5\)Ibid.

\(^6\)Board of Trustees' Reports, 1928-1930, 9.

\(^7\)Board of Trustees' Reports, 1930-1932.
In an attempt to help solve the growing economic problems, a new office of the Extension Division was created in 1930 called the Office of Extension Economist. W. P. Thomas and C. O. Scott were appointed as the first extension economists. The office was to be concerned with four project areas; 1) cooperative marketing; 2) economic surveys; 3) farm accounting; and 4) agricultural outlook. All of these projects had been carried out to some degree by the agents or other departments, but they were now to be reemphasized. 8

Cooperative marketing seemed to be the best answer to the dropping prices. If farmers would corner their own market rather than compete with each other they could demand somewhat higher prices from processors. The Agricultural Outlook was an analysis of the markets for various products and the outlook for prices for the coming season. These reports were published in bulletins by the Extension Division and distributed throughout the state. Each year after 1930 when the report was first published showed the outlook for the coming year dim in most staple crops and livestock. 9

In 1930 the Farmers' Encampments were discontinued and in 1932 the Extension News was also discontinued because of budget cuts. 10

8Ibid.
10Board of Trustees' Reports, 1932-1934, 6.
Each division reporting in 1931-1932 reported declines in projects due to low prices. Demonstration trains which had been discontinued during World War I were revived as a less expensive way of reaching the people.\textsuperscript{11}

In addition to the economic depression faced by the Utah farmers, an unusual drought during the summer of 1931 further reduced production levels. The normal production of crops in the state was lessened by 700,000 tons of hay; 3,000,000 bushels of wheat; 500,000 bushels of barley; 180,000 bushels of oats, and vegetables and fruits were correspondingly diminished.\textsuperscript{12}

At this time the Federal Government began taking measures to alleviate somewhat the difficult situation. In January of 1932 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was created with the passage of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.\textsuperscript{13} The purpose of the Act was to provide financing facilities to aid in financing agriculture as well as commerce and industry. Loans were to be made to farmers who could not buy feed for their cattle or seed to put into crop production for 1923. Preference was given in making such loans to farmers who had suffered from crop failures in 1931.\textsuperscript{14}

To handle applications for the feed and seed loans now made available it was necessary to set up a Farm Loan Committee in each

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12}Board of Trustees' Reports, 1930-1932.
\textsuperscript{13}U. S. Statutes-At-Large, XLVII, 5.
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid.
county. In Utah the county agent acted as a secretary to receive applications for such loans. The agent used his travel budget to make necessary contacts with the people wishing to borrow money and received no extra salary or expense money for this work. Officially the Utah Extension Division took an impartial view on this matter of government loans, neither encouraging or discouraging the use of them. When a farmer inquired about a loan the agent "explained the terms on which it could be secured, the provisions of the mortgage that had to be given, and emphasized the fact that the loan was to be repaid." The necessary papers were then filled out if the farmer decided to apply. By 1934 feed loans had been secured for 4,000 farmers totaling $475,000 and seed loans were secured for 3,000 for a total of $498,505.

In March of 1932 another government program was enacted which greatly benefited the farm population and again involved the Extension Division in federal programs. In this program government-owned wheat was to be made available to the American National Red Cross for use in "providing food for the needy and distressed people of the United States and Territories and for feed for livestock in the 1931 crop-failure areas."

---
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Again the county agent was instrumental in setting up committees in the counties to help distribute the flour and grain made available. From almost every county in Utah, county agents sent reports telling of this program. By 1934 agents had helped make available 11,727,434 pounds of flour and 55,582 pounds of feed wheat.\(^{19}\)

These emergency programs came at a time when money was simply not available elsewhere. Farmers were able to feed their cattle through the winter and obtain seed so a new crop could be planted. Judging from the number of people who participated in these programs it was a boon to the farmers and according to Extension Director William Peterson, was much appreciated by the people.\(^{20}\)

During this time of emergency, the agents working with the Farm Bureau and the farmers directly found that Utah farmers were too dependent upon a one crop or one commodity product for a livelihood. During the depression years farmers were encouraged to diversify and economize. One program which was introduced by the Extension Division was the "Live-At-Home" project and was used to replace the Farmers' Encampments since rural people no longer felt that they could afford the four day stay in Logan.\(^{21}\)

Under the "Live-At-Home" project, farm families were to agree to try to provide the following food on their own farms: vegetables,

\(^{19}\)Board of Trustees' Reports, 1932-1934, 6.

\(^{20}\)Ibid.

\(^{21}\)Ibid., 4.
fruit, meat, milk, and eggs. They also agreed to beautify their home grounds and each member of the family out of school agreed to read two good books. To promote this new program extension workers prepared a traveling trailer exhibit. Inside the trailer was shown the actual quantities of food necessary for survival for one adult for one month. Pulled behind a car this exhibit visited 15 counties in 1932 with a total attendance of 6,271 people. In 1933 it visited 18 counties with 4,262 people viewing the exhibit.

The biggest undertaking in this project was the raising of food products for home consumption. As in the earlier emergency program of World War I, the raising of gardens was stressed, and again the county agents found that the most effective way of contacting a majority of the people was through the L.D.S. church organizations. In this instance the county agents met with stake presidents, bishoprics, and Relief Society presidencies. With their consent and cooperation agents prepared illustrated circulars with suggestions on garden planting. These circulars were given to the local church leaders who in turn distributed them to the ward teachers (priesthood holders who visited each family in the church ecclesiastical division known as a ward) and Relief Society visiting teachers) women counter-part of the ward teachers who visited the members of the Relief Society each month). These

---
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ward and home teachers were instructed to leave the circulars with the families they visited. In Cache county alone, 5,476 circulars were given out.24

In Wasatch county, agent Russell Keetch went a step further in his promotion campaign by preparing the message to be given by the ward teachers for April, 1933. In this message he advised the people to do eleven things which in essence embodied the philosophy of the Extension Division.

1. Let every man work faithfully to provide resources according to a plan suited to their individual needs, to increase the home production of their food supply for the whole year. This will entail greater emphasis on garden, orchard, dairy, poultry, and livestock enterprises than heretofore. It will also require a well planned program to can, dry, store or otherwise preserve products for out of season periods.

2. Provide your own fuel by exchange or work.

3. Do home repair work.
   (a) On house.
   (b) On yards.
   (c) On clothing.
   (d) On furniture.

4. So far as you can follow the budget system of use of time and money.

5. Use care in buying to meet actual needs. Spend money for necessities of living, not for non-essentials and luxuries.

6. Exchange with neighbors, transportation, labor, equipment, reading material, etc.

7. Live within available income. Keep out of debt.

8. Keep informed on national and world wide economic changes and their effect on the home.

9. KEEP CHEERFUL AND HOPEFUL.

10. Be proud of what you can do to PROVIDE FOR YOURSELF. Be independent. Walk uprightly in the sight of God. You are not unemployed until you have supplied the necessities of life for your own family.

11. Be prepared to help those who may be so unfortunate as to need charity.

His concluding comment was, "These people take pride in being self-sustaining. The 'Depression' will be over when each individual has learned to provide for his own needs." 25

More advice came in the form of instructions in the selection of the garden plot for size, soil, convenience, time and method of preparation, selection of seed for varieties, time and method of planting, culture, and utilization and preservation for winter use. 26

In Beaver county, agent LewMar Price tried to instigate a project whereby a community garden plot for those who were on relief and had no ground or water at home to raise gardens themselves could be cultivated as a community project. Though lectures and bulletins giving all the needed information were given to these people, and ground, water, and seed were supplied without cost, the project failed because of lack of interest on the part of those to be benefitted. Not any would undertake the project. 27

In some counties there were people willing to plant gardens but who were unable to afford the price of seed. Cache county was


27Ibid., 2,3.
representative. Working through the L.D.S. Relief Society and with funds furnished by the R.F.C., the agent distributed 522 packages of free garden seed to "needy families" in forty wards. Agent Robert L. Wrigley then secured an agreement with Theurer Brothers' stores to put up $1.20 packages of selected seed for each family and the county would pay $1.00. Thus the county paid $322 for $386 worth of seed and was able to distribute 322 more packages of seed to needy families in the county.28 Other counties reported that the program was successful and many more people were able to supply their needs from their own gardens and orchards. Beaver county reported that every farm home had a garden as well as every town home where ground and water were available.29

Certain areas had relatively unique problems brought on by the Depression. In eastern Juab county families could not afford to ship in coal for their winter fuel. There was in the near vicinity hardwood forest areas which could be used as a substitute for the much needed coal, but road facilities into the area prohibited the full utilization of this resource. Agent Albert E. Smith instigated an extension project to build the three miles of road necessary to gain access to the forest area. People of the area volunteered to work on the road. Because of


this cooperative effort teams were able to bring out enough wood to supply the families for the winter.\textsuperscript{30}

In Tooele county, the fate of the annual county fair looked dim due to the inability of the county to appropriate the usual $1,250 for the event. County agent A. G. Kilburn would not be deterred, however, and set about organizing a committee to promote the fair. With the backing of local businesses and the civic groups who donated their time the fair was held. The only cash outlay came in the purchasing of ribbons, the money for which was donated by the county commissioners. In the words of Mr. Kilburn it was the "largest and best fair Tooele county's every had."\textsuperscript{31}

In March of 1933 the Federal Government took another step with far-reaching effects for the Utah farmer and the Utah Extension Division. On March 12, Congress passed the act known as the Agricultural Adjustment Act in response to a program outlined by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Act declared a state of emergency to exist due to the great difference in price between agricultural goods and other commodities. This disparity had destroyed the purchasing power of the farmer and Congress justified its interference in the situation by claiming that there was a disruption in interstate commerce.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{30} Board of Trustees' Reports, 1930-1932.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
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The Act gave the Secretary of Agriculture broad powers. He could provide for acreage, or reduction in production for market, or both, for any basic agricultural commodity through agreements with producers or other "voluntary" methods. He could provide "benefit payments" for those commodities or any other commodity "required for domestic consumption." Revenue to carry out this program was to be raised by a tax on the processing and processors of agricultural products. The Act also set up an Agricultural Adjustment Administration to carry out the outlined program.

Through additional amendments to this basic act, the A.A.A. program for Utah involved producers of wheat, corn and hogs, sugar beets, and livestock. The wheat program began in Utah in June 1933, the corn-hog program in December 1933, and the cattle purchasing and beet programs in June 1934. Again the Extension Division was in a perfect position to promote and take charge of the programs. Regular educational programs were greatly curtailed so sufficient time could be spent with the emergency work.

The wheat allotment program was the first program introduced and was based on the proposition that in order for the price of wheat to rise, production should be curtailed. Farmers in most counties were contacted by letter to attend meetings in each community. Here the

---
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program was explained by extension workers. The farmer was asked to consider reducing the amount of acres planted in wheat in return for benefit payments from the federal government. At the meeting a local committee was elected to take charge of the work and assist the farmers in understanding the program. A chairman for this committee was appointed to work closely with the county agent and report new developments to committee members who in turn could pass the information on to the farmers in their area.  

Later, agents sent out to every wheat producer a circular and an application which, when properly filled out, would indicate the number of acres usually planted in wheat and the approximate yield per acre. Farmers were told to contact local committeemen for any assistance they might need. Applications were then to be brought to a scheduled meeting for final approval and signatures.

Many county agents spent much time making corrections in applications and answering numerous questions and calls concerning the program. In some cases it was necessary for an additional person to be appointed as the director of the wheat program in order to somewhat alleviate the burden placed on the county agent.

---


Completed applications were forwarded to the Utah State Board of Review and from there to Washington, D.C. for final completion. In September 1933, each farmer who had applied for a contract was notified of his allotment and a final contract was signed by the producer. The following representative counties give some idea of the number participating. In Cache county in 1933, 1013 farmers signed wheat contracts; 39 in Weber county 187; 40 in Washington county 57; 41 and so on with wide variation depending on that county's usual wheat production.

After the wheat contracts were signed it was necessary for the county agent to supervise the measuring of the wheat fields planted for the year to determine whether or not each signee was exceeding his given allotment. Counties often joined together and appointed a Board of Directors to handle the work of measuring the fields. Finances for this group in Salt Lake and Tooele counties obtained by assessing each wheat producer two and one-half cents per bushel. 42

The wheat allotment program was carried out until 1937 when it was terminated by the United States Supreme Court ruling that the A.A.A. was unconstitutional. The program did raise parity prices for
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wheat, but it also served as a sort of insurance for farmers in assuring them some cash income. In 1934 some of the wheat crops failed, but the allotment payments gave the farmers at least enough to pay for the cost of planting. In the first year of the program alone a total of $655,473 was paid to the wheat growers of Utah.

The A.A.A. corn-hog program was similar to the wheat program and the objective much the same—to cut down production in order to raise prices. The same general procedure was followed for contacting the farmer and organizing the program. Circulars were sent out and meetings of hog producers held. A Corn-Hog Production Control Association was established in many counties though some counties joined together to form one district under one committee. Producers were asked to sign contracts reducing the number of acres of corn produced and the number of hogs fed for marketing. Applications sent to the State Board of Review indicated the number of acres of corn and number of animals being produced. This board then determined how many acres and animals were to be reduced. Salt Lake county reported a reduction of 250 animals, Washington county 215, and Kane county 18. The farmer was required to produce receipts and

\[43\] Ibid.

\[44\] Board of Trustees' Reports, 1932-1934, 5.


"supporting evidence" to show that his hog production had not exceeded the allotment.\textsuperscript{47}

The corn-hog program was conducted on a smaller scale than the wheat allotment work but during the first year 2,500 farmers of Utah participated representing all 29 counties and involving about 80 percent of the hogs produced in the State. Payments amounted to $225,000.\textsuperscript{48} The number of people participating declined and in 1936 the program was terminated.\textsuperscript{49}

The sugar beet reduction program was similar and was carried out much the same way as the wheat and corn-hog programs though not begun until June 1934. The size of the program again depended upon the number of normal producers in each county. Cache county led with 1,739 farmers signing contracts in 1935.\textsuperscript{50} Again there was the problem of getting contracts signed and applications corrected. In Cache county a group of 21 men were engaged to measure the beet fields and a committee was chosen to handle details or possible problems that might arise.\textsuperscript{51}


\textsuperscript{48}Board of Trustees' Reports, 1932-1934. 5.


\textsuperscript{51}Ibid., 22,23.
Russell R. Keetch reported that the beet program was the most popular in Wasatch county, due, he said, to the "fat check received by producers." Sugar beet payments up to 1935 in Wasatch county alone totaled $8,568.44.\(^52\)

Continued drought conditions, not only in Utah but in the midwest as well, caused continued feed shortages despite the feed and seed loans. The federal government under the A.A.A established a drought relief cattle purchase program. This program began in Utah in June, 1934. The government contracted to buy cattle for which the farmer would not be able to obtain feed, and use the meat to feed relief families.\(^53\)

The situation in Cache county was representative of the conditions throughout most of the state. A feed survey was conducted in Cache county and after careful figuring and a series of meetings it was determined that in 1934 only 80,000 tons of hay would be produced while 125,000 tons was the normal amount consumed by cattle in the county. Despite taking the greatest care in conserving pastures, pea vines, beet tops, grain, and straw, there would be a shortage of a great many thousand tons of hay. It was estimated the Cache county would have to dispose of between four and six thousand head of cattle.\(^54\)


\(^{53}\) Board of Trustees' Reports, 1932-1934, 1.

In Salt Lake county a county executive committee was organized which appointed an assistant director and four appraisers. This committee conducted a series of meetings to discuss the purchase program and farmers were urged to list cattle for sale that they would not be able to keep for lack of feed. To better facilitate buying, all cattle were assembled at centers for appraisal and purchase. From June to September of 1934, Salt Lake county had 2,147 head of cattle purchased by the government at a total of $27,500 and 19,684 head of sheep at $3,528.55

Other counties urged cattle owners by letter to cull their herds and get rid of useless herd members which could not be kept. Washington county reported 3,188 head of cattle, 4,799 head of sheep and 5,500 head of goats purchased.56 Weber county reported the sale of 2,067 head of cattle and 4,397 head of sheep for a total of $37,768.57 And again 4,131 head of cattle and 5,711 head of sheep were purchased in Cache county.58 These counties represent the major producing areas but all other counties participated in this program culling herds of cattle, sheep, and goats. Those animals which the government inspectors thought

unfit for consumption were slaughtered on the farm and compensation
given to the farmer for them.

In addition to the cattle purchase program for the relief of
drought areas, the federal government instigated a soil and water
conservation program to be carried out by the A.A.A. in coopertaion
with the Federal Emergency Relief Association and the Civil Works
Administration. County agents often served on the C.W.A. and F.E.R.A.
county committees.

Money from these government agencies were used for irrigation
improvement projects and soil erosion prevention programs. In Cache
county five pump wells were driven which provided extra water saving
several hundred acres of crops.\textsuperscript{59} A water development survey was
taken of the Bear River area. The county agent helped organize meetings
with representatives of all the canal companies in the county. At the
meetings information as to the work that could be done for the develop-
ment of more water in their systems, such as cleaning and straightening
canals, improving diversion dams and underground development was dis-
cussed and given out to the representatives.\textsuperscript{60}

In Washington county cooperation was solicited from the Civilian
Conservation Corps camps. This workers helped replace and clean up
ditches filled with debris in order that more water could be provided

\textsuperscript{59}Ibid., 19.
\textsuperscript{60}Ibid., 20.
for drought stricken crops.\textsuperscript{61} Two hundred men from C.C.C. camps also helped restore the banks of Santa Clara Creek in Washington county to prevent flooding and soil erosion.\textsuperscript{62}

Farmers were encouraged to plant soil conserving crops such as alfalfa and to put their farms on a soil conservation program which would allow them to receive benefit payments. The A.A.A. also advocated range management and the use of farm account record books. Farmers were paid to establish good farming practices. It is ironic perhaps that county agents had for years been preaching farm account record keeping, soil conservation, culling of dairy herds, range management, cooperative action on buying and marketing, plus cooperation with processors and buyers. They had also stressed that such improved methods and united action would increase production and gain higher prices. But it took a national disaster to put so many of the improved methods into actual practice and then chiefly by the use of government subsidy. It must have seemed rather paradoxical to the county agent who had a few years before been teaching improved methods for increased production for more money, to now be organizing campaigns to pay the farmer not to produce and pay him to practice better methods not for the sake of quantity but for reduced production levels.

Agents were active in advising and consulting with almost every federal agency set up under the New Deal program. They answered


questions and helped fill out applications for loans, for mortgages, for public relief and helped in the distribution of relief and allotment checks. Farming as an individualistic enterprise was changing to a system of farm programs undertaken with heavy subsidization from the federal government.

These then were the agricultural projects carried out by the men. What of the women and the home demonstration agents? They, too, were busy. But their work was basically a re-emphasis of programs carried out earlier. Much stress was put on home economy. Women were urged to keep home record accounts and to carefully budget what cash was available. The emergency gardens and "Live-At-Home" projects were carried out oft-times by the farm women.

The biggest major project carried out by the home demonstration agents was instigated by the Federal Emergency Relief Agency. Washington county provides a typical example of the details of this program. Having no home demonstration agent, Miss Evelyn Hansen from the state F.E.R.A. office was assigned to the county. She conducted food preservation demonstrations in six communities and with the help of Mrs. Eleanor Smith and assistance from the county agent, set up canning centers in eight communities. The purpose of the program was to give people on or near

relief assistance in getting their garden produce preserved and to teach safe methods of food preservation.  

Washington county employed 12 to 20 people in each canning center daily during the 1934 season. They canned a total of 23,406 cans of peaches and pears, 2,218 of tomatoes and beans, and 1,030 of meat. As a result of the demonstrations it was estimated that 28,567 cans of fruits and vegetables had been preserved and 10,070 pounds of fruits and vegetables dried.  

Salt Lake county home demonstration agent, Ivy L. Hall, reported that 19 communities in the county, with the help of 20 volunteer leaders participated in putting up canning centers. Statewide supervisors of the project, Rose Widstoe and Elna Miller, worked closely with communities moving from one area to another giving aid and advice. The centers operated 677 days, assisted 667 relief families and 1,068 near relief families; 48,267 quarts of food were canned.  

Every family bringing garden produce to can in the center was asked to bring one or two people on relief to assist with the work. These people would be paid with a share of the produce. The county

---


welfare agency then provided sugar and cans for people on relief who could not obtain them to preserve this produce.\textsuperscript{67}

Home agents also stressed proper diet and the need for balanced meals. Emphasis was placed on the value of low cost food and how it could be tastefully prepared. Agents felt it was especially important to reach young mothers. Nutrition specialist, Elna Miller, wrote many pamphlets and circulars on good home nutrition. Often such material was distributed by sending it home with school children.\textsuperscript{68}

The activities and programs of the federal government changed the basic program of the Extension Service and caused somewhat of a strain on the workers. Additional government funds for various programs did make possible the hiring of extra county agents, assistant county agents, and supervisors and specialists. Director of Extension, William Peterson, gave a tribute to his extension staff when he wrote in his biennial report

In attempting to carry this unusual load the members of the entire extension staff have been driven almost to the breaking point. Instead of working 6 or 8 hours per day they have been compelled to work 10 to 15 hours per day and every day of the week including Sundays and holidays. In all this there has been little complaint. Staff members have looked upon this as a duty in which they have been called to function and the job has been accepted with great satisfaction.\textsuperscript{69}

There was during this time an alienation of the extension agent from the rural people. The program, while still a state and federal

\textsuperscript{67}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{68}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{69}Board of Trustees' Reports, 1932-1934, 5.
government project as far as finances were concerned, became oriented toward the federal government programs and with less local or state sponsored programs and with less local or state sponsored ideas or innovations. The New Deal farm programs thus changed the relationship of the Extension Service to the federal government and since so many programs were simply direct aid rather than education or cooperation there seems to have been a creeping feeling of paternalism on the part of the extension agent.
The pressure of depression emergency programs was easing a bit by 1937 and 1938. Local committees and local leaders trained by the Extension Division were being used to carry out the bulk of the federal programs with agents again engaged more in an advisory position. The emergencies of World War I and the Depression had changed the extension program to quite an extent, though the major goals of bringing information and better methods to farmers remained the same.

It was the approach to the work that had changed. County agent Robert J. Wrigley caught the essence of this change in his 1937 report. Mr. Wrigley claimed that in the early days of extension work an agent had time to visit the farmers on their farms and discuss their problems with them personally. But by the late '30s he had become more of an executive, confined more to the office, discussing the farmers' problems only when they called at the office either in person or by telephone. In this way the agent served as a source of information answering, on the average, 45 calls a day. Wrigley viewed his position as more of a desk job, being a ready source of information when needed in contrast to early agents who actively went among the farmers, persuading them to try new ideas and demonstrating improvements. His duty was that of
"stimulating rural people to assume responsibility to study current conditions, and develop rural leadership which will strengthen the farm people in the county."

The United States' entrance into World War II further involved the Extension Service in centralized programs rather than local projects. During the years 1935 to 1945 the Farm Bureau gradually came to play a smaller part in planning since projects were being dictated from federal agencies. The programs undertaken during World War II were in many respects similar to earlier programs with emphasis on greater production of some products, strict conservation and preservation of others, economy, sacrifice for the war effort, and defense preparedness.

In January 1942, counties, under federal direction, organized United States Department of Agriculture War (or Defense) Boards. These committees were made up of representatives of federal agencies interested in agriculture and included the Agriculture Adjustment Administration (reestablished in 1938), the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest and Park Service, the Public Welfare Agency, the Farm Security Administration and others. The major duty of the board was to coordinate


government programs in agriculture and organize planning programs in the county to further the farm war effort. Specific projects were to

1. help agriculture in any way possible during this time of war and get farmers to work close together.

2. organize a scrap metal campaign—write letters to farmers to ask them to conserve scrap metal.

3. help the Selective Service Board check applications for deferment—give no recommendations, just information.

4. pass on applications for priorities in obtaining building material, farm machinery, and other necessities on which the government had restrictions.

5. register all farm and commercial trucks.³

In carrying out plans for increased production the War Boards made production adjustment studies which were used by the federal government as a basis for establishing food production goals. These also provided a source of information for state and county agencies in developing local agricultural programs for the purpose of reaching the goals set.⁴

After the surveys were made and analyzed the County Agricultural War/Defense Boards were instructed to give the following instructions to the people of their county: increase milk production 13 percent; dairy cattle 3 percent; breed sows 12 percent; barley 1½ percent; corn for silage 10 percent; farm gardens 25 percent; eggs 35 percent; chickens 11 percent; turkeys 5 percent; and slaughter 20 percent more beef cattle.⁵

³Ibid.
⁴Board of Trustees' Reports, 1944-1946, 372.
The work of educating the people to this new program of limited increase in production, of explaining the methods to be used in reaching this goal, was assigned to the Extension Service. That the county extension agent was well chosen for this assignment as far as having developed lasting relationships with the rural people is confirmed by the following example.

A group of men representing several agencies of the government were discussing an agriculture problem with a meeting of farmers. The farmers said they would like to consider the matter among themselves if the government men would withdraw. When the agent started out with the others the farmer spokesman said to him, "We didn't mean you, you're one of us."

The agent was again to visit each farmer personally and encourage him to adjust his acreage and production to conform with the government program. The Division was successful in that by the third year of the program production levels were up to, and in some areas exceeding, production goals.

The emphasis for this campaign was on defense and victory and projects were given such names as "Dairy Products for Defense,"

---
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"Victory Gardens,"'10 "Food For Freedom,"'11 "Vitamins for Victory,"'12 and others. Victory gardens were stressed as a defense measure. It would seem that planting a garden and preserving the produce was the Extension Service's answer to any and all emergencies. Projects carried out were similar to the earlier programs, though much of the activity was sponsored by church groups or civic organizations with the backing of the Extension Service. Since sugar and meat did have to be rationed talks were given on substitutes for these items with emphasis on proper foods in the home to insure a strong American youth.'13

Civilian defense organizations were established and extension staff members often served as chairmen of the county committees of this organization. Surveys were taken to see that there was county preparedness in housing, food, clothing, medical supplies, and other equipment for defense. Information on supplies available was tabulated and made "ready for use when needed."'14

Other war services rendered by members of the extension staff included service by the extension economist on the State Agricultural War Finance Committee in order to assist in outlining and executing the rural war bond purchase program; and later as a member of the State

10Ibid., 339.
12Ibid.
13Ibid.
Post-War Planning Committee in order to assist in developing projects and programs for "sound development of agriculture during and after the war." In addition to the regular extension staff a state war food supervisor and twenty-one county and district emergency war food assistants were appointed. Their objective was to reach everyone with an intensive program which would provide a maximum of food for every family, release commercial food for non-producers, aid people to adjust to food rationing while maintaining an adequate diet, and help eliminate the tremendous American food wastes.

The 4-H clubs were especially active in helping with the war effort. Early in the war they pledged themselves to a 7-point victory program in which they resolved to help interpret the victory program to the community, understand some of the social and economic forces, save for victory, develop their health and that of the community, acquire useful and mechanical skills, practice democratic procedure and learn to appreciate the American way of life, and produce and conserve needed food supplies for home and abroad. They were also active in the drive to collect scrap metal and rubber, and in selling and investing

---
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in war bonds and stamps. One meat-animal club adopted as its slogan, "More Meat to Save Defeat." Clubs also made projects of sending letters and gifts to soldiers.19

One of the major problems faced by the agricultural community during the war was that of labor shortage. With draft and enlistment, plus war industries taking many of the regular farm workers, and drives for increased production being met, the labor shortage had become acute by 1943.

On April 29, 1943, President Roosevelt signed Public Law 45 which gave to the Federal Extension Service, and in turn to the State Extension Service, the job of determining farm labor needs in various counties. They were to mobilize all local labor and have charge of the placement of all farm labor. A Congressional appropriation provided for the hiring of a state farm labor supervisor and county farm labor assistants to help the county agents with this program.20

Farmers were asked to make their requests for farm laborers through the county agent and anyone seeking employment was also to get in touch with the county Extension Service. But the shortage of workers at harvest time necessitated recruiting workers among the farm and non-farm

---
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youth, service clubs, townspeople, women workers, Japanese evacuees, Indians, and Italian prisoners of war. 21

The Japanese evacuee labor came from the Topaz relocation center 22 and in 1944, 1,220 of these uprooted Americans were employed on the farms of Utah usually picking fruit or harvesting beets or potatoes. Cache county reported having used them "in every type of harvesting endeavor." 23

A labor camp for Italian war prisoners had been established at Roy, Utah. Weber county agricultural agent Archie H. Christiansen was asked by various fruit producing cooperatives to contact the army in an effort to obtain war prisoners to do farm work. Mr. Christiansen was successful in his attempt and contracts between the army and North Ogden Fruit Growers Exchange, Utah Fruit Growers, Inc., Weber and Box Elder counties labor committees, and the Ben Lomond Orchard Company were signed. 24

The fruit associations agreed to pay the army 16 cents per bushel of fruit picked and two cents per mile per man for transportation. 25

21 Ibid.


25 Ibid.
In 1944, 250 Italian war prisoners were employed picking 25,775 bushels of apricots, and 23,271 pounds of sour cherries for 31 Weber county growers. "The growers who received the labor cooperated fully and did what they could to encourage the men to work by treating them to cigarettes, softdrinks, extra food, etc. Indeed such treatment was a little too lavish in some cases." It cost the fruit producers $5,104.92 for this service of which $2,250.00 went to the federal government. Italian prisoners were also used to pick beans and peaches and three groups topped beets. Other "imported" labor in 1944 included 740 Mexicans and 150 Navajo Indians. A total of 2,360 "non-resident" laborers were thus employed on Utah farms in this year. Without such help many crops would have been wasted.

During the war years, the local projects usually stressed were programmed to fit into the war program. With the end of the war new adjustments were made but many of the innovations were retained. The U.S.D.A. War and Defense Boards were retained under the name U.S.D.A Council in order to continue to coordinate the activities of the numerous federal agencies now involved in farm and rural life. These agencies with which the Extension Service cooperated and gave advice, often corelating and combining projects, included the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, recreated in 1938 for the purpose of conservation, and

26 Ibid., 35.
27 Ibid., 35, 36.
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"... to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, and rice to the extent necessary to provide ... a balanced flow of such commodities ... through storage of reserve supplies, loans, marketing quotas ... parity prices for such commodities..."  

This act continued acreage allotments in wheat and corn thus continuing the contract programs and quota checks of the New Deal years. County A.A.A. committees were set up to handle the problems arising under this act and the county agent automatically became a member of this committee. More time was spent by the agricultural agents with this agency than others.

Other federal agencies having projects in Utah and with whom the agent was expected to cooperate included the U.S. Farm-Security Administration, Reclamation Service, Soil Conservation Service, Indian Service, Park Service, Forest Service, Grazing Service, Public Welfare Agency, and the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. Utah agencies and associations included State Farm Bureau Federation, State Biological Survey, associations such as the Cattle and Horse Growers, Utah Poultry Producers, Utah Wool Growers, Utah Dairy Federation, Utah

---
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State Horticultural Society, Utah Forest Service, Utah Soil Conservation, and various cooperative buying and marketing associations.\(^{32}\)

By 1942 there was established in each county a county planning board to study the problems or major commodity of the area and draft recommendations for improvement.\(^{33}\) The agent seemed by the '40s to be taking less part in local planning leaving it to local committees farm bureaus. The agent became more dependent for ideas upon the local project leaders trained in county conventions, college short courses held during the summer, or upon farmers specially qualified to lead some special projects. In 1942 there was an average of 101 male project leaders in each county.\(^{34}\)

During the 1940's, the extension economist became increasingly important. His duties covered four major areas: 1) county agricultural planning; 2) farm management; 3) marketing and outlook information; and 4) cooperatives. His general objective was to try to find the best marketing procedures and advise farmers on how to adjust to changing demands.\(^{35}\) In 1942 the extension economist was installed as secretary of the newly created Utah Council of Farmers' Cooperatives. This organization was instituted to give more direct assistance to cooperative movements and to "aid in the establishment and maintenance of better

---
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managed farms." It began with 30 active member associations representing 20,000 farmers. The extension economist's function was to act as secretary and advisor to the council and have primary responsibilities in developing and carrying through the program of work. 36

Another very important new member of the staff was the agricultural engineer whose duty it was to help plan buildings for the farm including homes, rooms in homes, barns, silos, other outbuildings, storage space, equipment, sewage disposal systems, wells, or any other engineering problem. The agricultural extension editor was also playing a larger role. With the increase in the number of farm families having access to radios and newspapers, the editor was in charge of keeping a steady stream of information sent to 55 weekly newspapers, seven daily newspapers, one farm journal, and eight radio stations in Utah. This became the more effective and efficient way to reach individual farm families with news and new ideas. 37

In 1948, the first rural sociologist was employed. This job involved studying rural social problems in an effort to devise new programs designed with these problems in mind. 38

During the 1940s the work of the 4-H clubs grew and much more time was spent on the part of the agent in working with the groups and leaders.

36 Board of Trustees' Reports, 1934-1936, 322.
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In 1946, Utah ranked third among all western states in the percent of boys and girls ten to twenty years of age involved in the program.39

In 1948 there was a total of 8,500 young people enrolled, with 1,600 adult leaders, in 1,000 clubs throughout the state.40

By 1948 the organization had certainly mushroomed, growing from nine full time workers in 1907 to the size as described by the following analysis given by Carl Frischnecht in his 1948 report.

The Extension Service consists of a state staff of administrators and subject matter specialists in agriculture and home economics, and of county agricultural and home demonstration agents and assistant agents. During the biennium there has been one director, with one assistant director for agriculture, an assistant director for home economics, as assistant to each of them, agricultural agents in 28 counties, nine assistant agents, and one of more subject matter specialists in the following fields: Agricultural engineering, agricultural economics, agronomy, animal husbandry, 4-H club work, clothing, dairying, dairy manufacturing, entomology, farm labor, forestry, house planning and decoration, housing and home management, horticulture, information, irrigation, marketing, nutrition poultry, sociology, and soil conservation.41

Yet during the years the Extension Service grew, the size of farms in Utah diminished. By 1948, one-fourth of all Utah farms consisted of less than 20 acres. A large percentage of Utah Farmers held either part or full time jobs in industry.42 Yet a survey
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conducted in 1950 concluded that 57 percent of the people interviewed by the survey ranked the Extension Service as one of the three top most significant organizations in the state. Many wanted more information and details concerning the work and the programs. Work by the Extension Service was still in demand and there was yet a big job to be done.\textsuperscript{43}

CHAPTER VIII
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

At a time when engaging in agriculture was a rather isolated experience, when communications were limited to personal contact and printed material, the Extension Service, under the auspices of the land-grant colleges, supported by federal, state, and local governments was organized with the broad purpose of improving the conditions of the farmer through extending practical education to him and making available the results of experiments carried out by the Experiment Station related to better methods of farming. The Service, unlike other farm movements such as the Granger or Populist movements, has stressed education, rather than government reform as the factor leading to a better rural life.

It differs from other farm movements, also, in that it has always been basically a government-sponsored program. Rather than a grass-roots movement which spread until it influenced legislators, it was, rather, instigated by far-sighted legislators, and progressive agriculturalists. Over the years the Service has acted as a veritable go-between for the agricultural programs of the state and federal governments and the farm population whose lives these programs were to affect.

In carrying out the Extension Service's objectives the workers found it necessary to invade every facet of the farm family's life. The farmer needed to be educated, and so educated he would be; not only in improved farm methods, but in money management, child rearing, social activities, community improvement, cleanliness and health,
proper diet, and even fashions. Any problem that faced the farmer or the rural community as a whole was fair game for the project-minded extension worker.

In the early years between 1900 and 1930 extension workers attacked their work in the true progressive reform spirit, idealistically relying on the Enlightenment philosophy and believing man's situation could be improved if men were informed as to better methods of doing things. The various projects undertaken illustrate just how involved extension workers did become in the lives of many people. There were programs for the improvement of just about everything on the farm, in the home, and in the community.

But the task the extension worker had outlined for himself was a large one and the going was not always easy. They soon discovered that the cooperation of many citizens was necessary. The answer seemed to be to organize the community members for the purpose of solving their own problems. When a problem arose, a committee was formed, a local person put in charge of the committee, a project outlined to solve the problem, and with extension workers to advise, work began. These committees often took the form of permanent associations, with local leaders carrying the responsibility for their success. The extension worker, usually the county agent, then worked through the organization acting as an advisor rather than an instigator of programs. As years went by the agent tended more to this advisory position.

The history of the work of the Extension Service in Utah can be divided into four basic periods. In 1888 the Utah Agricultural College was founded for the purpose of extending practical information to farm
and industrial workers. The College sent out members of its faculty to speak to groups of interested farmers. This work expanded to become known as Farmers' Institutes. Heavy demand for this type of meeting necessitated the creation of a separate Department of Extension work which was organized in 1907 with a full time director.

The years 1907 to 1914 constitute the second phase. During this time the work was supported solely by state and county funds. New departments were added and the number of full-time employees increased. Programs during this time included such things as farmers' and housekeepers' schools held for one or two days and taught by members of the Extension Service staff or willing volunteer college professors. Demonstration trains helped arouse interest in the extension programs and a boys' and girls' club program was inaugurated which grew into the 4-H club work that has been of significant influence in the state of Utah.

These were important years in the development of the Service. It represents the time when the idea of outside help to farmers was introduced to them and the manner in which it was done affected the reception of the Service in the area for years to come. Many farmers accepted the idea quickly, others more slowly, and some not at all. It was a time of experimentation when the program was new and not encumbered by habit or tradition, or by a program dictated by the federal government. Experiments begun in a new type of extension work called farm and home demonstration, in which a trained person was
placed in a county to cooperate with the local farmers in order to demonstrate improved farm methods, proved to be so successful as to revolutionize the approach and the scope of extension work.

This work was furthered when Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 which provided federal funds for the placement of farm and home demonstrators. This inaugurated the third phase of the Utah extension work, wherein the federal government provided funds for the Extension Service but programs were still initiated by the state and local people. County agents became the backbone of the work and Farmers' Institutes faded into the background.

Programs initiated by the county agents included improvement of farming methods by increasing soil fertility, improved seed, irrigation projects, diversified farm products, improvement of range cattle and dairy herds. Farm economy and record keeping were also stressed in order to put the farm on a more business-like basis. Projects in food preparation, sewing, hat making, home beautification, child rearing, and proper home atmosphere were introduced for the farm wife.

But the agents' basic task was to convince the farmer and his family that he was interested in him, not because of an inquisitive or prying nature, or because he wanted to become involved in people's business, but because of a genuine commitment to the idea of bettering the farmers way of life through extended knowledge. This was a time when projects were varied and depended to a large degree on the personal whim of the county agricultural or home demonstration agent. Usually
they were planned in cooperation with members of the community and planned to fit the needs of the specific county or community.

From 1917 through World War II the orientation of the Extension Service changed and entered the fourth stage of development. During this time, emergencies necessitated the instigation of federal programs dealing with the agriculture and involving the Service in the process of carrying out such programs. From the time these programs were begun, the Extension Service became continually more deeply involved in federal programs and evolved into a full-fledged federal agency. Some earlier goals had been reached by this time and the first crusading zeal of the workers was slowly replaced by an efficiently operating, methodical extension staff.

New federal programs introduced included conservation and range management. Many New Deal programs were carried out under the direction of the Extension Service. These programs involved making contracts with farmers for the government purchase of certain commodities, payments for the reduction of acreage, welfare assistance and self-help projects. During both World War I and World War II farmers were encouraged to produce more of certain essential products such as wheat and hogs. During this time other government agencies dealing with agriculture were established in the states. The Service came to hold an advisory position to most of these agencies.

Many positive goals have been attained by the Extension Service. It fostered one of the most influential and constructive farmers' organizations in the nation, the Farm Bureau. It has organized and
advised many young people in its vast network of 4-H clubs and projects. Through its publications, schools, training courses, and agent work it has promoted the idea that there is more to farming than planting and harvesting; that farming is a science that needs to be studied and experimented with in order to reap greater benefits.

By 1950 Utah Farmers were not so isolated and there were now many sources of help for the agriculturalist. The Extension Service had moved from the position of sole government agency involved in agriculture to one of many. Perhaps it was the success of the Service that paved the way for the introduction of other agencies and programs which built upon the ideas and problems first brought to people's attention by the Extension Service. Many positive goals have been achieved. But the goal set by the Extension Service is a never ending one and its effectiveness can only be judged by the farmers of Utah and the Extension Service who together work toward their joint objectives.
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

The major source of information for the history of the Utah State Extension Service is found in the unpublished Annual Reports of Extension Work in Utah (1913-1950). These reports were prepared by the county agricultural and home demonstration agents of each individual county and vary in length and content according to the personal whim of the county agent. Some of the very early reports are handwritten and later ones are a combination of a special report form and a typewritten narrative report. These reports show how the extension program was carried out on a local level and have proven invaluable in determining the nature and scope of projects promoted. Many reports contain photos of projects, maps, diagrams, correspondence, and program promotion circulars. These reports fill twenty-six file boxes and are housed in the Special Collections Division of Utah State University Library.

Another major source of information is the Biennial Reports of the Board of Trustees of the Agricultural College of Utah (1890-1924). These reports are a compilation of reports from individual college departments including the Extension Service which were submitted to the State Legislature by the Board of Trustees. These reports were published under varying titles under the direction of the College until 1924. At this time the title was given as Utah State Agricultural College Biennial Reports (1925-1948) and are typewritten, bound copies.
The reports include those of the director of the Utah State Extension Service and give a view of the extension programs from an administrative point of view and show the over-all growth and development of the Extension Service.

The Utah State Agricultural College Extension Division Circulars, 1909-1950, (Vol. 1-7 and New Series, Circulars 1-236) give an interesting picture of programs as presented to the public in circular and pamphlet form. Included are programs of the various Round-Ups and Conferences, information leaflets, 4-H instruction booklets and financial outlooks. Another Extension Service publication of interest is the Utah Extension News (1920-1925) which provides items of news and interest for the period published. The Alumni Association of the Utah Agricultural College published The Agricultural College of Utah Graduate (Salt Lake City: Skelton Publishing Co., 1909) and this work provides biographical information on early directors and organizers of Utah's Extension Service.

Centennial Commission, 1926) provided insight into the philosophy and reasoning behind the land-grant movement.


Stephen L. Brower in 1950 conducted a study, "Attitude of Utah Farm People Toward the Extension Service in Utah," (unpublished MS thesis, Utah State University, 1950), which was of worth in evaluating the effectiveness of the program for the people of Utah.
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