

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS

STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL
COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE, COOPERATION

EXTENSION SERVICE

Narrative Report.

Louisa County Wheat Program.

I. The county and conditions.

Louisa, as all other counties, has its own problems of political factions, church differences, school animosities, Court House Organization, and social woes. However, the economic conditions of its people is the grave question of the day and its proper solution rests all other questions of financial policy and educational and agricultural development. The future of the county rests solely upon its agricultural development and it has a wide and varied agricultural industry composed of dairying, beef cattle, hogs, sheep, poultry, tobacco and the growing of general farm crops. The economic condition is bound to be serious when butter fat is 15¢ per lb., wheat 80¢ per bu., beef cattle 3¢ per lb., and other things in proportion that the farmer sells and the things he buys correspondingly higher. Wheat is a universally grown crop and is used extensively in feeding stock by reason of its cheapness. With a population of over 14,000 people allowing 5 bu. per capita would be 70,000 bu. and I feel confident that a very large part of the 105,000 bu. produced in the county is consumed in feeding livestock. With this in view the question of whether the county produced enough for its own needs often arose at meetings both public and private. It is true that much wheat was bought from the west for milling purposes and I was informed of that fact as soon as I arrived in the county. A meeting of the merchants and millers was called soon after I arrived in the county. We had Mr. Hummel and Mr. J. H. Quisenberry explain to them the plan in detail. We secured our growers lists from threshermen and mail carriers but I feel this list was not complete as there were some men who got their mail locally who were left off our list. There were no farmers organizations of any kind and only at Apple Grove was there an agricultural community spirit and this was due entirely to the efficient work of its Agricultural Teacher, Mr. A. W. Kay, and also being in an exceedingly good type section. The county has a good rotation of corn-wheat-clover.

*Nothing to
insert
Holl*

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

EXTENSION SERVICE

THE VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL
COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

Wheat producing sections were Holly Grove, Gold Mine, Green Spring, Apple Grove, Frederick Hall, Buckner, Mt. Garland, Bright Hope, Macedonia, Bells, Yanceyville. Non-producing sections were Forest Hill, Bumpass, Centerville, Zion, and Lewisville.

Our first meeting was held at Louisa Court House with a fine attendance. Those seated in the back of the building did not, the speakers and left before the meeting closed and this resulted in some confusion and the departure of some of the men who were needed to perfect an Educational Campaign but from that time on meetings were held in communities and they elected their own men to assist in the work. By reason of so many farms and supporting evidence some men hesitated to get their neighbors to sign but all showed a fine spirit of wishing to help solve a serious problem and those who only raised wheat for home use felt they should not sign. Meetings were held as follows: Apple Grove (both white and colored), Hopeful School, Salem Church, Shellfar School, Macedonia Church, Gallilee Church, Bright Hope Church, Zion Church, Mechanicsville Church, Forest Hill School, Gold Mine Church, Trinity Church, Frederick Hall Lodge, Buckner School, Louisa High School, Louisa Court House, Mt. Garland Church, and Frederick Hall School.

Because we were late getting our first educational meeting over we could not hold the second and had to go on with the sign-up instead. If we could have held these second meetings the results would have been very much better. The reaction of the people to a strange program presented by a stranger was very gratifying. We had no difficulty in perfecting an organization. The men really seemed desirous of helping in any way they could. The clerical work of completing applications and contracts was done in the office by the secretary-treasurer of the association, Miss Maxwell Quisenberry, and much detail work had to be done also. The community committees did their work in a fine spirit and the Allotment Committee worked on the budget faithfully till completed. The ministers of the various denominations cooperated splendidly, also the local editor, Mr. Blake, and the county Superintendent of Schools and Mr. Kay in particular. I was anxious to have at least 100 signers and no withdrawals but this could only be done by lots of personal work.

I worked a few days extra and the last day, Nov. 7, I went to see 4 different farmers in the evening in different parts of the county and 2 of them I suggested signing and the

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

EXTENSION SERVICE

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL
COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE, COOPERATION

other 2 I advised not to sign but to raise enough wheat for their own needs.

It took me 30 days to locate communities and men. A large number of them never attended meetings and only by seeing them on their farms could I reach them. I had to date back my applications to take care of such cases.

The rural need of Louisa County is safe and sane rural community leadership at this serious time and I am hoping the community committees of the various organizations will do much along this line.

Thomas D. Burfoot

Emergency Agrl. Ast.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS

U.S. Department of Agriculture
and State Agricultural Colleges
Cooperating

Extension Service
Office of Cooperative Extension Work
Washington, D.C.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENT
TO
ANNUAL REPORT OF COUNTY EXTENSION WORKERS
YEAR ENDING NOVEMBER 30, 1933

State: Virginia County (or counties): Louisa

Report of _____ Agricultural agent.
(Name)

_____ Home demonstration agent.
(Name)

_____ Boys' and girls' club agent or assistant.
(Name)

Thomas D. Surfoot Emergency agent.
(Name)

DIRECTIONS

This report form is for use of regularly employed county extension agents and temporary emergency agents, for reporting all work relating to production-reduction campaigns, relief activities, and other emergency work engaged in during the year. This report supplements but does not displace the regular annual statistical report of cooperatively employed agents, on form 285.

This report should be prepared as a single report for the county by all county extension agents and emergency agents working as a committee. Each individual agent should discuss in the regular narrative annual report his or her part in advancing the emergency work included in this supplement.

Where an emergency agent is the only extension worker employed in the county he should fill out this form and accompany it with a full narrative account of his work. In case the emergency agent works in several counties the report should cover the entire area worked in, and be so labeled.

Where the services of the emergency agent are discontinued prior to November 30, 1933, this schedule should be filled out before the agent leaves the county.

Two copies of this report should be sent to the State extension office, one of which will be forwarded to the Federal Extension Service.

PRODUCTION-REDUCTION CAMPAIGNS

ASSISTANCE RENDERED THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

Name of assistance or activity	Cotton	Wheat	Tobacco	Total
	00	00	00	
Agricultural agent				
Home demonstration agent				
1. Days devoted to campaign by agent or agents				1
Boys' and girls' club agent				
Emergency agent		75½		
2. Days State extension workers assisted in campaign in county		31		3
3. Smith-Hughes teachers assisting in campaign		1		3
4. Days such Smith-Hughes teachers assisted in campaign		32		4
5. Number voluntary county or community local leaders assisting in campaign		20		5
6. Total days spent on campaign by such local leaders		20		6
7. Farm visits made to explain plans for reducing production		478		7
8. Office calls to discuss reducing production		330		8
9. Individual letters written in interest of campaign		1335		9
10. Circular letters written for use in campaign		20		10
11. Total copies of such circular letters mailed		2905		11
12. News articles relating to reducing production furnished local papers		18		12
13. Meetings held to advance campaign		36		13
14. Total attendance at such meetings		654		14
15. Farms for which production-reduction contracts were completed		80		15
16. Total reduced production contracted for on such farms (acres, animals, etc.)		198		16
17. Number of farmers following advice of agent in the planting of replacement crops or other use of land removed from production of basic crops		80		17

* Insert name of any other crop or livestock enterprise on which a definite production-adjustment campaign has been conducted in your county.

