WARTIME AND OTHER EMERGENCY ACTIVITIES OF THE NEW YORK STATE EXTENSION SERVICE

BY L. R. SIMONS
FOREWORD

Cooperative Extension Work is a partnership of individuals, their state colleges and their governments. It is a two-way channel of information designed to help people solve the problems they encounter in agriculture, home economics, and related subjects. It offers education for action. Its program is planned with the wide-spread participation of local people. Thousands of local volunteer leaders are actively engaged in Cooperative Extension Work in New York and they are joined by county extension agents and specialists from the New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics at Cornell University. Because of the participation of all its partners, Cooperative Extension Work provides a maximum of flexibility and adjustment to local conditions.

In view of its breadth and flexibility, it is not surprising that the Extension Service is called upon in emergencies to help solve problems not entirely educational. In periods of war, drought, flood, and other disasters, the county extension agents and local leaders are among the first to plan for action.

L. R. Simons, the author of this bulletin, was an extension worker for 40 years. He actively participated in each of the emergency programs he has described in this report. This bulletin provides a record of extension activities in some emergencies in past years. It may serve as a useful reference in dealing with problems in years to come.

M. C. Bond
Director of Extension
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WARburg AND OTHER EMERGENCY ACTIVITIES
OF THE
NEW YORK STATE EXTENSION SERVICE

L. R. SIMONS

INTRODUCTION

The Extension Service commands the respect and confidence of all citizens, especially rural people. When war, drought, flood or other disaster comes, the demands for help are great. Rural people especially turn to the Extension Service. They know the Service can adapt itself to many unusual conditions; that while its program is primarily educational, it can serve as a coordinating agent bringing together the advice and cooperation of other agencies and, if there is need, become an “action” agency as well.

The early extension workers operated in a vacuum of programs and procedures. There were no guideposts to help them. Leadership is based partially on the ability of a leader to keep one step ahead of the people he is supposed to lead. In this case, the extension state or federal leader needed to search the records of other agencies and to try to apply certain well-proven principles to extension procedures. A county agent, as the man on the spot, needed to apply several kinds of procedures to plans which, at the moment, seemed to be of greatest help in solving acute problems. Through trial and error, he chose those which seemed to be of some lasting value.

Gradually, through additional experiences, certain fundamental principles were established on a state and then a national basis. Changing conditions necessitate changes in extension policies, programs and procedures. These changes are going on today and probably will continue as long as extension work is progressive and forward looking.

Fundamental guideposts have been established and policies and procedures formalized. These can be applied to most regular programs, to fit current and long time conditions. Usually, those applicable to regular and peace time conditions cannot be used in disasters or emergencies such as drought, wind, flood and war. No set rules can be applied to all emergencies. Each demands separate study and treatment. A tailor-made pattern must be made quickly and revised as experiences dictate and time permits.
The point of view of Federal administrators regarding emergencies usually has been somewhat different from that in the states or localities. In some Federal circles, dominance and expediency sometimes have superseded the actual requirements. There are exceptions to this, as was demonstrated in the farm labor program of the second World War. This will be treated in chronological order with other emergencies described in this manuscript. The administration of this program, as compared to other wartime agricultural programs, is significantly different. It was primarily an extension war program and, typically, extension, was greatly decentralized and operated in cooperation with farmer-selected committees.

Long term emergencies, such as World War I and World War II, both of which could be anticipated and preliminary preparations made, are different from a flood or a hurricane which strikes quickly in concentrated areas or regions and for which little or no preparation can be made.

War in Europe for several years preceding the United States entry into both world wars permitted much early preparation in the United States. It was realized that a single act of aggression against this country would most certainly embroil us. Of course, lessons learned from the first world war could be and were applied more easily and orderly in the second conflict.

In the case of localized emergencies, such as a flood or hurricane, little preparation can be made and makeshift procedures must be applied quickly and with little orderliness, particularly in the saving of lives, until more systematic procedures can be formulated and applied.

Even in drought, which comes in slow degrees, the hope is present always that soon conditions will moderate through rainfall. So, early preparations for a prolonged drought are slow and sometimes ineffective.

This publication is not a textbook of methods to guide future generations in the handling of each kind of emergency. Rather, it is designed to bring together the part played by the Extension Service, particularly in New York State, in wartime activities and in area-restricted emergencies, such as the disastrous flood in South Central New York during the summer of 1935. These are described elsewhere in voluminous detail in current recording of these events and filed in the archives for future reference. No one who has participated in all of these emergencies has prepared a short description of them in printed form.

The writer, as an agriculturist in the Federal States Relations Service during the first World War, can give the Federal point of view, and as a State extension director during the second world war, can express also the state or local point of view.

Although not an on-the-spot participant in any of the local catastrophes outside of New York State, while working for the U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1916-20, the writer did observe some of the activities of county extension agents in the forest fires in the cut-over regions of Northern Minnesota and the upper peninsula of Michigan. The heroic deeds performed by these agents in saving life and property deserve the highest commendation. No one who has not seen one of the conflagrations can visualize the rapid advance of the flames and the horror of the people as farms and whole villages are destroyed, forcing humans and all animals to get out of the way as best they can.

The agents risked their lives, sometimes unsuccessfully, in warning the people and improving all possible safeguards for those who must abandon their homes. This required the best of organizing ability in the recruitment and direction of volunteers and superior skill and endurance.

One particular instance can be recalled vividly. We were on a train going through upper Michigan. For miles flames and smoke could be seen in the distance. Few stops were made because the stations were in danger. Finally the train stopped, and the passengers were warned that they would be passing through the burning area and difficulties would be encountered. The passengers could embark or proceed at their own risk. Most remained on the train which proceeded at a slow speed for miles through the burning area where the heat and stifling smoke were almost unbearable.

One could imagine the suffering of the people and the fatigue of the relief workers, particularly the extension agents who, according to the reports, were the first line organizers and leaders. No doubt their magnificent work was properly recognized but probably never rewarded completely.

During May and June 1943, disastrous floods in Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri and Oklahoma overflowed approximately 5,775,000 acres of land, much of it already planted in crops. Extension agents in the areas concerned were among the first representatives of public agencies to render services to farmers in evacuating people and livestock before the floods came and in getting them back, replanting crops and rehabilitating homes after the waters receded. Similar dramatic experiences of extension workers were recorded when hurricane
Audrey devastated parts of Southern Louisiana in the summer of 1957. The Mississippi flood of 1927 and the hurricane on the Gulf Coast in 1926 might be mentioned also.

First hand experience enables the writer to be more specific in the description of extension participation in World War I, shipment of food to drought sufferers in West Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee in 1931; Central New York flood in 1955; shipment of food to the Ohio Valley flood sufferers in 1937; World War II, December 1941-August 1945; and the Chemung River Flood of 1946. There were other emergencies, but these furnish a few of the best examples of extension activities.

WORLD WAR I—1917-1918

The Federal Smith-Lever Act of 1914 established Cooperative Extension Work on a sound basis. It prescribed a partnership arrangement between the State Land-Grant Colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture. During the first three years of operation under the Act, certain fundamental principles of program and procedure were developed, the programs were broadened and perfected, and staff was enlarged and extended. When the United States entered the war in 1917, a relatively large and strong cooperative extension organization had been established in every State. This was indeed fortunate, because a much heavier burden than contemplated by the sponsors of the Smith-Lever Act was about to be handed to this new organization.

Large numbers of farm workers were engaged in the war in Europe. American food products, especially wheat, were in great demand. Unfortunately, 1916 was a poor crop year in the United States. The production of cereals was 1,204,000,000 bushels below that of 1915. The world production of wheat was also down and the prospects for 1917 were not good. Large cargoes of food and other supplies were sunk at sea. The supply of animal food products was not sufficient to keep up with domestic consumption plus foreign demand. There was a great demand also for cotton for war purposes.

Farmers were urged to increase the production of foods, feeds and other essential farm products. The burdens on the extension forces multiplied and there was general recognition that by some means their numbers must be increased in order to aid not only in production but in the conservation of food.

The Council of National Defense, composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, authorized by Congress in August 1916, was organized March 3, 1917 (about one month before the United States declared war on Germany) "for the coordination of industries and resources for the national security and welfare". All states complied with the request of this Council and by July 1, 1917 all states had Councils of Defense.

A women's committee of the National Council promoted an organization in each State. These had many functions, including the registration of women for war work and cooperation with the Department of Agriculture in food production and home economics. Herbert Hoover was appointed as Food Administrator and authorized to mobilize all voluntary forces in the conservation of food and the elimination of waste.

Many organizations, including the Red Cross, were entering the food production and conservation fields. Delicate situations arose because of the competitive efforts of these agencies, and diplomacy was required of the extension workers in their daily contacts with those of the other agencies.

Uncertainty prevailed as to the exact function of extension in the war activities. Funds were insufficient, but even where positions could be financed, competent persons could not be found. The armed forces usually had priority, and other agencies engaged in war work sometimes made more attractive offers.

The haste in recruitment of personnel for these voluntary agencies resulted in an inexperienced, uncooperative group of individuals not familiar with the spirit and morale of extension workers and not anxious to learn. Not knowing just where they were supposed to fit in, extensioners learned to bide their time, get along as best they could with the personnel of other agencies and wait for specific legislation or governmental orders.

Only limited amounts of State or local funds were available. Demands for the services of county agents were met incompletely. There was hope that a national policy for agricultural and home economics extension work would be realized and Federal funds provided with which to fully meet these demands. Extension was ready and anxious to help win the war but was without portfolio until the passage of the food production and control acts later, in August 1917.

Through those acts, the Food Administration under Herbert Hoover, and the Fuel Administration under H. A. Garfield, were established officially and financed. A working agreement between the Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture was formalized.
The primary functions of the Food Administration were the control and regulation of the commercial distribution of foods and feedstuffs and the elimination of waste through the employment of both official and volunteer agencies.

The Department of Agriculture was to continue to administer the laws under its jurisdiction and direct its production activities, assist farmers in their marketing activities and promote the conservation of perishable foodstuffs on the farms.

This resulted in the employment of large numbers of county agricultural agent personnel by the Department of Agriculture and its partners in the Land-Grant Colleges to engage in production and marketing up to commercial channels and to consumers. The Food Administration in cooperation with the food conservation bureaus of the State food councils or commissions employed hundreds of home demonstration agents to engage in the conservation of food in the homes of consumers both rural and urban.

Fortunately, these two lines of work in most states supplemented each other. Agreements as to the functions of each were reached and arrangements made to operate the production agents and the conservation agents as a team under one director or under closely allied supervision.

By the end of October 1917, more than 1600 emergency demonstration agents—men and women—were at work, making a total of about 5,000 cooperative extension workers—agents, specialists and administrators. Included also were 100 home demonstration agents in cities and 100 additional leaders in boys and girls club work.

Farm Organizations Needed to Support War Work

War conditions required active organizations of farming people to support the extension agents and to participate in the planning and conduct of extension work. The Federal States Relations Service, headed by A. C. True as Director, was divided into the Southern Office and the Office of the Northern and Western States. C. B. Smith was Chief of the Northern Office and Bradford Knapp of the Southern Office. He was the son of Seaman A. Knapp, who originated farm demonstration work in the south. Both offices and their respective State land-grant college partners promoted these supporting organizations through the county agents. In the fifteen southern states, community organizations were promoted, including an expansion of the many 4-H boys and girls clubs. In the north, county extension organizations (farm bureaus or food bureaus) and 4-H clubs already in existence in many counties were organized in hundreds of additional counties.

Emergency Training Schools

The writer was employed in 1916 as agriculturist in the Federal Northern Office primarily to apply his farm bureau experience to the program of county farm bureau expansion in the 33 northern and western states. This was done through the demonstration method in the majority of these states. A state director of extension would invite key farmers, county agents, specialists and state leaders for a week's schooling in farm bureau-extension organization methods. A Federal staff of three, representing the three lines of work—agricultural agents, home demonstration agents, and 4-H club agents—with the writer representing the agricultural agent section, in charge.

After each of these schools or workshops, as they would be called now, the participants would direct the organization of farm bureaus in those counties not organized and revitalize others already functioning on a perfunctory basis. This was a wartime activity and each county bureau was expected to go “all out” in helping to win the war. Where local funds were not available, these bureaus were called food bureaus, and

---

Martha Van Rensselaer, with Claribel Nye as Assistant, served in Washington, D. C. as head of the home economics division of the Food Administration. Both were on leave from Cornell University.
the membership consisted of those enrolling as cooperators without paying a fee. Later, when local appropriations were made, the name was changed to farm bureau or farm and home bureau with a paid membership.

**Difficulties Experienced**

Naturally, some difficulty was experienced and the Federal representatives were subject to considerable abuse in those limited regions where farm people of German extraction or those resenting Federal interference even in wartime, questioned the propriety of the government to force this new-fangled tool on the people. The Federal staff tried to be patient and lenient, but under the stress of war and continuous week to week travel working with new people, it is no wonder that we became impatient and perhaps moved a little too fast. The pressures from the Food Administration, as well as the Department of Agriculture, were great. We were urged to get organizations organized and agents hired. We may have been over-anxious to comply and do our best to win the war.

The writer will remember always, one instance when he was demonstrating methods under local conditions. A farm leader with somewhat limited knowledge of governmental agencies became obstructionist in his refusal to comply with Federal requests for cooperation on the war program. He became so obnoxious that the writer flashed his Federal States Relations personnel card before the man. He had heard of the Federal Secret Service and what it did to slackers and objectors. He thought he was face to face with a Secret Service agent and became very humble and cooperative.

On another occasion, midway through a workshop, the writer and associates were advised to leave the State as soon as possible. After several successful workshops in adjoining states, this request came as a shock to the Federal staff. The same procedures were followed here as elsewhere. There was no open antagonism or rebellion on the part of the workshop members. The trouble seemed to be the result of adverse conditions back home which they thought needed their attention. They thought they were wasting their time at the workshop. We decided to leave with our job half done. When this was announced, they signed a round-robin letter urging us to stay. With this change in attitude, we thought they would accomplish our purposes better alone and we departed on the midnight train.

In another state, an open attack by the county agent leader was made on the writer during an early session of the workshop. We learned this was caused by the State leader's resentment that the Director of Extension had invited us in without his consent. With the approval of the participants, we finished the school. Later, this leader became a capable and respected top official in one of the action programs in Washington and a good friend of the writer.

One additional experience is recalled. In one of the central states where the writer was stationed for several weeks to work in the field with the emergency staff organizing county farm bureaus, progress seemed to be made too slowly to suit our Federal office, and a wire came from Federal headquarters appointing the writer as the Director of Extension in that State for the duration of the war. Previous unfriendly relations with the college administration was responsible partly for this unwise decision. Actually, satisfactory progress was being made, so the writer wired back that he would resign if this appointment was insisted upon. This settled the matter and excellent cooperation with good results followed. The matter was never mentioned afterwards.

**Tendency of Federal Leaders to Move Too Fast**

These situations have been mentioned in order to point out the tendency of Federal officials to move too fast under the stress of wartime conditions. People, generally, are quite willing to cooperate in times of war or other emergency but they do not like to be pushed around. This experience was of great help in guiding the policies of the writer when, as a state director of extension, he was helping to guide national programs on the state level. The important steps taken before and during World War II will be described later.

**Double Load for Extension Agents**

During the war of 1917–1918, the cooperative extension agents in all states carried on their regular duties and in addition, as representatives of the Federal government, assisted in its agricultural and home economics war activities. These included the several programs of the Food Administration, the mobilization of military forces by the War and Navy Departments, the Liberty-Loan campaigns of the Treasury Department, the farm labor program of the Labor Department, the Federal and State Councils of Defense, and the Red Cross.

As Dr. A. C. True described it, "The character of extension work has changed materially during the war. It had lost to a considerable degree its educational purpose and had become very largely service work for individuals and organizations, and for the Federal government. This was necessary under war conditions, when everything had to be sub-
ordinated to patriotic endeavors to uphold the military operations of
the government. Though not so designated, the county agents were in
fact a part of the great governmental organization through which the
nation was striving to win the war. In some respects it was unfortunate
that this was not recognized under laws providing for the mobilization
of the civil forces acting as essential factors in bringing the war to a
successful end.

"When the war was over, the economic problems became so pressing
and acute that they needed the extension forces, and particularly the
county agricultural agents to give them personal service, not only in
matters relating to agricultural production but also in the marketing
of their products. Problems relating to marketing, therefore, had a
larger place in the further development of the agricultural extension
service."

New York Organized for War Work

In New York State during the war, as in most of the other states,
special emphasis was laid on food conservation and preservation and
the use of perishable and locally produced foods. Demonstrations were
given on the conservation of wheat by mixing corn, barley and potatoes
with flour in breadmaking. Excessive use of meat and sugar was dis-
couraged. Home gardening was stimulated.

New York's Food Supply Commission

On April 13, 1917, just a week after this country entered the war,
Governor Whitman appointed the Patriotic Agricultural Service Com-
mittee which, on April 17 by Act of the Legislature, became the New
York State Food Supply Commission. This Commission carried on its
responsibilities until October 15, 1917, when it became the New York
State Food Commission. Membership of the Food Supply Commission
consisted of:

Charles S. Wilson, Albany, State Commissioner of Agriculture, Chair-
man in charge of the Division of Agriculture

A. R. Mann, Ithaca, Acting Dean of the New York State College of
Agriculture, Secretary, in charge of the Division of Food Conserva-
tion, including insect and plant disease control

M. C. Burritt, Ithaca, Vice-Director of Extension, in charge of the
Division of County Organizations

J. H. Finley, Albany, State Commissioner of Education, in charge of
the Division of Schools and Colleges

J. J. Dillon, New York City, State Commissioner of Foods and Mar-
kets, in charge of the Division of Distribution, Storage and
Marketing

S. J. Lowell, Fredonia, Master of the State Grange, in charge of the
Division of Loans and Farm Lands

F. W. Sessions, Utica, President of the State Agricultural Society, in
charge of the Division of Farm Labor

R. D. Cooper, Little Falls, President of the Dairymen's League, in
charge of the Division of Seeds, Fertilizers and Livestock

S. J. T. Bush, President of the Western New York Horticultural
Society, in charge of the Division of Transportation and Machinery

Dwight Sanderson, Albany, Assistant Secretary

Charles Scott, Albany, Accountant

The first step was the holding of a meeting in Ithaca on April 16,
1917. It was attended by representatives of 58 counties. They went back
to their respective localities to direct certain definite plans including
Agricultural Mobilization Day, April 21, 1917, which Governor Whit-
man set by proclamation. On that day, patriotic meetings were held in
1,089 communities, attended by 85,075 persons. A program of increased
production was started there.

The 1918 progress report of the Commission stated:

The big problem before the Food Supply Commission was, as its name
implied, to insure New York's contribution to an adequate food supply. Broadly
speaking, it undertook to increase the available supply through increased pro-
duction, conservation and improved distribution.
Extension’s Part

It would have been impossible for the Commission to carry through to any degree of fruition its comprehensive program, had it been necessary to set up entirely new machinery for its operation. Fortunately, well organized associations, closely allied with the interests of the Commission, already existed. These were the county farm bureaus established in 41 counties. This was the most effective link with the farmers and these bureaus were brought at once into cooperation with the Commission, furnishing the means of carrying out in the counties the work planned by each of the divisions of the Commission.

The farm bureaus were cooperatively organized and supported by the State and Federal governments and by the farmers of the counties. They were, therefore, the logically prepared and ready agencies for reaching individual farmers, and groups of farmers and under the State Director of Farm Bureaus, they were enlisted to carry through the Commission work. Each county agricultural agent, or farm bureau manager as he is called by New York State, was appointed the special representative of the Commission in his county. In order not to interfere unduly with the regular work of the bureaus, special assistants were assigned to most of the counties. Thirty-seven such assistants were appointed.

In the fifteen agricultural counties where there were no regularly organized farm bureaus, the chairmen of the county home defense committees were asked by the Commission to appoint sub-committees on agriculture, composed of leading farmers to act in an advisory capacity with temporarily appointed county representatives of the Commission. In the counties with farm bureaus, the executive committees served in that capacity. This well-organized machinery gave the Commission direct contact with farmers and their needs and problems. Too much cannot be said of the importance of these agents to the work which the Commission undertook.

The War Food Commission

Whereas the Food Supply Commission had eleven members, the Food Commission authorized by law August 29, 1917 consisted of only three members: John Mitchell, Jacob Gould Schurman, President of Cornell University (succeeded by Albert R. Mann, May 31, 1918) and Charles A. Wieting. Charles H. Betts was appointed secretary.

Assurances from Federal Food Administrator Herbert Hoover that the Commission would become the New York State arm of the Federal Commission, the Commission proceeded to organize with a staff of employees.

The Federal Administrator appointed Arthur Williams, Food Administrator for New York City, and Charles E. Treman of Ithaca for upstate New York. By agreement, the State Food Commission and the two Federal administrators united into the Federal Food Board for New York State to avoid overlapping and duplication. Mr. Mitchell was made Chairman of the Board. Practically all activities, except fiscal control, were conducted as a unit. The work was divided among three bureaus. The Bureau of Production under Calvin J. Huson, former New York State Commissioner of Agriculture; the Bureau of Distribution and Transportation under Cyrus C. Miller, former president of the

An exhibit at the State Fair, 1918, showing the results of the work of the New York State Food Commission campaign for enlisting city boys for farm labor
Careful analysis of the report of the State Food Supply Commission and of its successor, the State Food Commission, indicates the tremendous load placed upon the College of Agriculture, which then included the Department of Home Economics, and upon the county extension agents.

**County Agricultural Agents Key Men—Farm Labor Survey**

County agricultural agents were in the heart of production programs, including farm labor, farm tractors (owned by the Commission and rented to small farmers), ditching machines (owned by the Commission and rented only to farm bureaus), increasing pork and wheat production, improvement of the seed supply, war gardens, control of insect pests and plant diseases, power potato sprayers (owned by the Commission and rented to the large growers). The agents supervised the taking of the 1918 agricultural census under the direction of Mr. Babcock. The blanks and supplies were distributed by rural school teachers and the results tabulated locally by them and sent to the county agents.

One of the significant facts gleaned from the farm census was the shortage of labor. A need of 50,000 farm laborers was indicated. Farmers were financially unable to employ men, particularly in areas around large manufacturing centers, because of the high wages demanded. The following is a quotation from a 1918 report of the New York State Food Commission: “Early in April it was evident that the wage of farm hands must be increased if any help was to be had. The wage of $20 a month and board was a thing of the past, nor did $25 a month offer any temptation. By May 1, few men with experience could be had for less than $35 and board. In July the demand was swollen to $40, and then appeared farm workers who wanted $2 to $2.50 per day for harvest work alone and ‘no milking.”

**Farm Shortages**

New sources of labor had to be developed. The main sources used were untrained city labor and boys (Farm Cadets) released from schools. In addition, a small supply of women workers was added. These were recruited under the name of the New York State Women’s Farm Labor Reserve.

Another problem was the shortage of seeds such as potatoes, corn, and buckwheat; of supplies such as fertilizer and lime; and of farm implements. The Commission brought into the State, mostly from Maine, 42,000 bushels of potatoes at an approximate cost of $115,000. Other seeds such as buckwheat were distributed to farmers and lists of
sources of available seeds of many kinds were made available. The shortage of farm machinery was met in various ways, one being the purchase by the Commission of tractors, drainage ditches and power potato sprayers, as mentioned previously in this bulletin.

4-H Club work was expanded greatly during the war years. As in other extension activities, club work was conducted on a patriotic basis and the contributions of individual members and clubs were tremendous. Boys and girls clubs took an active part in patriotic drives such as home gardens, food preservation, wheat substitutes, Red Cross, and Liberty loans. However, much of this was mushroom growth which could not be completely maintained under peace time conditions.

Under the heading “Increasing Pork Production”, the Food Commission report states, “with the Department of Education and the Junior Extension Department of the College of Agriculture, boys and girls pig clubs are being organized at many points in New York State”. This was typical of boys and girls participation in war projects through 4-H Clubs. (See illustrations on page 23.)

Food Conservation and Use

Through the Conservation Bureau, under Ed Babcock, the people of the State were helped to put their voluntary effort into intelligent practice in their use of food.

This Bureau had not only the task of impressing the individual housewife with the importance of following food regulations, but of showing her how to do it. It taught her how to use foods that were plentiful in place of foods that were needed for shipment abroad to keep our allies from suffering and starvation.

The enormous foreign population in the cities made the task of this Bureau many times more difficult. The Jews, Poles, Bohemians, Scandinavians, Greeks, Russians and Spanish, all had to be approached in terms of their own experiences when they were requested to eat more of one thing and less of another. The demonstration method helped greatly in accomplishing this. Ninety-eight emergency home demonstration agents were employed. Fifty-six worked in New York City under the deputy director of the Conservation Bureau, Mary Swartz Rose of Columbia University. There were nine in upstate cities and thirty-three in the counties.

Martha Van Rensselaer was in charge of home economics emergency programs in New York State until called to Washington to assist Herbert Hoover. Her place was taken by Flora Rose, co-head with Miss Van Rensselaer of the Department of Home Economics of the New York State College of Agriculture. Florence Freer was State Leader of Home Demonstration Agents.

Mr. Babcock’s first deputy director was Florence Knapp, later in charge of home economics at Syracuse University. She was succeeded October 1, 1918 by Ruby Green Smith, who was on the staff of the Federal Office of Extension supervising the emergency urban home demonstration work.
Correlation of enterprises helped accomplish difficult tasks in both county and city. The general program of food conservation for New York State was developed from month to month by a State executive committee on conservation consisting of Director H. E. Babcock, Deputy Director Mary Swartz Rose in charge of New York City district, Flora Rose of the Home Economics Department of the College of Agriculture and Katherine Glover, Publicity Director of the Bureau.

Food Campaigns

The first state-wide campaign had as its purpose instruction in the use of substitutes for wheat flour in breadmaking. Recipes were worked out in the Home Economics departments at Cornell and at Teachers College, Columbia University. The breads were tested in the College cafeteria at Ithaca, the recipes printed and distributed in bulletins, news articles, exhibits. The home demonstration agents and demonstrators conducted demonstrations day after day for weeks. ²

Other projects which followed included the milk and dairy products campaign, conservation of sugar, meatless days. In the branch offices, community kitchens were maintained. These were designed to be headquarters for all food conservation activities in the cities and afford facilities for community effort in the canning and preserving of perishable foods.

The Victory Special

In addition, the so-called Victory Special was operated over the principal railroads of the State, from May to November in 1918. It was made up of two cars, one devoted to food exhibits and the other to demonstrations. Lucille Brewer of the College's Department of Home Economics was in charge throughout the entire period. Thousands of women were taught how and when to conserve food.

Postwar Extension Problems

The ninety-eight emergency home demonstration agents were employed for wartime projects. Unfortunately, in the stress of the war drive, sufficient time was not given to the permanent aspects of a home economics program.

²Sixteen of these wartime conservation bulletins are assembled in a bound volume TX 357, N 55 in the Mann Library at Cornell. A complete report of the New York State Food Supply Commission, 1917–1918 may be found in the same library under the call number HD 9007, N 7, A 5.
New York State was an exception. While home demonstration agent work was discontinued in New York City and in six upstate cities, urban programs were continued and competent agents have been employed to this day in Buffalo, Rochester and Syracuse. The work progressed with constantly increasing interest and with adequate yearly appropriations by the County Boards of Supervisors.

While the New York State Food Commission continued on for a time, the Food Conservation Bureau was ordered closed on January 15, 1919 and H. E. Babcock returned to his regular duties as State Leader of County Agricultural Agents on January 1, 1919.

Results from Extension Work

The goal of a big increase in food production in the United States was reached and probably exceeded. Extension forces contributed in large measure to this result. Not only were the folks at home supplied with food, but huge quantities were shipped overseas for the armed forces and the civilian populations of our allies.

Although the food supply at home was ample, the customary kinds of food were not available in sufficient quantities. Substitutes were made available and people learned how to use and thrive on these makeshifts. No small part of the conservation of food supplies at home and the know-how of the purchase and use of substitutes was supplied through the home demonstration workers in the field and at the colleges.

Therefore, the extension organization, although new in experience and undermanned, accomplished all that was expected of it by the government and public. As a result, it gained sufficient respect and prestige to be called upon in the post-war adjustment period for additional meritorious service. The final result, of course, was the establishment of a firm base for its future growth and usefulness.

NEW YORK FAMILIES SUPPLY FOOD AND CLOTHING TO DROUGHT STRICKEN FAMILIES IN THE SOUTH—1931

Suppose you were farming in a region where the crops were completely wiped out by drought and you and your neighbors did not know where you would get the next crust of bread. How would you feel to have a carload of food arrive at your railroad station and made available to you without cost? This is what happened in some fifty counties of Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia and West Virginia. It was shipped by fellow farmers and their families hundreds of miles away in the more favored sections of New York State.

The reaction of these stricken people was almost pathetic in its thankfulness. One of their expressions follow:

Allow me to express the appreciation of the drought stricken farmers in Muhlenburg County for the donation of the carload of food from the people in your state.

This generosity helps our farmers to realize their more fortunate workers have an interest in their welfare and creates a bond of friendship that does not exist in many instances between communities.

This donation was of untold value to our people who are in need and I am sure our farmers will reciprocate should a like emergency arise in your state.

The above statement, which is typical of many others, was received by the writer from J. S. Loyd, County Agent, Greenville, Kentucky.

Sixty-four carloads of food and clothing were assembled in New York State through the efforts of committees of the Farm and Home Bureaus and 4-H Clubs under the direction of the county extension agents. Food and clothing for fifty-seven of these cars were assembled, loaded and shipped in two weeks time during one of the worst snow storms ever experienced in New York State.

The total value of the donated surplus at wholesale prices was $52,736—a considerable sum in those days. The following additional items, all donated, were estimated very conservatively by the county
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committees as—labor $7,296; trucking $5,199; freight $12,900 (58 cars by the railroads and 6 by the Red Cross). The total weight of the products amounted to 1,357 tons. Supplies were donated by 17,877 persons in 35 counties, through the efforts of 3,870 committees. Figuring in the time and money expended by the personnel of the Extension Service and the New York State Farm Bureau Federation—including officials, committees, county extension agents and clerks—the total value of the project amounted to $90,000.

The real credit should go to the committees. These men and women carried the main load and worked under severe handicaps. Throughout the whole campaign, their cooperation and spirit were wonderful.

Special mention should be made of the cooperation of the railroads, and of that grand old man, the transportation director of the State Farm Bureau Federation, the late E. V. Titus of Glen Cove, Long Island, and of E. S. Foster, General Secretary of the Federation. Mr. Titus made all of the contacts with the railroads.

The American Red Cross officials were most businesslike and courteous in dealing with us. Without doubt, these large contributions were handled well and the distribution was to those most in need.

Just before the final seven cars had been shipped, Earl A. Flansburgh, Assistant County Agent Leader, described the procedure and the accomplishment in the April issue of the Extension Service News.

The following messages received during the drought relief campaign show how others regard results. C. E. Ladd, Deputy Conservation

Commissioner for New York State on leave as director of extension from the State College of Agriculture, writes:

Albany, March 16, 1931

Although I am some distance away from the center of activities this year, I have watched with a great deal of interest, the work that has been done by the farm and home bureaus and the extension service, to collect and forward food and other supplies to the drought stricken farmers of other states.
I want to congratulate you all on a wonderful job. I always knew that we had real teamwork among our farmers and agricultural workers in New York State. I never before appreciated just how effective this teamwork could be in a time of emergency. I feel that the real honors go to the farm and home bureau committee members and committee women. They have proven that they can cooperate, throughout the state, in doing a job that is very much worthwhile for agriculture and for all humanity.

After the work is done I hope that there may be some opportunity to extend to these local workers in their own communities, congratulations on a wonderful accomplishment.

ALBANY, NEW YORK

L. R. SIMONS,
STATE LEADER OF COUNTY AGENTS
NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
ITHACA, NEW YORK

I WAS DELIGHTED TO LEARN TODAY THAT YOU HAVE ALREADY SUCCEEDED IN COLLECTING THIRTY ONE CARLOADS OF FARM FOOD PRODUCTS FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE DROUGHT STRICKEN AREAS. I WISH TO CONGRATULATE YOU AND THE EXTENSION AGENTS AND THROUGH YOU THE FARMERS THE FARM WOMEN AND THE FARM BOYS AND GIRLS WHO HAVE SO GENEROSLY COME TO THE AID OF THE STRICKEN FARMERS OF OUR SISTER STATES. I AM PROUD THAT NEW YORK STATE FARMERS HAVE LED THOSE OF ALL OTHER STATES IN THIS SPLENDID WORK. MAY THE GOOD WORK CONTINUE.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

WE ARE DELIGHTED WITH THE SPLENDID RESPONSE TO THE CAMPAIGN BEING CONDUCTED THROUGH THE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS OF NEW YORK STATE FOR DONATIONS OF FOOD-STUFFS FOR THE DROUGHT SUFFERERS STOP THESE SUPPLIES WILL BE OF MATERIAL ASSISTANCE TO OUR CHAPTERS IN MEETING THE NEEDS OF THOUSANDS OF FARMERS IN WEST VIRGINIA KENTUCKY AND TENNESSEE WHO LOST THEIR CROPS AND ARE IN NEED OF RELIEF STOP I WISH ALSO TO PERSONALLY CONGRATULATE YOU ON THE ABLE LEADERSHIP YOU HAVE SHOWN IN THE ORGANIZATION AND CONDUCT OF THIS CAMPAIGN.

JOHN BARTON PAYNE, CHAIRMAN
AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. Flansburgh was responsible for all of the public information during the campaign and shared the administrative responsibilities with the writer who was State Leader at that time.

E. A. Flansburgh, Assistant State Leader of County Agricultural Agents in charge of Public Information Service during the food collection and shipment

E. V. Titus, Transportation Director of the New York State Farm Bureau Federation, made all contacts with railroad officials for shipping food to the drought area

E. S. Foster, Executive Secretary, New York State Farm Bureau Federation, played a major role in the food campaign

The Extension Directors of the South told us that one of the most interesting aspects was the feeling of thankfulness on the part of the families who received the supplies. The tangibility of the gift and its immediate usefulness appealed to them very much.

The following telegram sums up the appreciation of the southern people and the Red Cross:

Washington, D. C., March 21, 1931

L. R. SIMONS,
County Agricultural Agent Leader,
Ithaca, N. Y.

On behalf of thousands of farmers in the states of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia made destitute by last summer's drought, the American Red Cross desires you to express to the county agricultural agents, home demonstration agents, and county 4-H Club agents and other workers our great appreciation of the splendid contribution they have made. Our chapters report that shipments are arriving in excellent condition and are being rapidly distributed. We wish your workers could have been present when the cars arrived and the foodstuffs were distributed, as only in this way could they fully realize what a wonderful piece of work they have done. In all my experience with the Red Cross I know of no campaign of this nature which has been so well organized and so efficiently conducted as the New York State campaign for foodstuffs for the drought sufferers.

JAMES L. FISHER
Vice Chairman American Red Cross
(National Headquarters)
On August 25, 1931 Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt who had followed the operation closely throughout and at all times encouraged it, sent the following letter:

Mr. L. R. Simons,
Cornell University,
Ithaca, New York.

My dear Mr. Simons:
I am immensely pleased to learn through your letter of August thirteenth of further happy results of the distribution of New York State's contribution of 63 cars of food to drought sufferers. I wish to express to you again my warm appreciation for the very efficient manner in which this good work was handled.

Very sincerely yours,

Franklin D. Roosevelt

August 25, 1931.

CENTRAL NEW YORK FLOOD—JULY 7, 1935

The flood of July 7, 1935 caused damage in a region approximately twenty-five miles wide and one hundred eighty miles long. The counties most affected were Broome, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Schuyler, Steuben and Tompkins. A small area was affected also in Allegany, Chemung, Otsego, Seneca, Tioga and Yates. The Montezuma Swamp muck-crop area in Wayne and Cayuga counties was damaged by flood waters overflowing from Lake Cayuga.

The rainfall amounted to from nine to fourteen inches in twenty-four hours. The rapid run-off of the water caused severe erosion of cultivated land even in level fields, and on long slopes the gullying was very deep.

In the fruit sections many orchards and vineyards could never be completely rehabilitated and in practically all, the damage was sufficient to prevent or greatly retard the harvesting of the crops. Farm roads were washed out. Natural water courses were filled with debris causing an overflow which deposited gravel, stumps, logs and other rubbish on thousands of acres of farm lands. Crops were destroyed, farm bridges washed out, and fields isolated from the farm buildings so that harvesting was greatly delayed or made impossible.

In some cases buildings were swept away, demolished or damaged. Miles of fences were destroyed and livestock, particularly poultry, drowned. Hundreds of people were trapped in their homes by the storm which struck with such swiftness. Rescues were made by boat, by rope and by swimmers. In spite of these heroic efforts, 38 lives were lost.

These four paragraphs comprised the introduction of the report of the State Coordinator (the writer) of Farm Flood Relief to His Excellency, Herbert H. Lehman, Governor of the State of New York on December 14, 1935.

Dean Carl E. Ladd and the writer, then Director of Extension, attended a meeting in the Governor's office soon after the flood occurred. This was my first contact with Governor Lehman. It is recalled that the Governor asked each of the agency representatives
around the table what he would suggest might and should be done. Many good ideas were presented. The writer suggested that the two principal things were speed and coordination. That one person should be designated by the Governor to coordinate the activities of the many agencies involved. Afterwards Dean Ladd told me that the Governor wanted to know my name and my position. Later, he telephoned me.

On July 22, the following telegram was received:

ALBANY, NEW YORK
JULY 23, 1935

L. R. SIMONS
DIRECTOR OF EXTENSION
CORNUELL UNIVERSITY
ITHACA, NEW YORK

CONFIRMING OUR TELEPHONE CONVERSATION I WOULD ASK THAT YOU ACT AS THE COORDINATOR OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SEVERAL ORGANIZATIONS OR AGENCIES WHOSE WORK IS DIRECTED TOWARD FLOOD RELIEF AND REHABILITATION IN RURAL AREAS.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN, GOVERNOR

On July 23, the following telegram was sent to the county agricultural agents in 12 counties:

Governor Lehman has asked me to coordinate farm flood relief activities of all agencies in the flood stricken area. Will you assume similar responsibilities of coordination in your county? Please advise by wire. Our plans should reach you tomorrow. After receipt please give me your plan.

Signed: L. R. Simons

Personnel:

The agents were P. L. Higley, Broome; L. H. Woodward, Chemung; K. D. Scott, Chenango; I. B. Perry, Cortland; C. S. Denton, Delaware; M. E. Thompson, Otsego; R. O. Bale, Schuyler; E. K. Hanks, Seneca; William Stempfel, Steuben; A. R. Blanchard, Tioga; H. C. Morse, Tompkins; W. L. Webster, Rural Rehabilitation Agent, Yates. There was no county agricultural agent there at the time.

Needless to say, all accepted, and soon after, a state coordinating committee was organized hurriedly. In spite of the haste, the coordinator received instant cooperation from all agencies on the state and county levels with no questions asked. This friendly cooperation was created through long term friendly relations while serving together on regional and statewide committees of various kinds.

The regional coordinating committee, in addition to the Director of Extension as coordinator, was composed of Maurice Reddy, Red Cross; Arthur Hadlock and Raymond Barrows, Emergency Relief Administration; C. C. Carpenter, Rural Rehabilitation Corporation; W. E. Georgia and J. S. Strahan, Resettlement Administration; F. B. Howe and H. H. Wilson, Soil Conservation Service; Martha H. Eddy, College of Home Economics; L. D. Kelsey, College of Agriculture; C. A. Taylor, Extension Service in charge of radio publicity; James S. Knapp, Extension Service in charge of newspaper publicity.

Each county coordinator appointed a county policy committee composed of three farm leaders, one from the Grange, one represented the farm bureau and one the unorganized farmers.

Policy:

At no time did the state coordinator attempt to dictate policy of any cooperating agency. Rather he encouraged each to formulate its own plans as long as these plans were not inconsistent with public interest as interpreted by the Governor. Each member of the state committee
cooperated wholeheartedly with the coordinator and with each other. Committee meetings were held as often as necessary, which served to prevent duplication of effort or overlapping of functions.

The same procedure, with equally good results, was followed in each of the counties involved.

**Survey of Damage**

County extension agents and farm bureau committeemen made a quick survey of flood damage to farm property. Other reconnaissance surveys were made by the Soil Conservation Service and the Red Cross. The Red Cross survey covered a much broader area, since they were dealing with cities and villages as well as farms. From our survey, it was evident that at least 3000 farms were damaged so much that outside aid had to be rendered. Many more suffered damage less severe or the families were financially able to care for themselves.

**Financial and Other Aids**

The Board of Directors of the State Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, of which L. D. Kelsey and the writer were members, made available $150,000 to be expended for the relief of the more distressed farmers in accordance with a plan formulated by the Governor. The Red Cross made an additional sum of money available for relief in both urban and rural areas.

The Governor’s Agricultural Advisory Committee studied many proposals. It approved of the use of the Rehabilitation Corporation funds in the form of either grants or loans. They thought well of the Soil Conservation Service proposal to use its staff of trained engineers and other specialists to supervise farm rehabilitation work provided the necessary labor and equipment could be supplied by other agencies.

All Resettlement agricultural agents and home economists in the State were concentrated in the flood area with headquarters in the farm and home bureau offices. These and the county agricultural agents in flooded counties were called to Ithaca for conference to decide on procedure. They decided to follow the Governor’s advice to hold county meetings of farm leaders.

Each of the county meetings decided that the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation funds should be used as grants, each grant not to exceed $300 and each to be approved by the county RRC Committee. The Resettlement agents proceeded to make case studies for recommendation to the county committees.

The New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations met in Ithaca and approved in principle the plans already formulated and strongly recommended that funds be obtained to carry on rehabilitation work on flood damaged farms.

Later, through the efforts of Governor Lehman and Dean Carl E. Ladd, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration assigned funds to the State Temporary Emergency Relief Administration for the rental of heavy equipment, such as power shovels, bulldozers and grad-
ers; the purchase of small tools and other supplies and to pay wages to transient labor.

Transient labor in camps already in the area, supplemented by additional camps hurriedly established, plus Civilian Conservation Corps labor furnished by camps of the State Conservation Department, started work under the direction of Director F. B. Howe and his Soil Conservation Service staff.

An arrangement was made by the Resettlement Administration to obtain Agricultural Adjustment Administration surplus grain for distribution to distressed farmers. The Cooperative G. L. F. Exchange procured this grain and distributed the feed manufactured from this grain.

POSTAL NIGHT LETTER
AUGUST 8, 1935

GOVERNOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN
EXECUTIVE OFFICE
ALBANY, NEW YORK

WE ARE INFORMED THAT THREE THOUSAND TONS OF GRAIN FOR FARM ANIMALS WILL SHORTLY ARRIVE IN BUFFALO MILLS FOR MILLING AND RESHIPMENT TO DISTRESSED COUNTIES IN NEW YORK STATE. THIS HAS BEEN ARRANGED THROUGH AAA AND RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION. STOP THE G.L.F. WILL GRIND, BAG AND DISTRIBUTE GRAIN IN COOPERATION WITH THE COUNTY RURAL RESETTLEMENT AGENCIES AND COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES STOP LETTER EXPLAINING DETAILS FOLLOWS.

SIGNED. L. R. SIMONS

Organization and Coordination

It is apparent that without the aid of the agencies carried over from the post war rehabilitation period and the several general farm organizations and cooperatives like the G.L.F., the job on hand would have been insurmountable. If this flood had occurred in the twenties, only minor relief measures could have been applied.

The coordinator established a flood relief office in the College of Agriculture with Lincoln D. Kelsey in charge. Director W. E. Georgia of the Resettlement Administration assigned James L. Strahan to this office to direct the activities of the resettlement agents. Martha H. Eddy directed the work of the home demonstration agents in the afflicted counties and Mr. Kelsey the work of the county agricultural agents.

The transient division of the TERA established temporary headquarters in Ithaca, in the same building with the SCS. The concentration of all these offices in Ithaca facilitated greatly the coordination of all activities. The Red Cross headquarters was nearby, in Elmira.

Thus a compact group of effective workers through the Farm Flood Relief Coordinating Committee operated under one direction in all dealings with rehabilitation and relief activities for farms and farm families. Not all of these agencies are at present available and probably will not be in the future, but the pattern can be applied to similar disasters if such misfortunes happen again. The Extension Service agencies will be on hand and other governmental agencies can be adapted quickly if a good plan of organization and direction is formulated and applied. This was demonstrated in the localized Elmira Flood in 1946, which is described later in this bulletin.

Follow Up and Results

The Director of Extension as State Coordinator, his two assistants—Mrs. Martha H. Eddy and Lincoln D. Kelsey—the county agricultural and home demonstration agents, the clerical staffs and several of the college specialists, devoted practically all of their time for two months to the campaign. Complying with the request of the Governor, the coordinator made a direct personal telephone report of progress daily to the Governor and received suggestions. In such a hurry-up campaign, criticism was bound to arise from many sources; some of this was political. The effective daily information service perfected by C. A. Taylor and James S. Knapp not only served to keep the wheels in motion, but also answered many of the criticisms before they were made.

The College’s Agronomy Department prepared mimeographed circulars covering seasonal substitutes for the usual hay and forage crops. The Vegetable Crops Department issued similar statements recommending types of vegetables to be planted late and mature before frost. The Poultry Department prepared lists of owners of pullets for sale for use by those who lost their flocks, especially those who were receiving financial grants.

The Agricultural Engineering Department prepared a list of publications dealing with the repair of farm machinery. The specialists in the College of Home Economics prepared and distributed through the home demonstration agents, many circulars as aids in rehabilitating household furniture and equipment and what to look for in purchasing new household goods, materials and supplies.

The home demonstration agents from the distressed counties came to the college for first hand instruction in rehabilitation of farm homes. Several rural rehabilitation home economists from counties not directly
affected by the flood volunteered their services. These came from Washington, Warren, Jefferson, Monroe, Chautauqua, Schenectady and Allegany counties.

Nineteen rural resettlement agents investigated hundreds of farm cases of which 1,138 were approved and checks totaling $131,251 were distributed. The average farm grant was $107.30. Twenty-nine hundred tons of feed from surplus government grain were distributed to 2,023 farmers.

Of the 570 farm families registered with the Red Cross, 279 were found in dire need and aided. The Red Cross awarded $54,717 to farm families for such things as food, medical and nursery supplies, livestock and building supplies.

The clean-up and repair of homesteads, fields, farm bridges and roads by the combined efforts of the Soil Conservation Service, the Transient Division of the TERA and the Civilian Conservation Corps of the State Conservation Department were so numerous and enormous that a brief description does not do justice. A study of the detailed report of this great enterprise is most revealing.

From 900 to 1,500 laborers worked for four months with a payroll amounting to $76,475 and an expenditure of $164,100 for rental of large equipment. In addition, 8,760 days of man labor was furnished by the CCC camps. Altogether rehabilitation work was conducted on 2,218 farms.

In the final Report to the Governor, the State Farm Flood Relief Coordinator concluded as follows:

The farm flood relief campaign was from necessity hurriedly organized and conducted. Naturally mistakes were made and certain selfish individuals have criticized the activities and results of several of our cooperating organizations. Based on personal observation in a tour of inspection through the flood area at the completion of the campaign and on reports of our county coordinators and on statements from many persons, there seems to be general satisfaction with the farm flood relief activities.

In many sections of the flooded area, particularly in the fruit sections of Hector, Bluff Point and Hammondsport, the morale of the farmers and their families is at a very low ebb. Many of these farms have been in the same families for several generations. The Hector section has suffered two or three years of drought, severe hail storms, a winter kill and the flood. Some of the land on the steep slopes bordering Seneca Lake has been so eroded that it can never be completely rehabilitated.

Readjustment in farm enterprises is needed on many farms and, in some cases, farms should be combined to make operations profitable. Many of the farms are so encumbered with indebtedness that the farmers feel they cannot afford to borrow more. However, it is agreed generally that the present owners could operate their farms more successfully than new owners. It would seem to be in the public interest to help these farmers out of their difficulties. Many should have outside winter work to provide a living for their families and some working capital for spring operations. They do not want to go on the relief rolls.

In order to study the various problems in the different sections of the flood area and develop plans and programs to help solve the problems, a committee has been organized by the Director of Extension at the New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, County Agent Leader Earl A. Flansburgh is chairman of the committee. The other members are representatives of several departments of the State Colleges, the Federal Land Bank, the Re-settlement Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, the TERA and the Soil Conservation Service. The committee has held its first meeting and definite procedures are being formulated.

The Governor replied with individual letters of appreciation to the members of the Coordinating Committee, to the county extension agents and outstanding farm leaders and others who actively participated in the campaign. His letter to the writer is reproduced below.

\[
\text{HERBERT H. LEHMAN}
\text{GOVERNOR}
\text{EXECUTIVE CHAMBER}
\text{ALBANY}
\]

January 15, 1936.

\[
\text{DR. L. R. SIMONS,}
\text{DIRECTOR OF EXTENSION,}
\text{NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,}
\text{ITHACA, N. Y.}
\]

My dear Dr. Simons:

I have written to a number of men and women who were on your committee, thanking them for their cooperation in our efforts to aid those who suffered from the effects of the flood in the southern tier last July.

I cannot let the opportunity pass of expressing to you a very special word of appreciation. From the very first meeting which we held here in Albany two or three days after the flood, you took a very active part in handling the rural rehabilitation activities. Throughout the months that have since passed, your devotion has been outstanding and your efforts directed along very effective lines. I know that your effort or sacrifice was too great for you to make, and both officially as Governor of the State and personally, I am very grateful to you for your continued and splendid cooperation. I take very great pleasure in writing this letter to you.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

\[
\text{HERBERT Lehman}
\]
SCHUYLER COUNTY FLOOD—1937

The hard-hit flooded sections of Schuyler and lower Yates counties were stricken again in the summer of 1937. The damage in some instances was more severe because of the weakened condition of structures and stream banks from the flood of 1935. However, the over-all damage was less severe and more localized than in 1935. Little outside aid was requested. Local agencies bolstered by previous experience dealt with the situation ably and effectively.

AID TO OHIO VALLEY FLOOD VICTIMS—1937

In the early part of 1937, due to a heavy run off of rain and the melting of winter snow, the Ohio River overflowed its banks, inundated large areas of farm land and drove large numbers of people from their farm and village homes. The counties in all of the states bordering the Ohio River were affected. These included Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky and West Virginia. Food and clothing were needed not only by those who fled their homes but also by those who could remain. Many of these were unable financially to acquire sufficient food and clothing to replace their losses and permit them to live comfortably on even a temporary basis.

Fortunately, the procedure used in 1931 in shipping 64 carloads of food and clothing to the drought-stricken areas of West Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee was fresh in the minds of the writer, now Director of Extension, and E. A. Flansburgh, County Agent Leader. Most of the county extension agents and farm and home bureau committeemen who had assembled and shipped those supplies in 1931 were still on the job. These experienced forces were organized quickly by Earl Flansburgh. This time the writer turned over practically all of the campaign to him.

The monthly and annual reports of county agents indicate that the same hearty response was accorded by farm people throughout the State. The same heroic effort on the part of farm and home bureau committeemen and leaders in other farm and civic organizations was freely made. As an example, the report of D. Leo Hayes, now association state leader of county agricultural agents, at that time county agricultural agent in Madison County, New York is given below:

The Farm Bureau as usual is always ready to meet an emergency of any kind. During the severe flood in the Ohio Valley a call was issued for food and clothing. Farm organization leaders were called together and county agent letters were sent to all members of each organization asking for donations especially of non-perishable produce. Trucks were loaned by committeemen and the County Highway Department to pick up the produce at designated stations. One carload of produce such as potatoes, cabbage, carrots and canned foods was collected and sent to Red Cross headquarters, as designated by the county agent leader. An additional car of onions was donated by one farm (Dingfelder and Ballish) of Canastota.

A total of 82 carloads of food and clothing was donated by the farm people of New York State and shipped through the Red Cross to the flood sufferers of the Ohio Valley. Again, as in 1931, this work was done under unfavorable conditions of winter.

Director of Extension H. C. Ramsower of Ohio wrote:

The interest of your farmers in making contributions to our flood sufferers is indeed commendable. Food and clothing have been coming into Ohio and of course in other states, in enormous amounts, enough we think, for both immediate and future purposes.

Dean and Director H. W. Mumford of Illinois wrote:

I was delighted to receive your wire today telling me of the generous action of farm people of New York in providing food and clothing for our flood sufferers. May I express again our heartfelt appreciation to the farm people of your state.

At the close of the campaign, Mr. Flansburgh sent the following message to all county extension agents:

We are happy to know that the farm and home organizations of New York State have swung into line to do their bit for the cause. I doubt if there ever was a finer example of wholehearted rural teamwork than has been demonstrated. As coordinator for farm organization relief work, I wish to express to you and through you, to the officers and members of each of the organizations in your county my appreciation of your cooperation. Your task has been the hardest; my task has been easy. Your job has been to create the load and furnish the motive power; my job has been to throw the switches. Please express
to the men, women, boys and girls who have given their time and substance to the campaign, some measure of my appreciation.

On February 17, 1937 Governor Lehman, who had followed the campaign from the beginning, wrote as follows:

\[\text{[Image]}

\text{HERBERT H. LEHMAN}
\text{EXECUTIVE CHAMBER}
\text{ALBANY}

\text{February 17, 1937}

Dr. L. R. SIMONS,
Director of Flood Relief,
Cornell University,
Ithaca, N. Y.

My dear Dr. Simons:

I am just in receipt of your letter of February fifteenth advising me of the conclusion of the very successful campaign for flood relief carried on by the farmers of the State under your leadership.

I thank you and heartily congratulate you on the success of this campaign. I am very sincerely grateful to the farmers of the State for the public-spirited way in which they responded to the needs of the flood-stricken people of our sister states.

Sincerely yours,

\[\text{[Signature]}

\text{WORLD WAR II}

Not unlike the wartime agricultural and home economics programs of the first World War, the three objectives in the second world conflict were:

1. To provide the necessary food that would maintain adequate nutrition for our civilians, members of our armed forces and for all countries not under Axis control, especially our allies.

2. To transport the food to the ultimate consumer with the loss of as little nutritive value as possible and without excessive waste.

3. To encourage people at home to change their diet in order to conserve and provide the more essential items for our armed forces and our allies.

With the complete support and encouragement of the Dean of the College of Agriculture, Carl E. Ladd, the writer then Director of Extension decided in June 1940, to prepare the Extension Service in New York State for an all-out war emergency and to encourage the formation of a wartime agency composed of the leaders of statewide agricultural organizations.

The reasons for this somewhat early and hurried procedure were not discussed openly at the time, but can now be stated with frankness. During the first World War, the writer had operated on the staff of the Federal States Relations Service (now the Extension Service). He had observed that few states, particularly their colleges of agriculture and their farmers, had prepared sufficiently ahead of the entry of the United States into the World conflict to be most effective when hostilities began. He had observed that a few states, including New York, had made better preparation through the appointment of a State War Council and a State Food Commission. Several college administrators were active in these developments. He had observed and taken part in a Federal program, some parts of which were distasteful to the states and even the authority of the Federal government was resented. This had been the situation even though patriotic spirit ran high and the big majority of people were in favor of fighting the war to the utmost.

It seemed to the writer that it had not been the program itself so much that was questioned but the dominating manner with which it was presented. If the states had been better prepared, the Federal pressure could have been absorbed and a war program started much earlier and with greater enthusiasm.

In June 1940, the writer proposed to the New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations\(^3\) that an Agricultural Defense Committee be formed. He was aided in this proposal by E. S. Foster, Secretary, and Fred H. Sexauer, Chairman of the Board.

\text{New York State Agricultural Defense Committee}

After considerable discussion, on June 22, 1940, the Conference Board passed a resolution creating the New York State (Emergency) Agricultural Defense Committee (Appendix A), “to cooperate with the

\(^3\) The New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations was composed of the following organizations: The Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, New York State Federation of Home Bureaus; the New York State Farm Bureau Federation, New York State Horticultural Society, New York State Vegetable Growers Association, Cooperative GLF Exchange, the New York State Grange and the New York State Poultry Council.
National Defense Council, the Extension Service, the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, the State and Federal Departments of Agriculture, and any other national or state agencies dealing with defense measures in making available in so far as possible, the agricultural resources of New York State and to assist farm people in the various farm groups in the State of New York to study and appraise their agricultural resources and agricultural needs in the light of national and international conditions.”

The head of each member organization of the Conference Board was the designated representative on the new Agricultural Defense Committee.

The Conference Board went a step further in extending an invitation to several Federal agencies with branches in this State, namely: The Agricultural Conservation Administration, the Farm Security Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Production Credit Administration. The Board requested that the farmer chairmen of their state committees be designated representatives on the Agricultural Defense Committee.

It invited also the New York State Agricultural Land Use Planning Committee and the New York State 4-H Extension Federation to designate representatives on the Agricultural Defense Committee.

All agencies accepted the invitation and the Agricultural Defense Committee was organized formally with fourteen members.

Fred H. Saxauer was chosen Chairman and E. S. Foster, Secretary.

County Agricultural Defense Committees

The officers of each of the member organizations of the State Committee requested the officers of their county units, if any, to appoint representatives on county agricultural defense committees. This was accomplished in the next few weeks.

From then on these State and County agricultural defense committees performed yeoman service in the State and National defense and war programs as these affected particularly the rural people. Later these committees received official designation as the official bodies of the New York State War Council representing all of the farm wartime interests.

Thus, to the credit of the State agricultural leaders, more than two months before Governor Herbert Lehman appointed the State Defense Council (August, 1940), the New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations took the lead in providing an agency to act whenever necessary in furthering the national defense program. A sample of the responsibilities of these committees is indicated by the discussions at the first meeting of the State Committee.

The shortage of farm labor particularly in the periphery of the major war production centers concerned them, as did the probable future shortages of dairy feed, fertilizers, seeds, farm machinery and other farm supplies. In each case, preliminary plans for future action were made.

Relation of Agricultural Defense Committees to Selective Service

The first definite action by the State Committee came soon after Selective Service was established in September 1940. The Committee, at the Governor's request, submitted the names of qualified farmers to be considered for appointment to the appeal boards, and at the same time, considered what could be done to cope with the probable loss of manpower through the draft.

At this and subsequent meetings, the entire farm labor problem occupied much of the committee's time. Top Selective Service officials assigned to this State, Extension administrators, and farmers, especially those using large numbers of farm workers, were invited in for consultation.

Several important steps were taken, particularly the preparation of a so-called yardstick for basing the deferment of farm workers on the productive capacity of the farm. This was done at the request of Selective Service and with the aid of the College of Agriculture. This and a supplemental farm deferment blank, the principles of which were later adopted by the National Selective Service, were made available in large numbers free to the draft boards.

The county agricultural defense committees gave the county agricultural agents much assistance in helping essential farm workers fill out their questionnaires.

County Agricultural Agents Had Many Wartime Responsibilities

Sufficient credit has never been given to the county agricultural agents for their many important wartime activities. In addition to their regular responsibilities, they served as secretaries of the county agricultural defense committees and later (July 8, 1941) by appointment of Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, as secretaries of the USDA Defense Boards (later called USDA War Boards). These combined
duties placed a tremendous load on them. They carried this skillfully and with dispatch. No other governmental official on the county level had such important responsibilities.

They did most of the work throughout the emergency in making investigations and submitting recommendations on agricultural deferments to the county agricultural defense committees.

Deferments were not requested by the defense committees unless really necessary; a policy which secured the confidence of the draft boards and maintained it throughout the emergency. This policy of the agricultural defense committees and their devotion to duty resulted in two important things.

In April 1941, the work of these farmer committees had become so important that the Governor urged city and county defense councils to appoint the chairmen of the county agricultural defense committees as members of the Councils.4

**USDA War Boards**

Later, although the USDA War Boards were designated by Selective Service as the official bodies to make recommendations on farm labor deferments, the (New York State) USDA War Board authorized the county agricultural defense committees to continue serving in that capacity with only monthly reports to the State USDA War Board.5 This policy was continued for several years under similar committees called (in 1948) Agricultural Security Committees.

---

4From *The Empire State at War* published 1949 by the State of New York contains this statement: "Thus within a year of the establishment of the New York State Agricultural Defense Committee, the farmers of the State had received unmistakable recognition both from Selective Service and from the State Defense Council. They had won the right not only to speak out for themselves, but also to be consulted on all measures affecting their interests."

5The Secretary of Agriculture not only authorized the USDA War Boards but also named the personnel. The County board was composed of the heads of each Federal action agency operating in the State, namely AAA, SCS, FSA and FCA, with the chairman of AAA as chairman and the county agricultural agent (approved by the Director of Extension) as secretary.

The New York State USDA War Board was composed of the heads of the action agencies plus the Director of Extension, the State Statistician, the Director of Vocational Education, the State Director of Agricultural Research, and the College Editor.

Later, the New York State Board, no doubt with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, invited a representative of the State College of Forestry and the State Commissioner of Agriculture or his representative to serve on the Board. This Board, under the new name of USDA Council, still continues in New York and meets quarterly to discuss current and future plans and programs. It has been and is a very useful vehicle in maintaining relationships.

---

**The Role of the State Agricultural Defense Committee**

**The Farm Labor Shortage**

The next important step was taken by the State Agricultural Defense Committee when, on August 12, 1941, the Committee authorized its Secretary, E. S. Foster, to wire Governor Lehman advising him that by September 1 the expected farm labor shortage would exceed 30,000. It requested the Defense Council to secure an amendment to the State law to protect school districts from loss of State aid when students were excused for harvest work.

On the same day, the request was approved by the Defense Council and a resolution adopted recommending that the Governor and legislative leaders sign a certificate of intent. This would provide that the next legislature pass a law giving authorization to the Commissioner of Education to release for farm work pupils fourteen years or older for not more than ten days in districts outside of cities.

When the bill passed, it applied to both city and county districts to release students up to 20 days and later the time was extended to 30 days. The County Agricultural Defense Committee was called upon to be the co-signer of the documents stating the need for such students.

**The Farm Machinery Shortage**

The third important step was taken by the State Agricultural Defense Committee in the winter of 1941, in requesting Dean Carl E. Ladd, a member of the State Defense Council, to present to the Council a request for assistance to farmers in the repair of farm machinery and equipment. He did this on December 10, 1941.

The Agricultural Defense Committee arrived at this decision after consultation with the Dean, the Director of Extension, and the staff of the Department of Agricultural Engineering at the College of Agriculture. They were familiar with a similar plan operated during the first World War. A farmer could bring his machinery to local clinics where a trained agricultural engineer would assist him in the repairs.

The Council, alarmed at the growing shortage of farm machinery, especially electric motors, gave $80,000 to the College of Agriculture. Fifteen district agricultural engineers were equipped with tools and trucks and stationed in districts of about four counties each. This program was so valuable that it was continued on a yearly basis until 1945, when it was placed on a permanent basis and continued for ten years with broadened functions to cover such things as farm structures and water supply. It was operated under the direction of Paul R. Hoff
District agricultural engineers were stationed in districts to help farmers keep their farm equipment in repair.

of the Agricultural Engineering Department, and the engineers were scheduled by a committee of county agricultural agents within each district.

In the third annual report of the State War Council for the year 1943, it was stated that the district engineers conducted 367 repair clinics, 1,231 field demonstrations, and made 5,133 service calls to farmers. A total of 44,136 contacts were made and 8,609 farm machines were repaired or adjusted for efficient operation. In addition, the engineers carried on a program to stimulate the home production of buck rakes as a labor saving device for use in making hay.

As a Part of the State War Council

In February 1942, three months after Pearl Harbor, Chester Dumd, then Chairman of the State Agricultural Defense Committee, at a meeting of the Association of Towns, presented a six-point program of the Committee. Included in this was the setting up of farm labor camps, the use of selected city boys and girls for farm work, the recruitment of women for light work on fruit and vegetable farms, and assistance to farmers in adjusting their operations to produce more of the essential foods.

This program was the basis for the farm labor program formulated and operated during 1943 and led to the resolution by the State Defense Council (December 1, 1942) requesting “all groups planning statewide programs to help meet the farm labor shortage, to obtain clearance with the State Agricultural Defense Committee of the State War Council, to promote correlation of effort and to avoid duplication and overlapping.”

This was the first official mention of the Agricultural Defense Committee as a part of the Defense Council. Later, the Council resolved that in matters of agriculture, the County Agricultural Defense Committees should be the official subcommittees of the County War Councils.

Farm Labor Study Made

During the latter part of 1942, the State Agricultural Defense Committee with the help of specialists from the College of Agriculture made a thorough study of the farm labor supply as well as that of the canners. A six-point farm labor program was prepared and approved by the State War Council.

Agricultural Advisory Committee to the Regional War Manpower Director

On October 26, 1942, the Regional Director for New York State of the Federal War Manpower Commission, Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, appointed an agricultural advisory committee (Appendix B) composed of farmers, farm women and representatives of agencies dealing with farm labor. The writer represented the Extension Service on this committee of which Joseph P. King (a former assistant county agricultural agent in New York State) of the U. S. Employment Service, was Chairman. This committee was assigned the function of considering and recommending to Mrs. Rosenberg, policies and programs dealing with farm labor. This committee approved the six-point farm labor program of the Agricultural Defense Council.

The State Farm Manpower Service

On December 15, 1942, T. N. Hurd, agricultural economics specialist at the College of Agriculture, was hired by the New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations as Secretary of the Agricultural Defense Committee. After Governor Thomas E. Dewey took office and had studied the agricultural situation, mostly through his personal representative Hickman Powell, he appointed Dr. Hurd as head of the State Farm Manpower Service on March 15, 1943.
This Service was created "to coordinate the farm labor activities of all existing agents, private, state and federal." On the surface, this seemed like a logical and a comparatively easy undertaking, especially for a man of Dr. Hurd's personality and training. Actually, it proved to be one of the most difficult tasks of all in the farm labor emergency. To understand the reasons for this, the political situation must be examined. From January 1, 1943, the State government was headed by a Republican governor supported by a Republican legislature. A Democratic President and a Democratic Congress were in control of the Federal Government throughout the emergency. Although the New York farm labor program was started during the Democratic administration of Governor Lehman, a definite plan of operation was not developed and approved by the State War Council until after a Republican governor, Thomas E. Dewey, took office.

It was inevitable that each party would desire to control such an important enterprise designed to maintain or increase food production on New York State farms. On the one side was a State War Manpower Service designed to correlate all farm labor activities. On the other a Federal program backed by large sums of money for both recruitment and placement of farm labor.

It was fortunate that the State Farm Manpower Director had been employed previously by the Cooperative Extension Service, which is supported by funds of Federal origin as well as funds appropriated and raised within the State. It was fortunate, also, that he was a kindly, cooperative individual, capable of helping compromise a difficult situation into a workable solution.

A cooperative team plan was developed with the whole-hearted approval of the farmers, the public generally, and both Federal and State officials. This New York State plan was unique among all of the states and probably the most successful. This will be explained after the following statement about congressional action and the allotment of Federal funds.

**Need for Federal Farm Labor Appropriations**

Pressure from farmers nationwide, expressed through the leaders in their respective organizations, hastened action by Congress on special appropriations for recruitment and placement of farm labor. There was no doubt about the need for Federal funds. The scarcity of farm labor was getting more and more acute and there was much anxiety about an ample supply of food. The big problem facing Congress was not funds but what agency or agencies should operate the farm labor program. The question of decentralization into the states rather than bureaucratic Federal control was a big issue also.

In most states, the program was underway and in some it had been carried on for two or three years by several agencies such as the Extension Service and the State Employment Service using diverted funds of their own for the purpose. There was a limit to such funds and this fact had a bearing on the Congressional appropriations.

The State legislatures considered the problem and some appropriations were made; for example, New York, where early in 1943 the War Council set aside $50,000 for the State Farm Manpower office. California took similar action.

**The House Holds Farm Labor Hearings**

The appropriations committee of the House of Representatives started hearings on February 17, 1943. These were most thorough and many witnesses including the heads of the farm organizations, notably the Farm Bureau and the Grange were heard.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives and the National Farmers Union were represented also and made significant statements at these hearings. The Farm Bureau and the National Council were anxious to have as much of the program as possible decentralized into the states. They believed Federal red tape and the competition of Federal agencies for control would retard the program materially.

Their representatives testified that this problem of providing an adequate food supply with a big shortage of manpower was one of the most important issues of the day and should be dealt with immediately. The Farm Bureau was insistent that the responsibilities be assigned to one agency in the government with statewide and county agricultural representatives. In their opinion, the only existing agency meeting their specifications was the Extension Service.

The chief difficulty was that the Extension Service was an educational organization and in the states was not controlled directly from Washington. However, in many states the Extension Service had taken
the lead and already was operating a farm labor program through its county agricultural agents. In several states, the state employment agencies were working closely with the Extension Service.

In some states, the Farm Security Administration had attempted to use its organization for the purpose of supplying interstate and foreign labor, but its effort was criticized by many farm leaders. It was largely directed by its regional offices too far away from operations and with an inadequate staff, unsuited for the purpose. The work of this organization was discounted largely by Congress insofar as state and county operations were concerned.

The USDA Agricultural Labor Administration

On March 1, 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture had created, within the Department, the Agricultural Labor Administration and had placed an inexperienced man in charge. This appointment was distasteful to the farm organizations. The informal council of national farm organization leaders advised the Secretary that they favored the creation of a farm labor office, but believed the best trained men available should be secured. These leaders advised the Federal Administration and Congressional leaders also that the food problem was so big and important that a food administrator was needed. They believed the Secretary of Agriculture had too many other important responsibilities to handle the food program effectively.

The Director of the Agricultural Labor Administration presented a program to Secretary Claude Wickard which was not approved. So, on March 18, 1943, the Secretary issued a memorandum to provide temporarily for the administration of the farm labor program until Congress took final action on the so-called emergency farm labor bill.

The Federal Administration of Food Production and Distribution

On March 25, 1943, the President announced the creation, within the Department of Agriculture, of an Administration of Food Production and Distribution under the direction of Chester C. Davis, with the title of Administrator. The announcement stated that the Administrator would have charge of the food production and distribution activities of the Department, including the recruitment of farm labor.

Mr. Davis took office a few days later and made his first appearance before the Senate appropriations subcommittee on farm labor on March 30, 1943.

By executive order, issued March 26, 1943, the following bureaus and agencies were consolidated within the Department of Agriculture: the Food Production and Distribution Administration, the Commodity Credit Administration and the Extension Service. The Food Production and Distribution Administrator was appointed by and responsible to the President.

The War Food Administration

On April 19, 1943, Mr. Davis’ title was changed to War Food Administrator and all the essential agencies were consolidated under his direction within the Department of Agriculture.

In several other capacities, Chester Davis had proved himself to be a capable administrator, especially so when he headed the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The farm leaders approved of this move and the choice of Mr. Davis. They and Congress had complete confidence in his integrity and his ability. Therefore, on the last days of the Senate farm labor hearings, the chief concern was about the wording of the proposed legislation so that it would not only enable Extension to operate effectively in the states and counties but also enable Mr. Davis to employ the most competent personnel and best equipped agencies to carry on the interstate phases of the program under his direction.

Strife over Farm Labor Control

The American Farm Bureau Federation continued firm in its conviction that the Extension Service within the Administration of Mr. Davis should have complete control of the entire program including the recruitment and transportation of migrant and foreign workers.

The Grange and the Farmers Union wanted this latter responsibility handled by some Federal agency “better equipped to deal with this matter”.

The Federal Director of Extension and some of the State directors of extension were inclined to be favorable to the Grange point of view, although willing to undertake the whole job if Congress and the Administration so desired.

Extension’s Role Determined by Land-Grant College Association

Congress was concerned about the attitude of the Land-Grant College Association. Some of its officers believed that the Extension Service should not engage in any action program. That it should continue quite largely in the educational field. This was supported to some extent by the Chairman of its Committee on Extension Organization and Policy and by the Federal Office of Extension. The Secretary of Agriculture had only nominal supervision of the state exten-
sion services and their personnel. Therefore, it was up to the Land-Grant College Association to state its position clearly.

Under the skilful guidance of Deans Carl E. Ladd of New York and Thomas B. Symons of Maryland, both members of the Executive Committee of the Land-Grant College Association, that committee took formal action in a resolution stating that, if requested by Congress, the State Extension Services would accept the farm labor responsibility. This resolution, signed by President T. O. Walton of Texas A & M, Chairman of the Committee, is reproduced below.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTION TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRA NT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES—MARCH 5 & 6, 1943

The Executive Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities at their meeting on March 5 and 6, 1943 discussed at length the problem of securing a farm labor supply to assist the food production program for 1943. The Executive Committee also studied and discussed the various proposals of the Secretary of Agriculture, the farm organizations and the Congress for meeting this acute farm labor shortage. The Committee believes that a feasible, workable plan should be adopted at the earliest possible date as crops are already being planted in many states and any program developed at this late date will barely be able to meet the needs in even the northern dairy and corn belt states.

The Land-Grant Colleges through their Agricultural Extension Services do not seek responsibility for supervising the farm labor program but if it is the will of Congress, the Extension Service should undertake such a program; then the Executive Committee in view of the emergency pledges the full cooperation of the Land-Grant Colleges through the Extension Service and providing adequate appropriations are made to implement this program will accept responsibility for:

1. Mobilizing and placing all available labor within the county, including experienced farm labor, high school students in cooperation with the schools, volunteer business men, women and others.
2. Transporting, housing, placing and supervising migratory labor within the state in cooperation with the U.S. Employment Service or other agency designated by Congress.
3. Cooperating with the U.S. Employment Service or other agency designated by Congress in placing, housing and supervising migratory labor from without the state who will be recruited and transported by the designated agency.

Federal appropriations made to the Extension Services for this program should be allotted to the states without necessity of offset.

The above statement was approved by the Executive Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in regular meeting on March 5 and 6, 1943 in Washington, D.C.

Chairman of Executive Committee

P.O. Walton

The writer, who together with Director of Extension P. O. Davis of Alabama and Director C. E. Brehm of Tennessee, had been acting as consultants to the American Farm Bureau Federation at the request of President Edward A. O'Neal, was handed the document to deliver to Congressman Clarence Cannon, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Mr. Cannon had requested the Association to state its position.

The writer, accompanied by the Chairman of the Committee on Extension Organization and Policy, delivered the resolution personally to Mr. Cannon on Saturday afternoon, March 6, 1943, and left a copy at the office of Congressman John Taber, ranking minority member of the committee.

Additional Hearings by the House and Senate

Hearings on the appropriations were conducted from February 17 to March 5, 1943 by the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. In the Senate similar hearings were conducted from March 22 to March 30, 1943. At both hearings the American Farm Bureau Federation played an important part. Their officers appeared as witnesses and at their request Directors P. O. Davis of Alabama, C. E. Brehm of Tennessee, and the writer were invited to present testimony about the details of the farm labor program now underway in their states. This was done and many important questions were asked. At the Senate Committee hearings, the writer made this statement: "I should like to emphasize Mr. Chairman, that no national pattern in this farm labor program can apply to all of the states. The conditions in each State, as you know, are different. In my conversations and communications with directors of extension, widely scattered over the country, I know that practically every State has undertaken a program, some months past, to relieve the farm labor shortage. It varies according to the State and the facilities and the personnel they have to operate it."

"The point I want to make is that there can be no Federal program set down as a pattern for each State. Each State has to work out its own solution to this problem and I should like to briefly illustrate this by our own State."

The New York Plan Appealed to Congress

The New York plan of mutual cooperation of Federal, State and private agencies with the farm leaders as policy makers seemed to appeal to both House and Senate committees. The writer learned later
that this plan furnished the basis in the debate particularly on the floor of the Senate, for making the large appropriations for use by the Extension Service.

At the Senate hearings, Director P. O. Davis gave supporting evidence that contrary to the belief of some, the State Directors of Extension were willing to undertake the farm labor job under the proposed provisions of House Joint Resolution 96. He introduced telegrams of approval from nineteen directors received up to that time, with more expected.

Public Law 45

The Extension Service was officially designated (Public Law 45) as the responsible agency for leadership in the emergency farm labor mobilization and placement program within the states. This law was known popularly as the Emergency Farm Labor Act as approved April 29, 1943. $13,050,000 was appropriated to the Extension Service and $13,050,000 to the War Food Administration for the interstate aspects of the farm labor program and the importation and transportation of foreign labor.

On May 8, 1943, the writer reported to the College Extension Wartime Council that “it is not yet known what will happen to the farm labor program. The plan and program are written but we haven’t been told what we can or cannot do.

“After July 1, the United States Employment Service will not have funds for the farm labor program. Probably with Federal funds available, we will contract with the U. S. Employment Service for recruitment and placement service.”

Funds Allotted to States on Basis of Need

As soon as Food Administrator Chester Davis had become established in his new position, he named Lieutenant Colonel Jay L. Taylor as Deputy Administrator in charge of the Farm Labor Service. He was a personal friend of H. E. Babcock who considered him a reliable, capable administrator. Soon thereafter formal agreements were entered into by the Administrator and the President of each Land-Grant College desiring to participate. Funds were allocated to the states by the Federal Office of Extension on the basis of need which was determined mostly by the size of the job to be undertaken.

Colonel Taylor served until June 21, 1943, when he returned to the Army and was succeeded by his assistant Colonel Philip G. Bruton. Both were cooperative and were successful administrators. Colonel

Bruton continued in this capacity until September 24, 1943. From that date until May 24, 1944 he carried the title of Director of Farm Labor in the War Food Administration.

Meredith C. Wilson, Federal Deputy Director of Extension, was placed in charge of the Extension farm labor program. Because of his familiarity with each State situation, the funds appropriated for Extension were allocated wisely on the basis of need throughout the duration of the program.

New York Continued Its Cooperative Plan

As outlined in the writer’s testimony before the House and Senate Committees, the farm labor program in New York was in control of the farmers through their State and County Agricultural Defense Committees. They recommended the policies and a State Operating Committee made the necessary determinations, made recommendations to the farmer committee and carried out the program. The Operating Committee (See Appendix C) was headed by the Director

Emergency Farm Labor Program, Executive Committee of the operating staff, December 11, 1944.

Left to right: Thomas Atterbury, N.Y.S. Canners Association; T. N. Hurd, State Farm Manpower Service; Jack Weaver, State Education Department; Charles Howard, U.S. Employment Service; E. K. Hanks, Assistant State Supervisor, Extension Service; L. R. Simons, Director of Extension; Robert Polson, State Supervisor, Extension Service; Nelson Hopper, State Representative, War Food Administration, Office of Labor; Joseph Sugden, U.S. Employment Service; S. R. Shapley, Assistant State Leader of County Agricultural Agents
of Extension but with the assignment of much of his responsibilities to his assistant, the State Farm Labor Supervisor. The other members of the committee varied as the program changed from time to time, but in general all agencies dealing with farm labor within the State were represented. These included the State Farm Manpower Office, the State Education Department, the Employment Service, Farm Security Administration, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the canners, plus a staff of technicians dealing with camp construction, feeding of workers in camps, mobilization, training and information.

Under this arrangement, there was a division of responsibility and a centralized plan, resulting in no apparent dissension between the members. Frequent meetings of this staff worked out difficulties and differences of opinion so that a united front was presented at all times.

New York prepared and operated early, so when the large sums of Federal funds were made available, the farmers and the staff were ready to continue with only minor changes as the situation demanded.

Great care was exercised so that no one organization or person would receive credit for the work accomplished. It was a team operation from start to finish. By such unselfish procedure, the respect and confidence of the farmers, the public agencies, and the general public were secured and maintained.

Win Tyler (standing, right), County Agricultural Agent, was host to Cornell visitors at a Wayne County farm labor camp.

**The Memorandum for Joint Authority**

On May 24, 1944, the Administrator divided the responsibility between the Office of Farm Labor and the Federal Extension Service. The Federal Director of Farm Labor and the Federal Director of Extension issued a joint memorandum which authorized the respective state directors of extension to deal directly with the Director of Labor regarding the need for agricultural workers from outside the State. The Extension Service was assigned all functions relating to intrastate domestic and migratory domestic labor, except the provisions of housing, subsistence and medical care where such interstate labor or other migratory labor was housed in War Food Administration camps operated by the Office of Labor.

Minor variations in these plans followed from time to time, but in general, no major policy changes were made in most states. In New York, the Director of Extension, who had organized and staffed a successful camp housing and feeding program in cooperation with the County Farm and Home Bureau and 4-H Club Associations, applied for and received permission, in the form of a formal contract, to house and feed all farm workers living in all camps financed by public funds. These camps included those previously operated by the War Food Administration and those acquired through rental or purchase by the County Farm and Home Bureau and 4-H Club Associations.
Director of Extension contracted with these county associations, and the associations, through the county agricultural agents, arranged the necessary managerial procedures. In cases where the camps were owned by farm labor cooperatives, the county associations made all necessary arrangements with them through association-cooperative contracts.

At the peak of operation, laborers were housed and fed by the Extension Service staff in 41 camps. Sixteen additional camps, usually privately operated through cooperatives, were helped through loan of equipment and advice on management and feeding. Many others, owned and operated by individuals were given educational assistance by the Extension staff.

When the emergency was over, the War Food Administration turned over to the Extension Service in New York State, by formal agreement, $150,000 worth of equipment and supplies. Much of this was distributed to the county extension associations according to need and used in many useful ways such as in 4-H Club camps. All remaining equipment was sold on bid and this money, together with the surplus from the feeding and housing project, amounting to a total of approximately $78,000, was turned over by the Director of Extension to the Director of Finance of the College of Agriculture. This was used later to finance several research projects relating to some phase of farm labor, including labor saving equipment.

Retrospect

After having assumed so much responsibility in the farm labor program, probably more than any other State director, the writer, looking back on the whole situation, marvels that so much was accomplished with such little friction and criticism. Starting with inexperienced help from the State Farm Labor Supervisor down to the camp managers, it seems almost incredible that what amounted to the operation of a chain of over forty hotels was operated in the black with a large surplus of property and cash left over at the end. The credit should be given very largely to the entire operating staff, especially to the three successive supervisors—S. Reuben Shapley, Robert A. Polson and Elton K. Hanks.

Report of the State Farm Manpower Director

On June 1, 1943, the State Farm Manpower Director reported to the State War Council in part, as follows:

Prompt recognition of the farm labor crisis and energetic action by various agencies of New York State, in collaboration with the Federal government had much to do in forwarding a program which has improved the situation. The State Agricultural Defense Committee's program puts a large part of the responsibility on the Extension Service and the U. S. Employment Service and involved a high degree of decentralization.

The modification in Selective Service regulations, which have returned essential labor to the farms, was in conformity with changes recommended as a part of the New York program. The urgency of the need was personally presented to General Lewis B. Hershey, Federal Director of Selective Service by Director L. R. Simons, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Regional Director of War Manpower Commission, and by Governor Dewey.

The following State Departments and Federal agencies are participating in the farm labor program:

State Agricultural Defense Committee—policy making
Farm Labor Advisory Committee—guiding the Regional Director of War Manpower Commission on farm labor problems
Extension Service of the New York State College of Agriculture—in general charge of the recruitment, transportation, placement and housing of intrastate farm workers through its staff in Ithaca and the county extension agents
U. S. Employment Service—responsible for the recruitment, transportation and placement of intrastate farm workers under a contract with the Extension Service (effective June 1, 1943) and responsible for the placement of out-of-state workers
Farm Security Administration—designated by the Deputy Food Administrator to house and transport out-of-state help
State Education Department—responsible for the administration of the Farm Cadet Victory Corps under the direction of the Farm Manpower Director
Selective Service—responsible for the administration of the Selective Service Act and regulations with respect to agricultural deferment
State Health Department—in charge of the inspection and approval of farm labor camps
State Department of Agriculture and Markets—cooperates in obtaining statistics on the demand for and supply of farm labor
Civilian Mobilization Office of local War Councils—participating in the village and city enrollment of workers under the local farm labor mobilization drives
Farm Manpower Service—over-all coordination and expediting of the program for the State War Council

Dr. Hurd concludes, as he did in subsequent reports to the War Council, "Because of the excellent teamwork and spirit of cooperation shown by all of the participating agencies, it should be possible to give New York State farmers all available assistance in obtaining maximum food production."

**Supervision of the Program**

In 1943, S. Reuben Shapley was loaned from the State Leader of County Agricultural Agents’ office to supervise the farm labor program. Robert A. Polson, Head of the Department of Rural Sociology, was drafted as assistant state farm labor supervisor. When Shapley was called back to his regular position in 1944, Dr. Polson succeeded him. Elton K. Hanks was called in from his county agricultural agent position in Rensselaer County as assistant and when Polson returned to his regular position, Hanks succeeded him as State Supervisor in January 1946. All three handled a difficult job splendidly. However, the job became increasingly large and more difficult, so probably it was Elton Hanks who had the bigger responsibility in the last part of the campaign in supervising the whole program, including the big housing and feeding camp operation. He was given the responsibility at the close of the program of disposing of the equipment and supplies and in helping the county associations turn over the camps to farmer cooperatives.

**Program Conducted Cooperatively with Farmers**

**The Fundamental Policy**

Perhaps the most significant and fundamental policy adopted early in New York State was that the farm labor program was an emergency job, not a permanent one. That eventually farmers alone or in groups must take over the job and learn to handle it with only minor assistance from government. We are reminded often by Elton Hanks that this policy was emphasized so much by the writer that it became the watchword of the campaign. This was true especially in the later years...
—"Prepare now to turn the farm labor program over to the farmers".

The staff agreed with this policy and at all times took forward-looking steps to bring it to full fruition. All three of the farm labor supervisors—Shapley, Polson and Hanks—with the able assistance of Norm Hurd, taught this idea to the farmers and aided them in organizing for the future as well as the present.

Encouragement and assistance were given to farmers and processors to organize cooperatives and membership corporations through which to pool labor needs, enter into contracts for certain types of emergency labor, and to contribute equitably a part of the cost and responsibility of housing and servicing farm labor.

Specific assistance was given to farmers to take over the housing, feeding and management of seasonal workers so that the emergency program could be brought to an early conclusion. Thus, one of the long time Extension fundamental policies—that of teaching people to help themselves—was fully exemplified in this very important wartime program.

The Women’s Land Army

Martha H. Eddy had many important assignments during the emergency, all of which she did thoroughly and with dispatch. She made many of the official contacts with several statewide organizations and departments, particularly the State Labor and Health Departments and the State Nutrition Committee. Perhaps her most important responsibility of the farm labor program was as head of the Women’s Land Army. Not only did she perform her administrative duties in the office, but she was on the road almost constantly supervising the girls located in foster farm homes or in farm labor camps. Many critical cases of relationships both within the camps and outside in the communities where the camps were located were handled by her personally with perseverance and skill. She worked far beyond the call of duty and commanded the admiration and respect of everyone who came in contact with her work, including public officials, her staff associates, and especially the women in the land army. These girls looked upon her as a mother away from home and a counselor to whom they could unburden all of their troubles.

Results of the Farm Labor Program in New York State

Different individuals placed on farms 1943–47 inclusive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Youth under 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal (5 months or less)</td>
<td>287,764</td>
<td>65,175</td>
<td>111,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year around (over 5 months)</td>
<td>28,115</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>2,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315,879*</td>
<td>65,889†</td>
<td>113,864‡</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total placements by operating staff—495,632.

Persons not ordinarily doing farm work from villages and suburbs, recruited for part-time work—usually weekends or holidays, by community or neighborhood drives, 1943–47 inclusive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Youth under 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41,109</td>
<td>25,903</td>
<td>41,247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total—108,250.

*The adult men placed included Jamaicans 10,359; Bahamians 1,628; Barbadians 1,107; Newfoundlanders 1,107. There are no accurate figures for soldiers, prisoners of war, and conscientious objectors.
†The women were supplied through the Women’s Land Army, Martha H. Eddy in charge.
‡The boys were supplied by the Farm Cadet Victory Corps, Jack Weaver in charge.
Cost of the Farm Labor Program in New York State 1943–47

State funds (Emergency)
Farm Cadet Victory Corps $265,155
Office State Farm Manpower 100,005

State total $365,160
Federal funds (Emergency) Total 2,526,911

Grand Total $2,892,071

*This does not include the cost in terms of salaries, expenses, equipment and supplies paid for on regular funds of the extension service and the several operating agencies. If this could be approximated, the total cost would be extremely large.

In Conclusion

The concluding statements about the effectiveness of the New York farm labor operating staff might well be the one made by the writer before the House Appropriations Committee when the 1944 farm labor appropriation was under consideration, as follows:

The operating staff of the New York farm labor program is composed of representatives of the U. S. Employment Service, the Office of Labor, War Food Administration, Extension Service of the State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, the State Department of Education, the State Farm Manpower Service and the Association of New York State Canners.

It meets about once each week, during the peak production season to discuss operations during the previous week and to make plans for the week ahead. The staff operates as a unit. There is no overlapping or duplication of effort. No agency attempts to take credit for itself.

It is a good example of successful cooperation of federal and state governmental agencies. This subordination of selfish ambitions and the application of united effort, which has produced excellent results, is much appreciated by the farmers and the public generally.

A statement about the effectiveness of the Farm Labor Program Operating staff is contained in the book The Empire State at War and quoted below:

Although farm labor was but one problem, it was by far the most vital and in its ramifications the most complex. . . .

The secret of the success of the Farm Labor Program lay in the unity and cooperation promoted among federal, state and local agencies and the farm organizations. The successful functioning of the agencies and groups as a single unit during the entire war period demonstrates the logic and clarity of the program and is a credit to the character of the leadership operating in New York agriculture.

The January 30, 1948 weekly letter from Director M. L. Wilson to state extension directors contained the following statement:

Farm Labor Program Becomes History—Today the deadline has been reached for the complete liquidation of the extension farm labor program, in accordance with the decision of Congress. The five years of the program have formed a notable chapter in extension history.

We have said little in these weekly letters about the farm labor operations because we had full confidence in the leadership and administrative ability of Meredith C. Wilson and the people chosen by the state directors to operate the program in the states and counties. In the next farm labor letter, he will give the destinations of the members of his staff. We are happy to know that many of them are going into positions of advanced leadership, where their extension training and experience will be reflected time and again.

The extension farm labor program has made some outstanding and extremely significant wartime contributions. But even these are overshadowed, in my judgment, by the basic philosophic and sociological contributions made toward a better understanding between worker and employer. A pilot program has ended its run to point the way toward better and more human relationships between two groups of our society that must work together. The extremely favorable acceptance of the program by agricultural labor, by farmer employers, and by the general public, reflects the energy and integrity which extension farm labor personnel put into their work.

As we note the termination of the extension farm labor program, we want to extend congratulations to M. C. Wilson and all of his fellow workers—here in Washington, in the states and in the counties—on a job well done. They've made a fine contribution to the extension record. To those who are going on to non-extension assignments we say "Fair and farewell!". But we know that in one way or another, they will always be associated with the ideals of leadership, democracy, and service that are so much a part of the extension workers creed.

THE PROGRAM DISCONTINUED

All operations under the Emergency Farm Labor Program ceased December 31, 1947. All remaining county personnel were through on that date. State Supervisor Elton K. Hanks, one of his assistants, Ralph Nelson, and a few financial clerks were continued in the state office on War Food funds through January 1948. From then until June 30, this office personnel operated on surplus farm labor funds. On July 1, 1948 all regular and supplementary operations were concluded.

If space permitted the outstanding work of each staff member should be described. Much more should be said about the long hours, the cooperative spirit and the team work of the staff on the state level as well as in each county. This would be revealed in detail to any person who wished to spend the time examining the voluminous records on file in the archives of the Cornell Division of Regional History.
Public Relations

Special mention should be made of Hugh Eames, a former rural newspaper correspondent and editor, who was employed by the Extension Service to head up the farm labor information service. Mr. Eames was an extrovert and a practical sort of individual. His writings, based on his many field contacts, did much to keep the public informed and to clear up misunderstandings about the intricate farm labor program.

To keep the staff and particularly the county agricultural agents informed, and to help keep up their morale, he prepared and distributed a mimeographed publication (usually issued weekly) with a tricky name “Farm Labor Pains”. The first issue was on May 4, 1944 and it continued throughout the major part of the campaign.

In the No. 17 issue, December 12, 1945, a description of the program was given under several subheadings. Under the first one “How Did We Get Into This?” he gives credit for the start of the farm labor program to the help given farmers by the county agricultural agents even before the war started. The farm labor program started with the small problems of individual farmers. It was comparatively easy for the agent to supply their needs at the start of the war through the substitution of a part-time city worker, a high school boy or a woman from the Women’s Land Army. He assisted also in cutting down the number of steps taken by the farmer and thereby increase his efficiency. He helped in the training of “green” help.

As each situation occurred, more and more frequently the agents needed help in the county and by specialists from the State office. Emergency funds were provided by the State and Federal governments with which to provide a farm labor State staff, field men and emergency assistant agents.

When the load of finding and supplying farm laborers became too great, the Extension Service contracted with the U. S. Employment Service to recruit and place the workers. This Service was under the direction of the Federal Regional War Manpower Director, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg and her staff, headed by Richard Brockway, Charles Howard and Joseph King.

The State farm labor operating staff with headquarters at the College and composed of representatives of all the cooperating agencies was molded into an effective coordinating force.

Under the next subheading “How Did We Do It?” Mr. Eames again gives the chief credit to the county agricultural agent. He was the focal point of the entire program. He was concerned and responsible for a great variety of activities including the determination of need for workers, wage hearings, camp construction and operations, worker-community relations, labor cooperatives, training of farm workers, Selective Service and relations with all cooperating agencies.

Under the next subheading “What’s Come Of It?” he said the outstanding result of the program nationally was that the United States had no food shortage. In New York State, with the greatest shortage of skilled farm workers ever experienced, greatly increased quantities of essential crops were produced for ourselves, our allies and our armed forces abroad.

The extent of operations is partially indicated by the funds expended. Over one-half million dollars of Federal funds was expended during the first ten months of 1945. This was in addition to all other funds used in the farm labor program such as regular college funds, War Council funds, direct War Food Administration funds and funds of other cooperating agencies. It did not include wages paid by farmers or expenses paid from room and board deductions of farm workers.

Workers supplied through the program in 1945 alone were approximately 3,500 Jamaicans, 500 Bahamans, 380 Newfoundlanders, 2,500 Farm Cadets (boys), 1,050 girls, 1,800 vacationists (from cities), 5,200 prisoners of war. For the remainder of the 220,000 people who worked on farms in the State, there were several thousand migrants and people recruited locally as well as those already on farms.

There was no basis of judging the effect of the program in total recruiting, over-all efficiency through training and management and other improved phases of the recruiting, placing and training of farm workers.

FINALLY, Mr. Eames again gives the chief credit for the success of the farm labor program to the excellent performance of the county agricultural agents. He predicted that this same efficient work would result in success in the completion of the emergency job and transition to a peace-time educational farm labor program.

As intended, Hugh Eames’ letter was a source of encouragement to the war-weary, hard-pressed county agricultural agents. In our opinion it was one of the highlights of the entire public relations part of the farm labor program.
The County Agricultural Agent and Selective Service

Mention has been made in several places in this manuscript about deferments from the armed forces of men needed for agricultural work. The responsibilities of the USDA War Boards and the New York State Agricultural Defense Committees have been described. Only brief mention has been made of the effective work of the county agricultural agents and their state leaders in connection with Selective Service.

The time of the agents consumed in this important work was enormous. It included not only the large amount of "paper work" in the offices but more important the "leg work" in the field making the necessary investigations. Each case required conscientious, painstaking study including interviews with the individual requesting deferment, his family, his neighbors and thorough examination of the business of the farm where he was needed.

As previously stated, the agent did this under the auspices of the County Agricultural Defense Committee of which he was secretary. Actually, many of the investigations and the reasons for deferment and perhaps, in a few cases, the actual decisions were shouldered by the agent on his own responsibility. A conscientious agent, and we believe all could be placed in that category, spent many sleepless nights and many anxious moments before he arrived at the final decision. He was subject to both praise and abuse by the persons concerned and by their neighbors whose sons had been taken into the armed services. Of course, some of these boys did not return.

Those agents who relied fully on their farmer committees and, therefore, shared the likes and dislikes, came through the ordeal with the least difficulty. After bitter experiences, the others soon learned to cut no corners in order to expedite the case under consideration, but to wait for the committee's meeting and decision.

Besides this detailed work of investigation and the filling out of the required official forms, the county agricultural agent was summoned frequently before the local draft boards to interpret farm needs and the meaning of an essential farm worker. Often he was accompanied by a farmer member of the county agricultural defense committee to explain how the training and experience of a particular farm boy or hired man fitted into this category.

Naturally, the county agricultural agent looked to his state leaders for guidance and up-to-date information regarding Selective Service regulations. S. R. Shapley, Assistant State Leader of County Agricultural Agents, was in charge of this part of war work. He, together with T. N. Hurd, State Manpower Director, made the contacts with Selective Service officials and he informed the agents of changes in regulations and advised them on procedure. His successor in 1945, C. F. Crowe, continued this important work with equal success. At this writing, he is cooperating still with Selective Service and through the county agricultural agents, keeps in touch with the county agricultural security committees. These committees are carrying on their usual functions of working on deferment cases referred to them by the draft boards.

The New York State Food Commission

The New York State Emergency Food Commission was appointed by Governor Dewey March 25, 1943 "for the purpose of correlating the activities of all agencies in the State working on the production, processing and distribution of food and on nutrition in an effort to protect the food supply of the State's thirteen million people and to aid in the battle for food in the United States."

The function of the Commission was to mobilize New York's food production resources for maximum output and to insure the efficient and effective distribution and use of food. The Commission had no compulsory or regulatory powers. It was an official branch of the State War Council.
The New York State Food Commission (original staff) left to right: Mrs. Roger W. Straus; Joseph McAlaster; Harold M. Stanley; L. A. Maynard; Earl S. Foster, Secretary; H. E. Babcock, Chairman; Chester C. Du Mond; C. E. Ladd, Executive Director; L. R. Simons; Austin W. Carpenter; H. W. Rathbun; T. N. Hurd. Warren W. Hawley and William I. Myers were appointed later.

Its complete membership and the responsibilities of each member are given in the Appendix D of this bulletin. The Cornell representatives were H. E. Babcock, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Cornell University, Carl E. Ladd, Dean of the New York State College of Agriculture, L. A. Maynard, Director of the School of Nutrition, L. R. Simons, Director of Extension.

The Commission met frequently, and for a period as often as once a week. This was necessary to act upon emergency situations which were presented by members of the Commission, and many which were referred to it by the Governor, members of the State War Council or by other governmental or private agencies or individuals.

The Commission developed and publicized a Wartime Food Program for New York State. This included all important elements for all-out production of food and for the best possible nutrition of humans and animals.

The Commission called in, as necessary, consultants on public information, economics and nutrition. The most frequent attendant was Dr. W. I. Myers, Head of the Department of Agricultural Economics at Cornell (later Dean of the New York State College of Agriculture).

---

Sarah Gibson Blanding, Dean of the New York State College of Home Economics, 1941–46. Miss Blanding organized the college staff for war work and participated in many state and national projects.

When he became a member of the Commission, succeeding Dr. Ladd, Dr. F. F. Hill, Head of that Department, succeeded him as economics consultant. Another important consultant was Dean Sarah Gibson Blanding of the New York State College of Home Economics at Cornell.

Although the responsibility for the State program for both human and animal nutrition was assigned to Dr. L. A. Maynard, Dean Blanding was appointed director of the human nutrition activities with the State Nutrition Committee, headed by Dr. Elizabeth Gardiner. This was the Commission’s principal advisory body on problems affecting human nutrition.

The Food and Nutrition Program in New York City

With the approval of the New York City officials, the Commission conducted a nutrition program for New York City with Commissioner Mrs. Roger W. Straus in charge. With the aid of Dean Blanding and her associates, a staff of home demonstration agents was maintained there during the war. These agents limited their activities to food and nutrition and did not cover the complete home economics field as did the regular and emergency agents upstate. The program in New York City functioned successfully from July 15, 1943 to June 1, 1945.
Mrs. Straus was aided greatly in the technical direction of the program by Dean Blanding's staff, especially by Frances Scudder, State Leader of Home Demonstration Agents. Fortunately, Miss Scudder had previous experience as a home demonstration agent in the City of Syracuse, as well as in rural work.

The Upstate Food Program

The food and nutrition work upstate was conducted through the regular home demonstration agents and twenty-six emergency agents working under the regular agents in both rural and urban areas. The salaries of personnel in New York City and the emergency agents upstate were paid from War Council funds. Thus, for the second time (the first in World War I) the entire State—both cities and counties were provided with home demonstration work in food and nutrition.

Unfortunately, as was the case in the first World War, no provision was made for continuing this work in New York City after the termination of the war. The work there was discontinued abruptly without sufficient explanation.

Home Demonstration Work Legalized in Cities

This was not the case in the upstate cities. The State Agricultural Defense Committee, noting the splendid progress made in consumer education by home demonstration agents in both world wars, decided it was in the best interests of the farmers, especially those producing perishable products, as well as the consumers, to conduct food and nutrition work in the cities. In 1946, with the backing of this Committee as well as the Food Commission, the State Conference Board of Farm Organizations succeeded in securing an amendment to the so-called State farm and home bureau law to permit counties having boards of supervisors to make additional appropriations for home economics work in cities, in counties having an urban population of 25,000 or more. The details of this permissive legislation may be found in the county law (Chapter 732 of the Laws of 1955).

Since New York City does not have county appropriating bodies as specified in the law, this new provision did not apply there. As the writer looks back at this development, he is inclined to blame himself for not urging the expansion of the enabling law to cover New York City. With the successful home demonstration agent experience fresh in the public mind, such a move might have met with success. Several subsequent attempts to accomplish this end did not have sufficient momentum to gain the desired results.

It was not until April 28th, 1957 (ten years after the first attempt was made) that a State Act was passed and signed by the Governor enabling the Board of Estimate of New York City to appropriate and pay out from time to time for the general improvement of horticulture and home conditions for the support and maintenance of a local horti-

---

Amelia Bielaski, Wyoming County, operating a Canning Cart as part of the Food Conservation program, 1945

To encourage home preservation of food, demonstrations such as this one by B. B. Robb on pressure cookers were given throughout the state
cultural and home economics extension association. Such an association would conduct demonstration and education work in agriculture and home economics with adults and youths through the employment of trained agents.

As in upstate counties, the act places the general supervision of the work under the direction of Cornell University as agent for the State. However, unlike the upstate enabling act, no State money is provided at this time. This may be provided for in subsequent legislation.

Principal Work of the Food Commission

Much of the time of the Food Commission was devoted to animal feed shortages and to short supplies of other essential commodities such as fertilizer, farm machinery, packages for farm products, fencing material, water supply equipment and storage batteries. Perhaps these items were given more consideration because of the presence of two feed merchants as members of the Commission. Perhaps, also, the other work the Commission was sponsoring, such as farm labor, human nutrition, Victory Gardens, was delegated largely to experts in those fields. It is possible that since no serious complaints were received about the progress of these important projects, the Commissioners thought best to leave such matters alone and devote more time to less easily organized and handled affairs. At any rate, the writer who attended most, if not all, meetings of the Commission does not recall any session where serious concern was expressed or excessive time devoted to farm labor, human nutrition, and Victory Gardens.

The Commission, through the Extension Service, undertook a campaign to help alleviate the grain shortage. This campaign was designed to induce farmers to produce more homegrown feeds, especially roughage, and to adopt better feeding practices. The Cornell Feed Service supplied the farmers and the feed industry with up-to-date facts regarding available surplus feed substitutes and animal nutrition.

Victory Gardens

New York State participated wholeheartedly in the National Victory Garden Campaign. The Extension Service nationally and in each State was asked to assume the responsibility for the program.

The Victory Garden Council

On January 20, 1942, upon invitation of the writer, representatives of forty-four State agencies, organizations and clubs met in Albany and organized the New York State Victory Garden Council. The writer was elected Chairman and Albert Hoefer, State 4-H Club Leader, was elected executive secretary. The County 4-H Club Agents were requested to act as Victory Garden coordinators and direct the campaign in their respective counties.

Professor Hoefer proceeded immediately with the organization of county victory garden councils. The purposes of the campaign were to help ensure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces; release essential foods for our allies; provide food for our allies; relieve transportation; contribute to the home food supply and family health.

At the second annual meeting, January 1943, the Council decided to extend the program to include cities and suburban areas with provision for City Councils to function in cooperation with the established County Councils. Because of the lessened teaching load at the College of Agriculture, several professors and instructors in the Departments of Vegetable Crops and Floriculture were assigned to help organize and train lay leaders in gardening throughout the State.

The State Institute at Farmingdale, Long Island, loaned a trained horticulturist, Carl Wedell, to take charge of the campaign in New York City in cooperation with the Greater New York Victory Garden Council. Professor L. H. MacDaniels, Head of the Department of Floriculture and Ornamental Horticulture at Cornell, spent most of his time working with Dr. Wedell. Professor H. C. Thompson, Head
of the Department of Vegetable Crops, as Chairman of the Extension Service Wartime Committee on gardening, covered the upstate area. Professor Hoefer served throughout the emergency as the over-all executive secretary for the entire State.

Victory Garden Bulletins

Under the title Victory Garden Bulletin a series of gardening bulletins was published with funds provided by the State War Council, and distributed through the county and city coordinators.

The Results

During the three years of major activity, victory gardens made big contributions to the total food production. It is estimated that in New York State alone, one and one-half million gardens were planted, covering each year about two hundred thousand acres. The estimated value of vegetables produced was over twenty million dollars. In Greater New York City alone, more than 168,000 gardens were reported with a production of about 400,000 tons of vegetables. The persons named above should receive much credit and praise for the skill employed in keeping so many statewide agencies and leaders working as a team. As in the case of county agricultural and home demonstration agents who operated so very well in their respective fields, the county 4-H club agents in upstate New York were responsible for the down-to-earth gardening operations. Here again, it was demonstrated that extension agents could function in action as well as

educational programs. These trained men and women not only carried out the responsibilities of their regular 4-H projects with boys and girls, but secured large additional enrollments in 4-H clubs besides conducting the garden campaign with adults.

The Victory Garden Council a Part of the Food Commission

On March 31, 1943 the Food Commission approved the recommendation of the State Victory Garden Council that official recognition be given to it as well as the County and City Councils. Then the State War Council designated the State Victory Garden Council as its official body on Victory Gardens and recommended that the local war councils take similar action with regard to county and city victory garden councils. The State War Council placed the Victory Garden program under the general supervision of the Food Commission with the writer, a member of the Commission, in charge.

Rationing Farm Supplies

Because of the shortage of many essential items for successful farm operation such as tractors, trucks, binder twine, electric motors, wire fencing, gasoline, building supplies, and rubber tires, the farm leaders, through their separate organizations, but more particularly through the New York State Agricultural Defense Committee and the Food Commission, were instrumental in aiding farmers and distributors in obtaining the State's share of these essentials.

Here again the county agricultural agents bore the brunt of this problem. A farmer in need of advice and assistance turned to the one person he knew he could depend upon—the county agent. With their many other war-time jobs, the agents depended on the College administration for specific information and interpretations of Federal directives.

Responsibility for this tedious, difficult job was given by the Director of Extension to Richard F. Fricke, Associate State Leader of County Agricultural Agents. He was especially well qualified for this responsibility. By nature he was meticulous and exacting, and by training and experience he had learned how to digest the complicated Federal directives, boil down the details to the important essentials, and interpret these for use by the county agents. He provided each agent with a loose-leaf notebook in which could be placed, for ready reference, the many simplified Federal directives concerning priorities, price supports, and ceilings. These were kept up-to-date at all times throughout the emergency. This was one of the most useful and appreciated services during the entire emergency.
Extension Wartime Councils and Extension Minutemen

The campaigns, programs and projects described previously in this bulletin were tied to those sponsored or directly related to undertakings of the Federal or State governments. Many additional programs were developed and sponsored by the Extension Service of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. In preparation for these and to furnish a coordinated vehicle for all wartime extension activities, the Director of Extension with the approval of the two deans established the State Extension Wartime Council (see appendix E) with a personnel representative of all departments and offices and with many sub-committees. The Director served as chairman; Dean Sarah G. Blanding, vice-chairman; Charles A. Taylor, executive secretary and Martha H. Eddy, assistant secretary.

This Council met for one hour once each week on Saturday mornings during the intensive part of the emergency. Later it met once every other week; then once a month and finally on call. The first meeting was held on March 9, 1942—the last, including the entire State extension personnel, on October 8, 1945.

The sub-committees listed in Appendix E met as often as necessary to take care of current situations developing in their particular areas and reported their findings to the Council. The Council referred the recommendations to the proper agencies or persons for action. At no time did the Council operate as an administrative or a direct action agency. The sub-committees did operate somewhat in the educational action field.

Upon recommendation of the Director and with the approval of the State Extension Council, county extension wartime councils were organized. The pattern in the counties differed from the State pattern. While there was a certain degree of flexibility, in general the membership of the county council consisted of the County Farm and Home Bureau and 4-H Club Association Board of Directors, the professional personnel and a few others such as former Association directors and officers.

Details of the organization on state and county levels including extension minute-men are given in the mimeographed statement (reproduced below) of the Director of Extension issued March 12, 1942 under the title:

Streamlining the Extension Service

EXTENSION MINUTEMEN

In normal times, at the Colleges and in the counties, programs can be formulated and carried on through three separate branches and with a minimum of central coordination. In wartime there is need of streamlining the Extension Service. This has been done at the State level. Twelve special Extension wartime committees composed of representatives from both colleges are at work. These committees are not confined to members of the Extension staff, but include heads of departments and research workers.

The chairmen and executive secretaries, plus a few others, compose the Extension Wartime Council. This Council is not administrative. It serves as a medium through which the activities of all committees may be discussed and integrated. Suggestions are made for the improvement of committee work and for undertaking additional activities.

Counties will not be asked to adopt plans which are similar to those now in effect at the Colleges, nor urged to institute a set pattern of coordination and integration. The Central Committee, or the Board of Directors, is well qualified to study local conditions and develop a plan best suited to such conditions. The need is apparent for some plan to reach every farm and village family with authentic important information quickly and to collect from them needed facts.

The State Extension Administrative Staff does recommend a pooling of local resources, particularly the farm bureau, home bureau, and 4-H committee men, by means of an over-all system of "minutemen". During peak load periods a pooling of the services of all agents and office secretaries and of equipment is desirable, even though it may mean a temporary lag in the less important activities of one or more of the departments.

We again urge a careful reading of the so-called "Extension Charter" (The Memorandum of February 11, 1942 from Secretary Wickard to Director M. L. Wilson). While this Charter does not meet fully the expectations of Extension, yet it is such an improvement over any previous document of its kind that it has received general commendation.

The following statements in the Charter are particularly significant:

"First of all I am looking to the Extension Service to carry forward on every sector of the farm front the general educational work in agriculture and home economics essential to the success of our war-time job."

"The Extension Service is recognized as the responsible subject-matter agency that taps the scientific and economic information of this Department (USDA) and of the State Experiment Stations and uses this information in a practical way in guiding farm people in all phases of farming and homemaking in the most comprehensive sense.

"The Extension Service is the only organization in this Department and in the States and local communities which works constantly with every research, regulatory, service, and action agency."

"...I ask that the Extension Service assume the leadership in the following:

(a) "Organize rural America for defense against destructive fires
(b) "Organize and direct educational campaigns among farm people for improved nutrition and for the production of farm-home food supplies
(c) "Organize and direct campaigns and aid in organizing rural people for the improvement of health
(d) "Organize and direct rural and community gardening
(e) "In cooperation with State and County Councils for Defense, organize and direct certain phases of Civilian Defense affecting farm people
9. These neighborhood, group, or “block” minutemen need few get-togethers on a community or township basis. They probably would wish to meet more often in the neighborhoods. Probably they should be visited occasionally by the local chairman or one of the agents. Please remember the chief job of the minutemen is to give out timely information and gather important facts as needed.

10. Material sent to minutemen, or requested facts, may be sponsored by the State Extension Service, the County Extension Wartime Council, the Township or Community Wartime Council, the local chairman, or by one or more of the county extension agents.

11. Timely authentic information such as rural fire protection, priorities affecting the rural farm and home, production quotas, health and other protective measures, material for discussion groups, labor and equipment, will be mailed or telephoned to minutemen.

12. Minutemen should not be burdened with minor information or that which can be given out through the press or by radio. They should not be given so much to do that it becomes irksome.

13. Direct line communication should be established from the minutemen to the county and state offices, and vice versa. The local chairmen will be most effective in connection with telephone communication.

14. Frequently a minuteman can save foot work by having announcements made in schools and other groups, such as Granges, which meet regularly.

15. A distinctive button, or other insignia, and a printed folder in which to place essential material will be furnished by the State Extension Service to each minuteman. Material from the College will bear a distinctive heading.

16. This is strictly a volunteer set up. Naturally, those persons accustomed to receiving a per diem from any of the action or other agencies, would give free services as minutemen.

17. Minutemen should receive letters of appointment, preferably from the Association President. A complete up-to-the-minute list of all county Minutemen should be on file in the County and the State offices.

18. In enlisting the services of minutemen, it is legitimate to use the patriotic appeal. A rural man and woman, young or old, can render no more important service to the Nation.

It is hoped that the extension agents and the association directors will not look upon this proposal as just one more thing. It is very important and in line with similar developments in many other States. It has the unanimous indorsement of the Executive Committee of the New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations.

Create only as much new machinery as seems necessary to get the job done. Perhaps a simple plan is better at first, with additions later.

The State Director of Extension and each member of the Administrative Staff solicits suggestions from the county groups at all times. It is only through constant refinement that any plan can be made most effective.

L. R. Simons
Director of Extension

To illustrate the kind of information mailed to minutemen, a typical letter is reproduced on the following page.
Subject: Minute Man Promotion

To ALL COUNTY AGENTS:

The two most important questions to consider with respect to the Extension Minute Man movement are:

1. Are the Minute Men themselves conscious of the fact that they are Minute Men and do they understand their functions?
2. Is the public generally informed of the Minute Man movement in your County?

I am quite convinced that we could answer this in different ways in different counties. The publicity that has gone out from some of the counties on the rubber campaign has been excellent. I am sure that people in those counties understand to a large degree at least what the Minute Man movement is about. In other counties, it is just a rubber campaign without giving attention to the organization that is operating it in the rural sections. I think we have obligations immediately if we have not already done them. Many agents already have, I know.

1. Set about very definitely to get farm people to understand the neighborhood idea as dramatized by the Minute Man system.
2. See that plenty of publicity and contacts of all sorts are established with the general public so that we are sure that the purpose is generally understood.
3. There are other minute men; emphasize Extension Minute Men.

After talking with Mr. Arnoldy, who is in charge of the State salvage campaign and with Mrs. Pennock, who is Director of Civilian Mobilization, State War Council, I am quite convinced that the Minute Man system, even with many weak spots, is doing a better job than the organizations in the city. You will be interested to know that farmers started delivering salvage before many gas companies had notified their local agents.

We should not be satisfied, however, until this type of service is available to all rural sections in New York State.

If you have any circulars or any publicity that have been particularly effective, we would appreciate getting copies of them so that we may pass these good ideas along and so that we may keep a record for our files. I am enclosing one sent out by Wilbur Pease of Wyoming County which was effective. Here is the way Madison and Rensselaer counties got their salvage letters out. I suspect others moved as rapidly. The wire left the office Saturday afternoon at 4:00 p.m. and Saturday night and Sunday they prepared a circular which was in the rural peoples' hands on Monday morning. Simultaneously with this release was a radio and newspaper release by wire from the State Office which was in the press on Sunday and on the radio Sunday and Monday, and secured as prominent a place as any of the other announcements on the salvage campaign. When the Extension Service can deliver this rapidly, we have no fear for its future.

I know this may sound a bit cheap, but the Extension Service must hold its head above water at the same time that it is doing a job. That is why I laid particular emphasis on these points of salesmanship.

Many counties have organized their Minute Men on a township basis with a township chairman. This is very effective. You may want to consider it.

I am going to write you from time to time information and suggestions which we get, because I believe that the Minute Man system, if properly developed, can be a vitalizing factor for the whole Extension Service and reach a large group of people who have never been actively touched by Extension before.

Sincerely yours,

EARL A. FLANSBURGH
County Agent Leader

Since no great catastrophe had happened within the United States, such as an invasion by foreign troops and no major destruction by "fifth columns" organized to destroy crops, livestock and shipping facilities, the minutemen could not undertake the major activities for which they were particularly organized. Naturally their morale diminished and many wondered if their assignments were worth while. In order to bolster their morale, Earl A. Flansburgh who was in charge of minutemen organization, or the secretaries of the county wartime councils would issue a "morale" letter from time to time. The following is an example:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS STATE OF NEW YORK

Dear Extension MINUTEMAN:

After Pearl Harbor, we all realized that anything might happen.

Farm people asked themselves: Is the enemy fifth column organized to destroy crops and livestock in this country; what if our coastal cities should be bombed; could the enemy actually invade our mainland?

More particularly, people in rural New York asked: What will we do if saboteurs should destroy our shipping facilities? What will we do if New York City, bombed by the enemy, should send a thousand evacuees to be cared for in our county? How can we be sure we are doing everything we can to produce the food-sinews of war, in face of shortages which may arise in any one of hundreds of things needed for production?

In other words, we did not know what situation we would have to meet in rural New York communities; but it seemed best to organize at once so that
every community and every rural home could be contacted quickly if need should arise, so that local neighborhoods would have a way to let county or state officials know, should a local emergency arise.

Each agricultural county in the state quickly organized Minutemen in every neighborhood.

Minutemen responded loyally and at once. They gladly accepted the responsibility of being the links between their neighborhoods and county extension wartime councils.

The Minuteman organization was an emergency organization for the emergency period. We dare not assume that this emergency is past, in spite of the splendid showing of our armed forces. We are glad that some of the things for which we prepared did not happen.

In the meantime, Minutemen in all the counties have done many useful things. They have been responsible for the united action in rural areas on such things as rationing, salvaging fats, metals and other war-critical materials, labor problems, shortages of machinery and supplies, Victory Gardens, bond sales and many others.

As secretary of the County Extension Wartime Council, I wish to thank you for your patriotic response to the request of the council that you act as Extension Minuteman in your neighborhood. I wish to thank you, also, for your effective work in the numerous campaigns and other help that, as a Minuteman, you have given the council and your country.

Though we do not expect to suffer invasion, we ask that you continue to stand by, prepared to act should real emergency arise, or should the government wish to transmit important information to all rural people, or to secure information from them.

Sincerely yours,

County Extension Agent
Secretary County Extension Wartime Council

Public Information

Extension Wartime Bulletins and Service Letters

A series of war emergency bulletins was instituted by the Extension Service in both colleges ranging from War Emergency Bulletin No. 1 “Hay for the Dairy Herd” by E. S. Harrison and H. B. Hartwig, to War Emergency Bulletin No. 121 “Fertilize Victory Wise in 1943” by E. L. Worthen. In between there were bulletins of all kinds, some with several illustrations. A few titles were “Mobile Kitchens” by Katharine W. Harris, Ella Cushman, and Margaret Floria; “Eat Well to Work Well” by Clive McKay, Christine A. Feller, Therese E. Wood. These were mostly 4 page, sometimes 8 page, bulletins, printed in large numbers and distributed widely, many through county extension agents.

The Victory Garden series was prepared and distributed in a separate series and paid for from special Food Commission funds.

In addition several series of service letters were prepared and distributed to a select list of such groups as florists, beekeepers and dairymen.

In general, public information was well conceived and carried out by a competent staff of writers, photographers, and illustrators. Special mention should be made of the work of Bristow Adams, Elmer Phillips, James Knapp, Charles Taylor, and Nell Leonard. As stated previously, the public information relating to the farm labor program was handled effectively by Hugh Eames and late in the campaign by Betty Burch.

Not All Federal Wartime Projects Approved by State Workers

The Federal government instituted a fat campaign in 1942 on the basis that it was needed to produce glycerin for war explosives. Apparently this was an abortive effort because all evidence pointed to the fact that fat was not needed for that purpose in this country. However, because the campaign posters, folders and other printed material had been prepared and distributed, the officials in charge refused to either withdraw the material or change the purpose to a collection of fats to prevent a soap shortage.

The Extension Wartime Council requested the writer to protest this action, and Director M. L. Wilson was informed that the New York State Extension Service would participate in a fat collection campaign for soap making but not one based on a glycerin shortage. New York State proceeded on that basis and all misleading material was junked.

Summary World War II

To summarize the effects of the work of the various parts of the streamlined Extension Service, the Director made certain statements at the final meeting of the State Extension Wartime Council and other staff members on October 8, 1945, given in part below as taken from the minutes of that meeting:

Director Simons reviewed the activities of the extension wartime council and its sub-committees during the war. He explained that the work of the council as a wartime institution is completed and that some other general assembly of the staff seemed to be needed for the period of reconvension. To accomplish this he stated that one hour meetings of this group had been suggested on the following dates—November 5, December 9, 1945 and January 7, 1946.

He emphasized the importance of rural policy committees on both state and county levels for the guidance of farm and home policies and also the work of the Extension Service. He feels that Extension’s chief job in the immediate
future is to help farm families to acquire the greatest efficiency, in order to operate successfully under declining price situations.

He recalled that the "minutemen" in the counties were organized to transmit and secure information in cases of emergency. They functioned in connection with several national campaigns notably war bonds and collections of scrap iron, tin and paper. We did not require their services often because of the difficulty in using their cars due to the scarcity of rubber and gasoline.

No doubt if the Japs had landed on the West Coast or the Eastern Seaboard cities had been bombed, the minutenemen would have performed outstanding services. The last recorded number of minutenemen in New York State was approximately seventeen thousand. This included large numbers of women especially in the villages and smaller cities. Minuteman was a generic term including women. The minutenemen organization has been discontinued.

Wartime extension activities were carried on along with the regular programs, many of which were not greatly curtailed and some were intensified, such as food and nutrition for both humans and animals. As previously mentioned extension forces were augmented by much additional paid personnel and many regular staff members who were drafted from the research and teaching staffs of both colleges. It is commendable that as work slackened at the colleges because of fewer students to be taught and fewer assistants to be supervised in the laboratories and the fields, these college staff members were willing to devote their time to extension activities. However, the armed forces in their need for manpower obtained the majority of those of draft age.

It has been said many times that there is no great loss without some small gain. This could be applied to extension in wartime. Many sacrifices were made and many extra long hours were contributed in the patriotic effort of producing food to help win the war. Although regular work suffered somewhat, the compensating effect of successful war work more than offset this and resulted in increased prestige for extension. It seems people were amazed that an educational agency could adapt itself so readily to an intensive action program.

In addition to their usual responsibilities the President of the University, the deans and directors in the several colleges served on Federal or State wartime committees or councils. They were consultants to many others. The writer, like most other directors of extension, spent about as much time away as he did in his office. His additional appointments included, on the Federal level, membership on the U. S. Department of Agriculture Committee on Wartime Extension, U. S. Department of Labor Committee on Young Workers in Wartime Agriculture, and Farm Labor Consultant to the American Farm Bureau Federation; on the regional level—a member of the Farm Labor Advisory Committee to the Regional Manpower Commission.

On the State level, the writer was a member of the New York State Emergency Food Commission, a member of the Division of Labor, Industry and Agriculture of the State War Council, chairman of the State Victory Garden Council and a member of the USDA State War Board.

Without the hearty cooperation of competent associates on the state and local levels such a tremendous load of responsibility could not have been undertaken and accomplished. Also, the Extension war programs could not have succeeded so wonderfully well.

The author of the publication The Empire State at War in commenting on the striking success achieved by the New York State Food Commission states:

There were many reasons for these splendid achievements. Most fundamental of all was the basic soundness of New York's prewar agriculture. Her individual farmer was an intelligent operator of superior efficiency. The farm organizations during the years had built up a leadership which was competent and respected. The program of research and the state-wide agricultural extension service, which were developed at Cornell University and were designed to encourage the application to agricultural practice of the latest methods and discoveries, reflected the wisdom and foresight of the people of the state. Especially important was the close cooperation existing before the war and needing but further development, between the farmers and the Extension Service of the State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. Taken together these factors supplied a firm foundation upon which to build a wartime program for food production.

War brings heavy financial obligations to government. There was apprehension in New York State that because of the great need for funds to carry on the military war effort, extension might suffer. On the contrary, all public appropriations for extension were maintained on all levels and in fact all appropriations were increased, especially by the boards of supervisors in the counties. In making these increases, appreciation was expressed by officials and citizens in all walks of life for the war undertakings and accomplishments by the Extension Service. This expression was intended to cover not only the professional workers at the state colleges and in the counties but the thousands of volunteer officers, leaders, and committee men of the county farm and home bureaus and 4-H club associations.

Preparedness for war, diligence in maintaining active cooperation of all participating organizations and personnel, vigilance and determination combined, brought about a continuing successful war program. These factors not only produced the desired results during the emergency but also established the Extension Service as not just a peacetime educational agency but one capable of adjusting to an action program to meet almost any emergency at any time.
The war effort could have brought about a decline in prestige or even a complete collapse of the Extension Service. In this case it resulted in a stronger organization, a dedicated personnel, and the admiration and respect of all citizens.

THE POSTWAR PERIOD

Reconversion

Extension’s role in the period immediately following the second World War was as important as that during the war and perhaps about as difficult. As stated previously in this bulletin, the chief responsibility of extension was to help farm families to acquire the greatest efficiency in order to operate successfully under declining price situations.

By means of the new technique and modern means of communication, the extension service with the backing of the researchers in both colleges prepared and promoted a postwar program in agriculture and homemaking. Of course, this was done in full cooperation with the local extension leaders and committeemen.

Space does not permit the printing of these plans and procedures. Mention should be made of one device, first of its kind in about twenty-five years, “The Farm and Home Special”.

An eight car train was provided and operated by the New York Central and Erie Railroads. It was often referred to as the Cornell Farm and Home Week on Wheels. The regular Farm and Home Week on the Cornell campus had been discontinued during the war because of the lack of facilities. The large influx of veterans for study occupied all available rooms and eating facilities. It had been hoped that the regular Farm and Home Week events could be restored on campus in 1946. The fall registration of students convinced the sponsors that it must be postponed another year. As a substitute the demonstration train, carrying many of the exhibits and the accompanying lecturers out to the people, was devised. Thus the thousands who visited Cornell during the peacetime Farm and Home Week needed to travel only a short distance to observe and hear about the new developments in farming and homemaking.

The exhibits were provided by the staffs of both colleges, Agriculture and Home Economics, and were explained to visitors by sixteen specialists. These exhibits were mostly housed in closed cars but a few, such as buck rakes and hay blowers, were on flat cars. To assist with the demonstrations, county agricultural, home demonstration and 4-H club agents came aboard at the various stops along the route. The exhibits and demonstrations stressed the possibilities of saving labor and improving farm production and homemaking practices.

Much local news and radio coverage preceded and followed the “College on Wheels” so that a large number of people might view the exhibits and also that those who could not attend might know where and how to obtain at least some of the knowledge obtained by the

The Cornell Farm and Home Special drew crowds along its 2000 mile route
train viewers. A large variety of bulletins were displayed on a bulletin rack. Thousands of orders for bulletins were taken and forwarded to the college for future delivery.

The train traveled 2000 miles in upstate New York on the New York Central and Erie Railroads during the first three weeks of April, 1946. It made 41 stops in 37 counties and was visited by 68,000 people. With the capable management of Prof. Paul R. Hoff and with the complete cooperation of the other specialists, researchers and county agents, the train was a success.

THE CHEMUNG RIVER VALLEY FLOOD—1946

The storm clouds that swept over the New York-Pennsylvania border May 27-28, 1941 released such a torrent of water that the area was devastated by the overflow of the Chemung River and its tributaries. The severest damage was confined almost entirely to the river flats although there was some erosion on the hill farms. This area had seen high water before and the Chemung River had overflowed its banks but never with such disastrous effects. Some homes were completely washed away and many had water half way up the first floor. Chemung County received the greatest damage although the southeastern corner of Steuben was badly inundated. Several blocks of residential and business places were flooded in Elmira.

It was a common sight to see people hosing out the first floor of their homes and pumping out the cellars. Furniture was ruined and several residents were without a pure water supply. Practically all utilities in the area were out of commission or partially crippled.

Following the procedure used in other emergencies, the extension director's representative, L. D. Kelsey, was on the spot soon after the flood, working with county extension agents. First he appraised the extent of the damage; second he helped coordinate the work of the governmental and private agencies. This was of great service to the rural areas, since the damage in the city of Elmira was drawing the attention of the medical and other public services out of proportion to the need in rural areas.

To accomplish both purposes, the officers of the county farm and home bureau and 4-H club associations met hurriedly and decided to do two things. They called together the representatives of all farm organizations, the Red Cross, public health officials, and credit organizations to consider what each could do to be of most help to farm families. Also they appointed two committees—one of farm bureau members to make a down-the-road survey of damage to farms and one of home bureau members to survey the farm homes. As they made the survey, the women distributed college booklets "First Aid for Flooded Homes" and bottles of Halazone tablets for chlorinating drinking water, which were obtained from the army depot. The booklets had been prepared by the New York State College of Home Economics following the big flood of 1935. These contained valuable information on ways to clean up and avoid infection. Homemakers were delighted to receive them.

At the central meeting of organization leaders, the relief function of each agency was decided. It was reported that soap was badly needed by homemakers to clean their homes and their clothing. Through the cooperation of the Red Cross and the Cooperative G.L.F. Exchange, the soap was secured in bulk. It was packaged by volunteer home bureau members and distributed by their district chairmen to all farm families needing it.

The Red Cross requested the Home Bureau to make a survey of suburban homes. At subsequent
meetings of the agencies' representatives, additional needs were examined and duties assigned.

From the very beginning, representatives of the several agencies gave timely information to home owners and farmers by means of the radio, telephone and magazines. For example, the Chemung County home demonstration agent, Charlotte K. Runey's talks on the day of the flood, and daily for two weeks following, were devoted to suggestions for repairing flood damage to the home and the garden. The other extension agents and other agency representatives gave similar talks on subjects in their particular fields. The Red Cross explained how farmers could receive help from the Red Cross.

Through the influence of Chemung County 4-H Club Agent, E. C. Grant, packets of seeds were made available by the Red Cross for those whose vegetable gardens had been destroyed.

The Red Cross established two centers outside the city where farmers could register their needs. These were located at Wellsburg and Big Flats.

One of the continuing pressing problems was the sterilization of drinking water. Upon the advice of the State Health Department representatives, chlorinated lime was distributed to various points in the area, and through publicity, people were urged to procure this lime and use it according to the mimeographed sheets of instructions.

The county agricultural agents, as they should be, were concerned primarily with rehabilitation of the farm lands and crops. Robert Boehlecke of Chemung County was especially busy because of the much larger area flooded in his county and the greater need for assistance. He reported in part as follows:

Many requests were received on how to handle some of the badly damaged land and what to do for some of the flooded crops. Arrangements were made, through Professor L. D. Kelsey, with Prof. E. L. Worthen from the Agronomy Department at the College of Agriculture to visit this area and to make recommendations on handling the land and the crops. A letter was sent out with these recommendations.

Many electric motors were flooded and needed complete overhauling before being returned to use. Arrangements were made with the Department of Agricultural Engineering to set up a clinic to handle this work. Their portable electric motor clinic was set up in the county highway garage. All eleven of the district agricultural engineers were sent here from all over the State. They worked on these motors, helping their owners clean them up, bake them dry and reassemble them. This service proved of great value in getting these motors back into operation again. Also the New York State Electric and Gas Corporation furnished engineer personnel to work on this problem.

Many tractors and trucks and other farm equipment were flooded and likewise in need of repair. Arrangements were made with local implement dealers to have engineers supplement their normal force and clean up this equipment in the shops of the dealers. The dealers gave priority to this type of work for their own mechanics.

Following the initial steps of reorganizing, another meeting of the committee was called to meet with the Red Cross officials to determine what financial help could be given to the flooded people. The Red Cross officials outlined their services and asked that rural people register their needs at their two centers in the area.

By the middle of June most people had recovered fairly well from the effects of the flood. Much of the replanting was done and most of the buildings had been cleaned up. The weather continues adversely so that many crops will make a very poor showing this year. Some of the farms were damaged also by two wind storms which followed the flood and caused considerable damage.

A tribute should be paid to the people for their courage in reestablishing themselves following such a disastrous flood. Most everyone took it in stride and worked to get back to normal again. Credit is due also to the various individuals and organizations who spent time and energy in this emergency.

If he had not been too modest he might have added that without the leadership exercised by himself, the other agents in Chemung and Steuben counties and by L. D. Kelsey representing the State Extension Service, the job could not have been done on time and so well.

The Chemung County home demonstration agent, Charlotte Runey summed it up in her final report, "Without an established organization such as the Extension Service, it would have been impossible to bring aid so quickly to those in need."

Similar activities were carried on by the Extension Service in Steuben County. County agricultural agent William Stempke reported in part as follows:

At the request of the farmers a motor repair clinic was set up at the Dann farm in Painted Post where District Engineer Nathaniel Chadwick supervised the cleaning of over 100 motors.

Immediately after the flood a survey was conducted in Steuben County which showed a loss of 79 cows, 29 head of young cattle, 3600 turkeys, 1460 hens, 908 chicks and 39 swine. Three hundred and ninety acres of corn were drowned out. Two hundred and twenty-one acres of peas, 90 acres of wheat, 290 acres of oats and 52 acres of vegetables were lost.

Three hundred and ninety acres were damaged either by erosion or deposit. Twelve houses suffered major damage, 14 minor. Twenty-one barns suffered severe damage, 14 minor and 36 smaller buildings such as range shelters were washed away.

If this amount of damage was done in only a small portion of Steuben County, the much greater amount can be realized on the larger area damaged in the Chemung area.

The Ithaca Journal carried a long story about the flood under date of June 3, 1946. Parts of it are given on the following page.
All eleven district agricultural engineers of the New York State Extension Service are converging today in the flood stricken areas in Chemung and Steuben counties. They are taking with them a mobile service truck unit with all necessary tools and equipment. This was announced today by Director of Extension L. R. Simons.

Farm damage is considered intensive in about 10 townships. The farm and home bureau committees report that hundreds of farmers suffered severe damage and more than 1,000 rural homes have been seriously affected. Hundreds of rods of barbed wire fence have gone down the river. Until a new supply is provided the cattle must be kept indoors. Additional feed is required and efforts are being made to get it.

South of Elmira, in a vegetable growing section, the crops have been washed out completely or inundated beyond recovery.

Not only was the extension personnel able to materially aid the flood sufferers where they needed aid the most, and in the rehabilitation of their fields and homes, but also with the friendly cooperation of the neighborhood committee, encouraged farm families to go forward with greater confidence and higher morale.

FINALLY

Many other emergencies and catastrophes have required the active participation of the Extension Service forces. Hardly a year passes that some region or locality does not suffer severe damage and hardship. The far western states have had many catastrophic floods and forest fires. The central western states and parts of the south have had many disastrous cyclones and floods. The hurricanes causing tremendous destruction and loss of life along the entire eastern seaboard could be mentioned also.

In all of these the extension forces have participated with a splendid record of accomplishment. No doubt these accomplishments have been recorded and the participants have received proper recognition. As stated in the beginning of this bulletin, the writer has attempted to deal with only those emergency enterprises in which he has participated. It is hoped this may provide a useful record as a partial guide for those who may be faced in the future with similar responsibilities.

APPENDIX A

(From December 1940 CURRENT EPISODES)

The New York State Agricultural Defense Committee

On June 22, 1940 the New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations, anticipating the need of a group to mobilize farm resources for defense and to prevent unnecessary hardships to farm life and business growing out of the disturbed world conditions, organized the New York State Agricultural Defense Committee, the first of the kind in this country. (Disbanded 1945)

Fred Sexauer, Chairman of the Conference Board (Dairymen's League), Chairman
Herbert P. King, Farm Bureau Federation
Mrs. H. M. Wagenblass, Federation of Home Bureaus
W. J. Rich, State Grange
Wessel Ten Broeck, Jr., Horticultural Society
Henry Marquart, Vegetable Growers
Leigh G. Kirkland, G.L.F. Exchange
William Mapes, Poultry Council
Carl Wooster, Agricultural Conservation Administration
Harold Peet, Soil Conservation Service
Millard Davis, Farm Security Administration
H. B. Munger, Production Credit
Harold M. Stanley, Land Use Planning Committee
John Riech, Jr., 4-H Extension Federation
E. S. Foster, Secretary of the Conference Board—Secretary

APPENDIX B

Farm Labor Advisory Committee

(Sub-Committee of the Regional War: Manpower Commission). Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, Commissioner
Joseph P. King, Farm Placement Supervisor, United States Employment Service, Chairman
T. N. Hurd, State Farm Manpower Service
L. R. Simons, State Extension Service
Miss Henrietta Rothstein, Farm Coordinator, USES (New York City)
Ralph Y. DeWolfe, U.S.D.A. War Board, New York State
Newell S. Hutchinson, Dairymen (St. Lawrence County)
Joseph P. Morgan, Vegetable Grower (Erie County)
William Mapes, Poultryman (Orange County)
APPENDIX C

1943

New York State Emergency Farm Labor Operating Staff

L. R. Simons, Director of Extension
L. D. Kelsey, Assistant to the Director
S. R. Shapley,* State Farm Labor Supervisor (Succeeded by R. A. Polson; E. K. Hanks succeeded Polson)
Mrs. Martha H. Eddy, State Supervisor, Women's Land Army
R. A. Polson, Asst. State Farm Labor Supervisor, Mobilization
Ernest R. Hall, Asst. State Farm Labor Supervisor, Housing
F. E. Heinzelman, Asst. State Farm Labor Supervisor, Supplies
Elmer S. Phillips, Asst. State Farm Labor Supervisor, Visual Aids
Hugh F. Eames, Asst. State Farm Labor Supervisor, Information
Clarence G. Bradt, Labor Utilization Specialist
Charles Howard, Asst. Director, U. S. War Manpower Commission
Joseph P. King, Asst. Director, United States Employment Service
Joseph Suggen, District Farm Placement Supervisor, USES
Charles Abbey, Farm Labor Supervisor, New York City, USES
T. N. Hurd, Director, State War Manpower Service
W. J. Weaver, State Supervisor, Farm Cadet Victory Corps, State Department of Education
Avery D. Gentle, State War Manpower Service, District Supervisor
Harry N. Haight, State War Manpower Service
Leo D. Allen, District Supervisor
R. Tyler Space, State Director, Farm Security Administration
Thomas Atterbury, Representative, Association of New York State Canners

*Presiding chairman at committee meetings.
Personnel changed somewhat from time to time, but in general the above positions were maintained and organizations were represented.

APPENDIX D

New York State Emergency Food Commission—Appointed March 23, 1943

H. E. Babcock, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Cornell University, Chairman*

Affiliation

A. W. Carpenter, Eastern Federation of Feed Merchants, Feed-Seed-Fertilizer
C. C. DuMonde, Commissioner, State Department of Agriculture and Markets, Executive Director†
T. N. Hurd, Director, Farm Manpower Service, Farm Labor
L. A. Maynard, Director, Cornell School of Nutrition, Nutrition
J. F. McAllister, Feed Merchant, Community Facilities and Farm Machinery
W. I. Myers, Dean, New York State College of Agriculture, Production
H. H. Rathbun, Vice-President, Dairymen’s League, Transportation and Gasoline
L. R. Simons, Director of Extension, Farm Labor and Victory Gardens
H. M. Stanley, Secretary, New York State Grange, Farm Supplies and Farm Machinery
Mrs. R. W. Straus, New York City Civic Leader, Nutrition-Metropolitan Area
Warren W. Hawley, Jr.; President, New York State Farm Bureau Federation
Earl C. Foster, Executive Secretary

*H. E. Babcock resigned December 16, 1943 and was succeeded by H. M. Stanley.
†Deceased July 23, 1945
‡Added to Commission later.

APPENDIX E

New York State Extension Wartime Council*

First Meeting, March 9, 1942
L. R. Simons, Chairman
Sarah G. Blanding, Co-chairman
Charles A. Taylor, Executive Secretary
Martha H. Eddy, Assistant Secretary

*Personnel changed in a few instances but the committees remained the same.
Sub-Committees

Better Living on the Farm from the Farm
Inez Prudent, Chairman
Orrilla Wright, Executive Secretary

Cities and Larger Villages
Ruby Green Smith
Lillian Shaben

Discussion Groups
Martha H. Eddy
F. B. Morris

Farm Labor
L. A. Muckle
T. N. Hurd

Farm Machinery
B. B. Robb
S. R. Shapley

Food for Victory—Production
E. A. Flansburgh
R. F. Fricke

Food for Victory—Marketing
W. I. Myers
M. C. Bond

Health and Safety
Martha H. Eddy
Iva Mae Gross

Nutrition
C. M. McCay
Carrie W. Taylor

Publications and Information
Bristow Adams
Charles A. Taylor

Recreation
Dwight Sanderson
Dorothy DeLany

Rural Fire Protection
V. B. Hart
Helen P. Hoefer

Soil Conservation
L. D. Kelsey
W. C. Huff

Victory Gardens
E. C. Thompson
Albert Hoefer

Research
C. E. F. Guterman

Finance
R. H. Wheeler