A study of the impact of the soil bank program on the common schools of five selected counties in coastal Georgia

Theron Spencer
*Atlanta University*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/dissertations](http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/dissertations)

Part of the *Education Commons*

Recommended Citation

A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM ON THE
COMMON SCHOOLS OF FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES
IN COASTAL GEORGIA

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, ATLANTA
UNIVERSITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

BY

THERON SPENCER

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

ATLANTA, GEORGIA
AUGUST, 1963
DEDICATED

to

Dr. Laurence E. Boyd

T. S.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express his most sincere appreciation to Doctor Laurence E. Boyd, Chairman of the Thesis Advisory Committee and Doctor Edward K. Weaver, Co-advisor, for their untiring service, sympathetic understanding, and helpful suggestions during the course of this study.

The writer also expresses his fullest appreciation and genuine thanks to: (a) the identifiable farmers (owners, renters, sharecroppers); (b) the County Clerks and Chambers of Commerce; (c) the County Agents and Home Demonstration Agents; and (d) the school principals, all of the five-locale counties, who executed the questionnaire or furnished official records or granted interviews through which the requisite data were furnished.

My sincere thanks go to Mr. R. E. Kicklighter, Superintendent of Tattnall County Public Schools, for permission to do this study.

T. S.
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA LOCATION MAP</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution of the Problem</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Educational Thought</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation of the Problem</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locale of Study</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the Subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the Instruments and Materials</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Procedure</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of the Data</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Related and Pertinent Literature</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Related Literature</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Statement</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the Soil Bank Program by the State of Georgia</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Payments and Terms of Contracts</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Farm Use Payments</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation by Individual Counties</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Land Use Pattern</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Trends in Five Selected Counties</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage Allotment System and the Soil Bank</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic Pattern of Five-County Area</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift from Row Crops to Livestock</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Soil Bank and Crop Reduction</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are Tenants and Sharecroppers Protected?</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight of the Tenants</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline of Tenantry in the Five Selected Counties</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment in Schools of Predominant Rural-Farm Environment</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long County (Walker High School)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattnall County (Collins Elementary School)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattnall County (Glenville, Seckinger Elementary School)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toombs County (Vidalia, Dickerson High School)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County (Screven, Screven Elementary School)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution of the Problem</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Educational Thought</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation of the Problem</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locale and Research Design of Study</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Related Literature</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Basic Findings</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIBLIOGRAPHY</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPENDIX</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen of Letter From Senator Herman E. Talmadge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen of Statistics on the Soil Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen of Letter to Superintendents and Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen of Questionnaire for the Superintendents and Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VITA</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Types of Acreage Use in the Conservation Reserve</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Soil Bank) Program in Georgia, 1956-1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Annual Payments and Terms of Contracts in Conservation Reserve</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Soil Bank) Program in Georgia, 1956-1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Types of Farm Use Payments in Conservation Reserve</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Soil Bank) Program in Georgia, 1956-1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participation in &quot;Soil Bank&quot; (Conservation Reserve Program) in</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-County Area, 1956-1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Farm Land in Five Selected Counties, 1959</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Total Value of All Farm Products Sold in Five Selected Counties</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Change in Average Size of Farm and Land Tenure in Five Selected Counties, 1949, 1954, and 1959, Respectively</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enrollment and Average Daily Attendance in Public Schools in Five Counties, 1954-1959</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Distribution of Enrollment in Public Schools Showing Impact of the Soil Bank, 1954-1959</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Area Location Map of Five Selected Counties</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of Farms in Five Selected Counties, 1959</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ratio of Cropland to Total Land Area In Selected Counties, 1959</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Per Cent of Total Land Area in Five Counties in Farms, 1959</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total Value of Farm Products Sold in Five Selected Counties, 1954-1959</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Total Value of All Farm Products Sold in Five Selected Counties, 1959</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cotton Acreage Harvested in Five Selected Counties, 1958</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tobacco Acreage Harvested in Five Selected Counties, 1958</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Peanuts - Acreage Harvested in Five Selected Counties, 1957</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Corn Acreage Harvested in Five Selected Counties, 1958</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vegetables Sold From Farms in Five Selected Counties, 1954</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cattle and Calves in Five Selected Counties, 1959</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Whole Milk Sold From Five Selected Counties, 1959</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hogs and Pigs in Five Selected Counties, 1959</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Total Population in Five Counties, 1960</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Number of Negro Farm Operators in Five Selected Counties, 1959</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Number of Negro Tenant Farmers in Five Selected Counties, 1959</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Percentage of Tenantry Among Negro Farm Operators of Five Selected Counties,</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Property Valuation by Race in Five Selected Counties, 1955</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Total Non-White Rural Farm Population in Five Selected Counties, 1950-and</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Change in Number of Teachers in Schools in Table 10 Showing Impact of the</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil Bank Program, in Five Selected Counties, 1954-1955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>New Classrooms Constructed in Schools Selected for Study in Five Counties,</td>
<td>68A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1954-1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 -- Evans County
2 -- Long County
3 -- Tattnall County
4 -- Toombs County
5 -- Wayne County
Rationale. — The "Soil Bank Program" had its beginning under the Eisenhower Administration in 1956. It had two parts: acreage reserve and conservation reserve. Under the first, a farmer agreed for one year not to grow crops such as corn, wheat, or cotton on land normally used for the purpose; he would be then paid by U. S. Treasury on the basis of the estimated net profit he would have made on the crop had he planted it. It is that half of the soil bank plan that the House struck down after only a one-year trial at a cost of $260 million.

At the same time the House recommended the other half of the president's plan; the conservation reserve, under which a farmer contracts for a period of one year to stop growing surplus crops on land which can be planted in trees, pasture, or put to certain other conservation uses. The Treasury pays the farmer a subsidy during a transitional period.

The most telling argument against the acreage plan was that it failed to lower production. Another was too much of last year's $260 million went to large corporation-type farms, such as: McCarthy and Hildebrand (California) $29,773; J. W. B. Farms, (Colorado) $45,817; and Gorvey Farms (Cal and Koso) $61,354.

---

Governmental agencies, in rendering services to a group, often affect the operative capacities of other bodies by virtue of their relationship. Such is the case of the "Soil Bank Program." This program, in rendering service designed to curb farm prices and over-production of farm products, had created problems which far outweigh the services rendered. These problems are related to school attendance on the part of the students and unemployment on the part of parents and other adult patrons of the community in question. These adults, unable to find satisfactory employment as a result of the squeeze put on them by the "Soil Bank Program," find it necessary to become rehabilitated to other vocations.

This study was concerned only with the "Soil Bank Program" as it affects the adults and students as they are concerned in their relationship with school, and not the ramifications remotely related to the school program.

The nature and characteristics of the "Soil Bank Program" are as follows:

1. A program designed to curtail overproduction of farm products.

2. A program designed to maintain an acceptable price program for farm products.

3. A program which benefits and pays off the landowner or landlord for a planned program of the use of available acreage.

4. A program which results in increased migration from the farm-rural areas to industrial-urban areas.

5. A program which encourages unemployment and depopulation.

1 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
6. A program which adds to burdens of urban centers.

7. A program which indirectly and without design encourages unemployment and depopulation.

The source of the proposed problems of this research can best be definitized in the series of questions which follow:

1. Why institute a farm program costing millions of dollars which aids the landlord, but at the same time displaces the majority of dedicated farmers who are not landowners?

2. Why should the federal government institute a program to depopularize rural counties while adding to the social and economic burdens of urban centers?

3. Why should the federal government, in these times of emphasized equality and integration, deliberately discriminate against the landless Negro in the deep South?

4. With reference to children in the rural community, why should the federal government institute a program which would result in their being forcibly transferred from new consolidated school buildings with more than adequate facilities to crowded urban schools with double sessions and less than adequate facilities?

The above discussions of the government's concern and action in meeting the challenge of changing and crucial socio-economic patterns; the definitizing of the nature and characteristic of the "Soil Bank Program" in meeting a social challenge, together with crucial questions pertinent to the "Soil Bank Program" constitute, in the writer's opinion, the valid frame-of-reference for the research project here under study. Two important factors facing the "Soil Bank Program" are (a) the decreasing school attendance and school closing down, and (b) the loss of farm labor, the shift of population to urban centers, and the redirection of adult pursuits for those remaining.

Evolution of the Problem.— The inauguration, growth, extent, and
impact of the "Soil Bank Program" which has seriously impaired and/or has tended to impair the educational program in the five selected coastal counties projected the problem for this study.

Further, during the past two years the writer has been a principal of a school in one of these counties vexed by the impact of the "Soil Bank Program" and has witnessed at first hand the shifting educational and economic patterns provoked by the "Soil Bank Program."

Therefore, he deemed it would be quite fruitful to use this socio-economic problem of his and adjacent counties as the problem for his thesis research.

Moreover, since the writer is a school principal and lives in a community fully impacted by the above described "Soil Bank Program," he has come to have a pointed interest in the exploration of all facets of this program with its concomitant social forces as they have influence upon the educational enterprise in the school community.

Contribution to Educational Thought.-- It is felt by the writer that the continual loss of students from the schools of rural communities as a result of the "Soil Bank Program" will result in the loss of the many prospective workers who would ordinarily remain in these areas. If a too large proportion of these students are taken from any one community, it will sap that community of its potential leadership in the various spheres of life, i.e., education, religion, industry, and the like. It is felt that this study will show the immediate and probable future loss of desirable young people who will be deprived of the opportunity of maturing into full citizenship
within the environs of their childhood and youth. Further, it is felt that the continuing loss of adult citizens and their economic value strikes at the stability of the local tax base for the support of schools in those communities with a full-fledged "Soil Bank Program." Therefore, the findings of this study might well serve to focus attention upon the crucial need for educators and citizens to come up with a newer formula for determining the financial support of schools in areas being continually depopulated by the impact of the "Soil Bank Program."

**Statement of the Problem.**— The problem involved in this research was to develop an analysis and interpretation of the impact of the "Soil Bank Program," with reference to; extent of the program, its effects upon school attendance and operation, the shift of population, and acreage curtailment, in five selected coastal-wise counties of Georgia for the period of 1956 through 1961.

**Limitation of the Problem.**— The major limitations to the successful approach to this problem inhere in:

1. The availability of the pertinent data.

2. The willingness and ability of prospective subjects to submit pertinent information.

**Purpose of the Study.**— The major purpose of this research was to determine and interpret the extent to which the impact of the "Soil Bank Program" has effected beneficially and/or adversely the educational enterprise and population-economic patterns in the five selected counties: Toombs, Evans, Long, Tattnall, and Wayne; Georgia, 1956-1961.
The specific purposes of this research were to determine:

1. The overall extent of the "Soil Bank Program" in the five counties during the 1956-1961 period.

2. The number of farmers taken in by the "Soil Bank Program" during the five years of 1956-1961.

3. The extent of population decline in the five counties during the five years of 1956-1961.

4. The shift in school populations in the counties during the five years of 1956-1961.

5. The direction and extent of population mobility caused by the "Soil Bank Program" during the 1956-1961 period.

6. The kind and amount of farming curtailment in the five counties during the five-year period of 1956-1961.

7. The extent of the decrease in rural elementary and high school enrollment during the 1956-1961 period of the "Soil Bank Program" in these five counties.

8. The extent to which displaced farm workers have found employment in the town of the respective county or elsewhere during the period of 1956-1961.

9. The extent to which "pockets of population" in the rural areas of the five counties have disappeared or have been crucially decimated during the 1956-1961 period.

10. The implications, if any, for educational theory and administrative practice as may be derived from the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Definition of Terms.— An official government document entitled A General Explanation, The 1960 Conservation Reserve states:

The Conservation Reserve of the Soil Bank provides for the withdrawal of cropland from production more nearly in line with demand. At the same time it provides that farmers establish and maintain sound conservation practices on the land they put in the Reserve.¹

Locale of Study.-- This study related to a situation and a problem which the writer has had first-hand acquaintance with during the recent years. For the past two years the writer has been principal of Collins Elementary School, Tattnall County, Georgia, a rural county. The major portion of the pupils of this school come from the farming areas of the county. For six years prior to the writer’s principalship at the Collins School, he was on the faculty of the Tattnall County High School, Reidsville, Georgia, a rural farm-center.

The majority of the parents, about 99 per cent, of the pupils of the Collins School are engaged in farm activities. In accordance with the established social and economic pattern of the rural South, a few of these parents are independent landowners; however, a vast majority of the parents are either renting or sharecropping. This vocation for them is an established way of life to which they have been adjusted since childhood; for their parents before them followed the same vocation. The knowledge, skills, and understanding of planting, cultivating, and harvesting, are vital parts of their life experiences. Although many of them are poor in material goods, they are not afflicted with frustration and psychic pressures which one generally finds among the poor laboring class in the urban industrial environment.

Method of Research.-- The Descriptive-Survey Method of research, employing the questionnaire, U. S. records and interviews, was used to collect the data required for this study.

Description of the Subjects.-- The subjects of this study were: (a) the identifiable farmers (owners, renters, sharecroppers); (b) the
school pupils; (c) the County Clerks and Chambers of Commerce; and (d) the County Agents and Home Demonstration Agents, in each of the five selected counties within the purview of this study.

Description of the Instruments and Materials.— The data-gathering instruments were: (a) U. S. Bureau of Census Reports showing trends in population movement in the five-county area, (b) U. S. and Georgia State records of the production of basic farm commodities, (c) U. S. records of the "Soil Bank Program" during the 1960 period, (d) interviews with important and knowledgeable participants, (e) a specifically designated questionnaire on the crucial elements of the "Soil Bank Program" as affecting average daily attendance in schools, decline in total school population, and effective classroom utilization.

Method of Procedure.— The method of procedure followed in this research was as follows:

1. The related literature pertinent to the problem of this research was reviewed, summarized, and incorporated in the thesis copy.

2. The anticipated subjects were contacted in order to orientate them to the purpose and needs of the research.

3. The questionnaire on the "Soil Bank Program" was constructed and validated under the direction of competent staff members of the School of Education, Atlanta University.

4. The administration of the questionnaire and holding interviews with the "Soil Bank Program" participants. The examination of the U. S. records.

5. The assemblage of the collected data into appropriate tables and graphs as the basis for the interpretation of the data.

6. The data were statistically treated with reference to the frequency and per cent of the data items. Wherever indicated other types of statistical treatments were utilized.
7. The formulation of the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for inclusion in the thesis copy.

Collection of the Data.-- The amassing of research materials and data for this study began in the winter of 1959-60. The writer contacted the office of Senator H. E. Talmadge explaining his interest in the effectiveness of the "Soil Bank Program." In reply the Senator provided the writer with valuable material and data relating to Georgia's participation in the conservation reserve program for the years 1956 through 1960.

Officials of the various county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees were helpful in providing data of a technical and statistical nature.

County superintendents were gracious in their ready response to the prepared questionnaire (the same having been formulated with the assistance of my esteemed Atlanta University advisor).

The personnel of the Agricultural Extension Service of Savannah State College were indeed gracious in encouragement, advice, and assistance; moreover, the writer was given free use of their extensive library of technical and statistical resource material.

The thesis outline was developed and approved at the close of the 1961 summer school session. During the fall months of 1961 the questionnaire and interview schedule sheet were developed and validated.

During the months of January and February of 1962 the questionnaire was distributed to the farmers in the "Soil Bank Program" in the five counties. The interviews with farmers, farm agents, Extension Service personnel, school superintendents and principals were conducted through
out the long period of the months of January through June of 1962.

The assembly of the data from the questionnaires and interviews was carried out during the months of July through December 1962.

The survey of the related literature was accomplished during the months of January 1962 through January 1963. In addition, there was a continuing perusal of the literature and/or printed materials throughout the period of the study.

During the months of January through March of 1963 the draft of the thesis copy was developed; and submitted to the advisors the third week of April, 1963.

Review of Related and Pertinent Literature.— The Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank) included provisions for federal financing and assistance to farmers for converting general cropland to conservation uses, including the planting of trees. In 1957, after the first full year of operation under the Act, the United States Department of Agriculture reported a total sign-up of 536,000 acres of farmland for planting trees in the conservation reserve phase of the "Soil Bank Program."

The planting by all agencies, public and private, totaled 915,428 acres in 1956. Of the area planted for forest purposes, 256,938 acres were planted by forest industries; 46,139 by other industries; 83,641 by federal agencies, 62,268 by state and other public agencies; and 438,667 by farmers and other private landowners. In addition to the

---

forest tree planting, 27,775 acres were planted for shelter belts or
wind barriers. The 1956 total of planting by all agencies showed an
increase of over 100,000 acres more than the 1955 figure. On June 30,
1957, the area of the 149 national forest and related lands under
administration of the forest service was 180,915,054 acres. During the
fiscal year 1957, the national forests supplied a total of 6,974,000,000
board feet over the 1956 cut. Receipts from the sale of timber,
grazing fees, and other uses of land under forest service administration
in the fiscal year 1957, amounted to $113,288,763, a small decrease
from 1956.

The government is paying farmers billions of dollars so they won't
grow stuff . . . and we get stuck with high prices. In 1957 some
5,235,000 acres of land were taken out by corn farmers, 12,785,000 by
wheat farmers, and 3,015,000 acres by cotton farmers. As a part of
this program, this part of the soil bank, called the acre reserve, has
been dropped; but the conservation reserve portion is still in effect.
Farmers are asked to put some portion of their land into trees and an
annual rental is paid the farmer for each year up to ten years.

In 1957, Business Week gave a mixed appraisal of the "Soil
Bank Program." It turned in some answers this week to a question
that has been puzzling farm equipment and supply industries for
six months: Does the Soil Bank Program—with its payments to
farmers to draw land from cultivation—help them?

On the face of it, pumping some $600 million into farmers
pockets this year, in return for not cultivating 21.6 million
acres, would seem to be a strong stimulant.

2 Ibid., pp. 42-43.
But the verdict is a mixed one and helps explain last week's surprising action by the House in killing the most important part of the soil bank.

The Southerners are leading the uprising against the soil bank for two reasons: first, most of the money goes to other areas; second, Southern businessmen in small towns are complaining. Few congressmen report dissatisfaction from farmers themselves.\(^1\)

Mr. Ezra Taft Bentson has said there has been "technological explosion" on American farms—an explosion which has helped to make possible the high standard of living, but which at the same time has forced millions of persons to leave the farms. The census bureau estimates that more than 1.6 million persons left the farms between April 19, 1957—the largest year's exodus on record—and that the farm population in the last seven years has declined by 4.7 million.\(^2\)

The writer feels that there is an abundant need for the food reserves, which accrue if there were no soil bank program. With people the world over in need, certainly we can at least relieve them of hunger if not other needs.

One of the great domestic issues confronting the 85th Congress is the question of determining solutions to the problems of American agriculture. Problems of agriculture are not new. For nearly 40 years the Congress and the Executive branch of the Federal Government have sought through various methods to stabilize farm prices and income.\(^3\)

That the search, by both Congress and the Administration, continues is indicated by the hearings held in December, 1957, by the Subcommittee

---

\(^1\) Ibid.


on Agricultural Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, and by the special message sent to the Congress on January 16, 1958, by President Eisenhower in which he outlined his recommendations of agricultural legislation. This message was first of the 1958 series of special messages on specific topics to be transmitted by the President to the Congress.

The problems confronting the farmer are complex in the extreme. In an effort to stabilize farm income and preserve the purchasing power of agriculture, numerous measures have been enacted over the period of the last quarter century. The laws provide that the Federal Government not only will support prices at levels of parity, but also will control production of the supported commodities through acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

The highlights in the development of this legislation are given on the following page. Operations of existing price programs of the Federal Government, other than the price support program, are summarized elsewhere.

In supporting the processing of farm commodities vast stores of these products are accumulated by the United States Department of Agriculture. This has made it necessary to provide methods for disposal of these surpluses.

Although the major portion of the 1959 budget of the United States Department of Agriculture is allocated to its price stabilization activities, the United States Department of Agriculture carries on

Ibid.
many other programs designed to promote the welfare of agriculture and
the general public.

Created in 1862, the Department of Agriculture conducts extensive
research in agricultural and industrial chemistry, industrial uses of
farm products, entomology, soils, agricultural economics, marketing,
crop and livestock products, human nutrition, home economics, forestry
and conservation.

It administers the national forests, and, in cooperation with
the states, promotes better protection and management of forests on
private lands. It aids farmers in planning and installing erosion-
control and other soil and water conservation measures on their farms.
The Department also provides Federal meat inspection service, and
seeks to eradicate and control plant and animal diseases and pests.
More than 50 regulatory laws are administered by the United States
Department of Agriculture to protect the farmer and the consuming
public.

Of these programs, greatest controversy surrounds those designed
to bolster the farm economy. Critics attack both the programs them-
selves and their administration, as shown by the recent appearance of
Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, before the Senate Committee
on Agriculture to testify in support of the Administration's program.
Most Senators present were critical either of the proposals or the

1 United States Department of Agriculture, Science in Farming,
2 Ibid., pp. 1-57.
actions taken by the United States Department of Agriculture.

This controversy, of course, is heightened in an election year, when legislators are caught between demands of farmers and demands of consumers for low food prices. Often overlooked in this dilemma are the costs of processing between the farmer and the consumer.

Historically, the so-called "farm bloc" of Southern and Midwestern members of Congress has exerted great power, not only in agricultural legislation, but also in other areas. In recent years this power has been waning due partly to the decline in farm population and partly to cleavages created within the farm bloc by differences over legislation. Of great significance, however, is the fact that 100 years ago the farm population represented 85 per cent of the United States total, while today, only 15 per cent of the total population reside on farms. The main problem is that through technological and scientific advances, less manpower is required to produce increased quantities of food and fiber for a greater population.

Widespread disagreement exists on the proper approach to the farm problem, as will be seen in the many pros and cons to the subject. The Administration's program seeks to revise existing policies and to move toward a gradual reduction of government control of Agriculture. Critics, however, declare that agriculture, in an era characterized by bigness in business and labor, not only is entitled to government assistance, but also that it is essential to the survival of

---

agriculture. These arguments and others will be heard frequently over
the next eight months as Congress and candidates debate the question
of farm policy.

Clearly, despite seasonal price fluctuations that may seem
temporarily to favor the farmer, he is caught in a deep and abiding
depression and when one recalls that the farm economy is still the
economic basis of small-town America, it is easy to project the farm
depression into a small-town depression. As soon as farm incomes fall
off, retail sales slow down, automobile sales virtually stop, the
hungry local printer underbids city shops and has his nonunionized
employees work all night at no extra pay, bank deposits begin to go down
and bank loans rise. A deep sense of pessimism, whose equivalent can
only be found by going back to 1933, pervades rural life today.

Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, in an address delivered
before the American National Cattlemen's Association at New Orleans,
January 10, 1956, had this to say in defense of the Soil Bank Program:

We are blessed in America as are few other people by the
abundance with which our agriculture can produce. Yet the
biggest difficulty we face in our farm problem is the mountainous
surpluses that have accumulated—the results, I repeat, of wartime
incentives too long continued .

To meet the twin problems of surpluses and diverted acres—to bring supplies into better balance with what our markets can
profitably absorb—the President has recommended a Soil Bank.
It is a Soil Bank of two parts—one immediate and short range
in affect, the other pointed toward longer—time adjustments.

---

1 M. H. Stand, "Some Hard Facts for America" in Nation's
One part of the Soil Bank proposal has been called an Acreage Reserve. It would be voluntary and temporary. It calls for a temporary cut in production of the crops now in greatest surplus. Through temporarily reduced production it would provide opportunity to work down accumulated surpluses to more normal levels.

The essence of the recommendation is that farmers will voluntarily reduce planting below their acreage allotments. In return they will receive certificates equal to a specified percentage of their normal yield on the acres they withhold. The certificates will be negotiable so farmers can convert them to cash. They will be redeemable by the Commodity Credit Corporation either in cash or in actual commodity at a specified rate.

This rate will be set at an incentive level high enough to assure the success of the program.

Because his income will be protected in this manner the farmer will contract neither to graze nor to harvest any other crop from acres he puts into this Reserve.

The second part of the Soil Bank proposal is pointed both toward achieving needed adjustment in land use and overcoming some of the problems created by acres already diverted out of surplus crops. This part is called a Conservation Reserve. Farmers will be asked to contract with the government to shift land out of cultivated crops and into forage or trees and where feasible to ponds and reservoirs. Any farmer will be eligible to participate, regardless of the crop he grows or where his farm is located. He will be paid a fair share of establishing the cost of the forage or tree cover.

Senator Barry Goldwater in speaking before the American National Cattlemen's Association in January, 1960, stated that:

For 30 years we have experimented with farm programs. Supports and controls and subsidies now extend to 30 percent of our farm products and after 30 years of failure we are still experimenting.

And what have we experienced by this thirty years of failure? We have succeeded in making the farmer the whipping boy of our economy.

---

Since 1953, the government has disposed of some 16 million dollars in surplus commodities overseas below cost. And we still have 9 million dollars left. Farm surpluses today are three-and-a-half times as large as they were at the beginning of 1953. Carrying charges, transportation, interest and the cost of storage amount to more than one billion dollars a year—or $2,739,726 a day.

Each year in Washington the statisticians with their slide rules have estimates of cotton production.

The cotton farmers of Arizona, when they found their planting limited to a certain number of acres, improved their technology. They used more fertilizer, they were more careful in their cultivation, and they succeeded in producing a greater total yield of cotton on a substantially decreased number of acres.1

A gloomy picture of farm affairs was described for the United States as a whole in The New York Times for March 29, 1958:

1. Net realized income from farming declined from $17 billion in 1952 to 13.9 billion in 1957. 2. Net income of farm families from all sources dropped from 23.1 billion to $20.2 billion. 3. While total per capite income of farm families rose from $953 in 1952 to $993 in 1957, the part derived from farming dropped from $702 to $684. 4. According to the Mid-March index, farm prices were still 8.5 per cent below 1952 levels and costs were 5 per cent higher. The parity ratio had dropped from 100 in 1952 to 87 per cent at Mid-March (or, to put this another way, the prices the farmer was receiving were 87 per cent of the prices he was paying).2

Noting the price decline during the period, the New York Times states:

The result of such drops in farm prices and losses in income has been to drive farmers from the farm. Between April, 1956, and April, 1957, the United States Census reports, the farm population declined by 1,861,000, or about 8 per cent. Between 1950 and 1957 farm population dropped from 25,958,000 to 20,396,000, a drop of 18.6 per cent.3

3. Ibid.
The Atlanta Constitution emphasizing the movement from rural areas to town states:

The farm-to-city movement was emphasized Tuesday with Census Bureau reports showing Atlanta now has the second largest percentage of Negroes among major cities in the country.

Atlanta's population of 487,555 includes 186,464 Negroes, or 38.3 per cent of the residents. Only Washington, D. C., with Negroes comprising 53.9 per cent of the city's 763,956 residents, has a larger percentage of Negroes.

New York City had the largest number of Negroes, 1,087,931 or 14 per cent of the total population of 7,781,984. Next in line were Chicago with 612,637 Negroes; Philadelphia 529,240; Detroit 482,223; Washington, D. C. 411,773; Los Angeles 334,916 and Baltimore 326,589.

Five of the 25 largest cities reported one-third or more of their population are Negroes. In addition to Washington and Atlanta they are New Orleans 627,524 white residents and 233,514 Negroes for a percentage of 37.2; Memphis 497,524 white, 326,589 Negro for a percentage of 34.8.

In the spring of 1960 The Atlanta Constitution noted that:

A recent study of school enrollment trends by the Atlanta and Fulton County Education Commission indicates Negro school enrollment will exceed white enrollment by 1965 or 1966.

Enrollment for 1961 shows 54,291 white and 49,190 Negro elementary and high school students in Atlanta. The projection for 1965 calls for 54,931 Negro and 52,105 white students.

In the March 22, 1961 issue of the Savannah Morning News, Senator

---

1 The Atlanta Constitution, March 4, 1960.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
Herman Talmadge, D-Ga., addressing the Houston County Farm Bureau, Saturday night declared: "All of the facy formulas and high-sounding schemes for solving the farm problem will be worth less than the paper on which they are written unless they have as their basis the solution of this country's number one economic ill; that is, farm income of less than one-third that earned in other segments of the nation's economy." Talmadge stated the Agriculture Department has under Benson's direction "spent more since 1951 than during all the previous 90 years of its existence combined. Yet, despite all his spending and all the power Congress has given him, Mr. Benson will leave office with the distinction of having reduced farm income by 24 per cent and forced more than five million persons to leave the farms of America."

Further, Talmadge said, farm program dollars are wasted unless they go directly into the pockets of the farmers and nothing less than a direct approach will be sufficient for coping with the issue.

It is well and good to talk about soil banks, strategic stockpiles and food for peace. But those are cures directed at the symptom rather than the disease. Back door approaches are no longer sufficient because the problem has reached crisis proportions and nothing short of bold and decisive action can save the country's agricultural economy.

Who participated in the soil bank in New York state?

There is little doubt that land put into the Conservation Reserve was being little used for farming--some of the land would have passed completely out of use in a short time without the program. A majority of the cooperators either never had

---

1 Savannah Morning News, March 22, 1961, p. 5.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
been full-time farmers or had left full-time farming prior to putting their land under contract.¹

Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, is of the opinion that government regulation of the business of farming is not a good thing. This was clearly stated by Mr. Shuman in his annual address to the 42nd Annual Convention of the A. F. B. Federation.

Congress should quickly discard such discredited ideas as . . . compensatory income payments, comprehensive supply control and other schemes calling for governmental interference in the farming business.

In addition we must look to the Congress to repeal the detrimental laws and legislative authorities that it has created in the past.²

The low-income rural resident truthfully presents a problem, and though such persons are engaged in agricultural activity, their basic problem is one which is psycho-sociological rather than purely agricultural.

The vast majority of the low-income rural families are sharecroppers precariously perched on the lower rungs of the ladder of tenancy. These people appear to be indolent and lazy, preferring to live the simple life. Although this attitude is debatable, no one questions the indisputable fact that much of this social maladjustment is the product of gross discrimination and inadequate education.

Moreover, minimum wage laws have tended to legislate such people out of jobs for rates of pay have been established at higher levels than their productive capacity normally warrants. In connection with this problem, Nation's Agriculture states:

One of the important ways to improve opportunity in a rural community is through better educational and vocational training programs. As the capacity and ambition of the people improve, capital tends to seek labor and new industries are established. As the desire for a better life is stimulated, these rural folk either find productive work in the community or relocate where opportunities are greater.¹

Summary of Related Literature.— Many farmers who fall in the marginal or submarginal category eke out a precarious living which is substandard and barely on the subsistence level. In all fairness to the federal authorities, one must admit that definite concern has been shown for those million and a half farmers who receive less than a thousand dollars a year from all sources. (This is about 40% of the total number of farmers in the nation.) The "Soil Bank Program" has been one among several devices resorted to assist in solving the farm problem.

1. In the short run the "Soil Bank Program" has been beneficial to land owning farmers. They received cash money from the government for allowing their fields to lie fallow. Overall production, however, of farm commodities have not declined for cash benefits were used to defray the costs of more intensive cultivation of allotted acreage.

2. The tenant and renter because of the program has had to seek employment elsewhere. This has hastened the trend of families from the farm to industrialized towns. This in turn has had an adverse effect on the economy of rural counties and rural towns. With reference to schools, in some instances a spur was given to consolidation.

¹ Ibid.
3. In a number of instances there has resulted accelerated depopulation of rural counties. Thus the "Soil Bank Program" has aggravated rather than helped the problem of surplus farm production.
CHAPTER II

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introductory Statement.-- The purpose of this chapter is to present, analyze and interpret the data derived from (a) United States Census Reports showing population status and movement in the five selected counties, (b) United States and Georgia State records of the production of basic farm commodities, (c) United States records of the "Soil Bank Program" during the 1960 period, (d) interviews with important and knowledgeable participants, and (e) a specifically designed questionnaire on the crucial elements of the "Soil Bank Program" as affecting average daily attendance in schools.

The presentation, analysis and interpretation of these data are shown in comparative tables, simple visual graphics; and, whenever possible, use had been made of elementary sketch-map descriptions of items under discussion.

The "Criteria of reliability" for these data were (a) the through-going accuracy of official Federal and State statistical records, and (b) the indisputed accuracy of school records from the offices of county superintendent of schools and of principals of schools.

The recapitulation of the research design; summary of the literature; findings, conclusions, implications; and recommendations are reserved for presentation in Chapter III.

Participation in the Soil Bank Program by the State of Georgia.-- The analysis of data presented in Table 1, 2, and 3 shows the type and
extent of Georgia's participation in the "Soil Bank Program." Technical terminology of the headings, however, require explanation. A grand total of 1,050,686 acres are in the "Program." Of this total 61 per cent or 641,389 acres comprise whole entire farms (producing no

### Table 1

**TYPES OF ACREAGE USE IN THE CONSERVATION RESERVE (SOIL BANK) PROGRAM IN GEORGIA, 1956-1960**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Acreage Use</th>
<th>Number of Acres</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total All Types</td>
<td>1,050,686</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Farms</td>
<td>641,389</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Farms Regular</td>
<td>389,565</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Farms Non-Diversion</td>
<td>19,732</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Present Cover</td>
<td>53,547</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and Maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Vegetative Cover</td>
<td>997,139</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Sharing</td>
<td>305,431</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Expense</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>688,834</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam, Pit, or Pond</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Cover</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Marsh Management</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Senator Herman E. Talmadge
### TABLE 2

ANNUAL PAYMENTS AND TERMS OF CONTRACTS IN CONSERVATION RESERVE (SOIL BANK) PROGRAM IN GEORGIA, 1956 - 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Expiration of Contracts</th>
<th>Annual Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>$6,212,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>193,803.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>131,608.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1,208,595.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>791,872.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>16,068.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>856,313.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1,748,491.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4,259,730.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2,788,129.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Senator Herman E. Talmadge

crops whatsoever) placed in the "Program." Farm owners receive payments nevertheless for such land held out of production. Under the heading "Part-Farms Regular" 389,565 acres, or 37 per cent of total acreage in the "Program" is land normally allotted for the production of crops under acreage restriction (cotton, peanuts, or tobacco).

"Part-Farms Non-Diversion" refers to acreage not given to production of restricted crops. In this category are 19,732 acres, which
### TABLE 3

**TYPES OF FARM-USE PAYMENTS IN CONSERVATION RESERVE (SOIL BANK) PROGRAM IN GEORGIA, 1956-1960**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Farms</th>
<th>Annual Payments</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total All Types</td>
<td>$12,000,827</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Farms</td>
<td>7,917,816</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Farm Regular</td>
<td>3,980,041</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Farm Non-Diversion</td>
<td>162,970</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Senator Herman E. Talmadge

is 2 per cent of the total acreage in the "Soil Bank."

"Maintain Present Cover" refers to 53,547 or 5 per cent of the total acreage placed in the "Soil Bank" wherein acceptable conservation farming is already in progress (young forest or improved pasture).

By far the greater portion, 997,139 or 95 per cent of the total acreage, is in the category "Establish and Maintain New Vegetative Cover."

Of the "New Vegetative Cover" the item "Trees" is by far the more popular item accounting for 688,634 or 69 per cent acres of the "Establish and Maintain" category.

"Adequate Cover, Cost Sharing" item is inclusive of 305,431 acres or 32.7 per cent of acreage to be "Establish and Maintained." "Cost-Sharing" refers to the practice of the government defraying part of the cost of conservation land improvements. Examples are such items
as dams to control water runoff, or irrigation practices that save or make more effective use of water or reduce soil erosion on land now in agricultural production. However, aid is not given when new land is brought into production.

For the state as a whole only a very small acreage, namely 514 acres or 0.05 per cent of the total acreage is included in contracts wherein the government is not to assist in cost of improving land.

A very small portion in the "Soil Bank Program" is included in three categories: (a) Dam, Pit and Pond with 259 acres or .02 per cent, (b) Wildlife Cover with 1,991 acres or .2 per cent, and (c) Wildlife Marsh Management with 110 acres or .01 per cent respectively of the total acreage.

**Annual Payments and Terms of Contracts.**— The United States Department of Agriculture enters into a voluntary contract with the individual farmer to retire cropland from production and devote it to conservation uses for 3 to 10 years. In turn the Department makes an annual rental payment to the farmer and pays part of the cost of establishing the agreed-upon conservation use of the land. Table 2 shows annual payments and terms of contracts with 15,159 farmers. These annual payments when projected reach their highest amount in 1968 when more than $4 million will be paid Georgia farmers.

Further, it is to be noted that the annual payments ranged from a low of $6,212.48 in 1960 to a projected high of $4,259,730.61 in 1968. There is an indicated fluctuation in the amount of increased or decreased payment from year to year, without any noticeable trend or
trends demonstrated, except that one year there is an increase in payments and the next year a decrease in payments.

**Types of Farm-Use Payments.**— Table 3, presents figure for 1960 showing annual payments to participants; and reveals that two-thirds of all payments, $7,917,817, went to farms where owners had placed all of their eligible acres in the program. On such farms, all the cropland is out of production—including the allotted acreages of major surplus crops. Nearly $1, million was paid owners who had placed a portion of their farms in the "Bank."

**Participation by Individual Counties.**— "Degree of County Participation" in the "Soil Bank Program" is shown in the data presented in Table 4, page 30. Total number of contracts ranged from a high of 82 in Toombs County to a low of 12 in Long County. The highest percentage of total cropland acreage in the "Program" is in Evans County, with 8 per cent; and by contrast, Tattnall and Wayne Counties each as only 1 per cent of total cropland acreage in the "Program." Toombs County has the greatest number of acres, namely, 5,962, receiving as annual payment the sum of $75,451. Here, too, are found the greatest number of whole farms placed in the "Program" which comprises a total of 4,814 acres. A total number of 173 contracts, comprising 9,083 acres, provide total payments of $111,698 to farmers of the five-county area.

**Agricultural Land Use Pattern.**— Much of the land of the five selected counties is too low and wet for profitable farming while other areas have a favorable reputation for fertility. Table 5, page 31, shows that Long County with an area of 257,920 acres has but 38,885
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of County</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
<th>Number of Acres</th>
<th>Annual Payment Obligations</th>
<th>Number of Whole Farms</th>
<th>Number of Acres on Whole Farms</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Farms in CR Program</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Cropland Acreage in CR Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>$16,404</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattnall</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>9,922</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toombs</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5962</td>
<td>75,451</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>7,046</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>9083</strong></td>
<td><strong>$111,698</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>6366</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Senator Herman E. Talmadge
TABLE 5

FARM LAND IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Land Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Land in Farms (Acres)</th>
<th>Per Cent in Farms</th>
<th>Number of Farms</th>
<th>Cropland (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>119,040</td>
<td>80,545</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>26,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>257,920</td>
<td>38,885</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>5,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattnall</td>
<td>315,520</td>
<td>201,055</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>58,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toombs</td>
<td>236,160</td>
<td>133,008</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>48,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>113,440</td>
<td>119,955</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>32,381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Census Report, 1959
acres or 15.1 per cent of its total area in farms. By contrast, Evans County has 80,545 acres or 67.7 per cent of its total area classed as farmland. Although Long County has twice the land area of Evans County, the smaller county, in turn, has more than twice the area in farms. Tattnall County readily reveals its superior position among the five counties in that the acreage of its farms is one quarter larger than its nearest rival and neighbor, Toombs County.

Figures 2, 3 and 4 give further clarification to the land-use pattern. Figure 2, page 33, shows that the number of farms in the individual counties ranges from a high of 1094 in Tattnall County to a low of 216 in Long County. Figure 3, page 34, shows that a considerable portion of the entire five-county area is (a) either too low for crop production or (b) given over to forest cover. This in large measure is influenced by the extensive swamp lands of the Altamaha River which constitutes the northeastern boundary of Wayne County and the southern boundary of Toombs, Tattnall and Long Counties. Figure 4, page 35, shows the favorable position of Evans County with reference to soil type and drainage. Of its total land area, 67.1 per cent is in farm land. By sharp contrast only 15.1 per cent of the total land area of Long County is in farm land.

Agricultural Trends in Five Selected Counties.—Farming, in general, of the five county area partakes of the general characteristics of those of the entire Atlantic Coastal Plain. Low natural fertility is the predominant factor. Hardly any of the land can be classed as "excellent" and only a little can be classed as "good."
FIGURE 2. NUMBER OF FARMS IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1959

Source: U. S. Census Reports
FIGURE 3. RATIO OF CROPLAND TO TOTAL LAND AREA IN SELECTED COUNTIES, 1959
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Source: U. S. Census Report
FIGURE 4. PER CENT OF TOTAL LAND AREA OF FIVE COUNTIES IN FARMS, 1959

Source: U. S. Census Report
The tobacco, cotton and improved pastures and other row crops are produced primarily as the result of soil tillage plus the use of a tremendous quantity of artificial fertilizers. Potential profits from farm operations suffer a heavy financial loss due to these expenditures for costly fertilizers.

Figure 5, page 37, gives a graphic illustration of the effectiveness of these scientific measures in increasing total value of farm products sold in the five selected counties in the five-year period, 1954-1959. Tattnall County is most outstanding in the greatest overall value of farm products sold, namely, $1,242,008 in 1954 increasing to $5,989,377 in 1959. Each of the counties showed a significant increase in total value of farm products produced in the five-year period. Evans County showed greatest relative increase. The figure for 1954 being $1,760,634; in 1959, however, this had increased nearly two-fold, namely, $3,018,645. Even Long County with little emphasis on farming showed a significant increase, from a value of $486,547 in 1954 to $629,452 in 1959.

Nevertheless, the present level of agricultural activity in the five counties was little dreamed of two or three decades ago. Progress has indeed surpassed all reasonable expectations. This is due primarily to science, engineering, and technology applied in fields, pastures, barns, and woodlots. Many intricate and perplexing problems have been solved, such as those relating to soil fertility, marketing, and the production of higher yields. The problems seem never ending, however; for it would appear that the solution of one farm problem only creates
FIGURE 5. TOTAL VALUE OF FARM PRODUCTS SOLD IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1954-1959

Source: U. S. Census Report
several more. Solving the problem of increased production is now attended
with the burden of acreage allotment due to overproduction.

**Acreage Allotment System and the Soil Bank.**—Rigid regulations
affect the planting of crops, namely: peanuts, cotton, and tobacco,
which are under the government "allotment program." Should there be
some questioning on the part of a government representative, the burden
of proof falls on the individual farmer. If the farmer has underplanted,
he loses base acreage allotment. If he overplants, he is required to
pay cost of remeasurement as well as destroy a portion of the planted
crop in question.

The "Soil Bank Program", however, presents no such headaches.
The individual landowner without toil, with prospects of low yield or
low price is indeed willing to cooperate with such a program.

Table 6, page 39 and Figure 6, page 40, show the preeminent
position of Tattnall County in Value of products sold from farms.
Tattnall's total sales amount to nearly $6 million; while her nearest
rival, Toombs County, received nearly $2 million less for its total
sales from farms. All of the figures and tables reflect the benefits
resulting from Tattnall County being chosen as a pilot area in
Secretary Benson's Rural Area Development Program. In 1954, Tattnall
was one of six counties selected to make a "showplace" presentation of
the beneficial effects of improved, scientific techniques in agriculture.

Demonstration farms were established to advertise the results of
more efficient land use. Answers to the following questions were
sought:
### TABLE 6

**TOTAL VALUE OF ALL FARM PRODUCTS SOLD IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>1959</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>$3,018,645</td>
<td>$1,760,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>629,452</td>
<td>486,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattnall</td>
<td>5,989,377</td>
<td>4,424,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toombs</td>
<td>4,054,378</td>
<td>3,161,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>3,241,478</td>
<td>2,175,527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Census Report

1. **How to get the greatest long-time returns from the use of the farmland?**

2. **What combination of activities will provide the highest payment for use of labor the family would like to operate the farm?**

3. **Is there a favorable market for the product of these activities?**

4. **Where and how available capital and credit can be used to best advantage?**

5. **How each of these resources can be integrated so that they will compliment the others to the utmost?**

The entire program was geared to facilitating changes and adjustments to the technical and economic opportunities afforded by proper fertilization, disease control, insect eradication and weed control. Emphasis, too, was placed on the overall assistance that individual
FIGURE 6. TOTAL VALUE OF ALL FARM PRODUCTS SOLD IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1959
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Source: U. S. Census Report
farm families might receive from such Federal agencies as the Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Conservation Program, Farmers Home Administrations, and National Farm Loan Associations.

Climatic Pattern of Five County Area.— In general, the land-use pattern of the Five-County Area, has been a logical result of the climatic pattern of the area. Indeed, the natural landscape of the area inclusive of surface waters, vegetation, animal life, soils and rocks is as equally the resultant of the climatic pattern as are the observed cultural or man-made features such as crops, domesticated animals, buildings, roads, and machinery.

Of prime consideration is the heavy rainfall of the area, occurring each of the four seasons of the year, which strongly influences the presence of dense forests, as well as the lateritic red and brown loamy soils. The same heavy rainfall is the basic cause of numerous and extensive swampy areas, coupled with a fine stream network giving rise to the rounded, well-eroded slopes of the area.

This coastal environment is not conducive to agriculture. A prime example is Long County which is peculiarly non-agricultural in spite of its rural-farm setting. Figures 7 through 14 clearly illustrate this fact. All of the maps depict Long County as poor farming country. This is an area wherein down through the years a reputation for infertility has been maintained. Descriptive names such as "wiregrass country," "piney woods country," and "flatwood swamps" are illustrative of the pine forest environment.

In Long County and for a large portion of Wayne County, farming is
less important than forest related activities, such as lumbering, pulpwood, and naval stores. In the case of Wayne and Long Counties, the large scale industrial activity at Jesup and the opportunity for job holding at the nearby Fort Stewart installation has tended to discourage many from looking to farming as a source of livelihood.

Tattnall, Toombs, and Evans counties occupy the southern fringe area of the Cotton Belt of Georgia wherein agricultural production, down through the years, has emphasized cotton and tobacco as the major commercial or money crops; while corn, sweet potatoes and vegetables have been the mainstay of the subsistence or supply crops.

Figures 7, 8, and 9 present graphic illustration of cotton, tobacco, and peanut production. These dot maps show that Toombs County is pre-eminent in cotton and peanut production, while Tattnall County is outstanding in tobacco production.

Figure 10 shows that production of corn is emphasized in each of the counties; yet by far the greater quantity being produced in Tattnall. Again, as is shown in Figure 11, Tattnall County is outstanding in the sales of vegetables sold from its farms.

The five selected counties lie within that part of Georgia known as the Lower Coastal Plain. The entire area falls within the drainage basins of the Altamaha, the Ogeechee, and the Little Ogeechee rivers.

The average temperature for midsummer is $80^\circ F$. While summers are long, the daytime temperature as a rule are not excessively high. Heat prostrations rarely occur.

In winter, prolonged spells of cold weather are rare. Very seldom
FIGURE 7. COTTON ACREAGE HARVESTED IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1958

1 Dot = 500 Acres

Source: Georgia Crop Reporting Service
FIGURE 8. TOBACCO ACREAGE HARVESTED IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1958

1 Dot = 300 Acres

Source: Georgia Crop Reporting Service
FIGURE 9. PEANUTS - ACREAGE HARVESTED IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1957

1 Dot = 300 Acres

Source: Georgia Crop Reporting Service
FIGURE 10. CORN ACREAGE HARVESTED IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1958

1 Dot = 5,000 Acres

Source: Georgia Crop Reporting Service
does freezing temperatures continue for more than 36 consecutive hours. There is usually an abundance of sunshine during the crop-growing season, although in summer and spring, prolonged periods of cloudiness and heavy rains are common.

Practically all precipitation occurs in the form of rain. The heaviest rainfall occurs when a West Indian hurricane occasionally passes inland from the Atlantic seaboard. No point within the area is more than forty miles from the Atlantic Coast.

Shift from Row Crops to Livestock.—— One feature of agriculture activity in the five selected counties is the rising importance of livestock production, namely: cattle, hogs, and dairying. Note that in Figure 12, page 49, each of the five counties shows an emphasis in cattle production. Significantly, in Figure 13, page 50, with the exception of Long County, Toombs, Tattnall, Evans and Wayne sell approximately the same amount of milk from the farm. Figure 14, page 51, shows the interest of Tattnall, Wayne and Toombs counties in hog production. Such activity is indeed profitable and does not necessitate as great a labor force as is involved in the production of the traditional cash or row crops of the area. Moreover, the guarantee of profits from operations is greater in any and all activities of meat production than it is in cash crop production.

The Soil Bank and Crop Reduction.—— The question may be asked, how effective has the "Soil Bank Program" been in achieving its goal of curtailing production of commodities? Statistical evidence shows that farmers in general have farmed fewer acres so intensively that acreage
FIGURE 11. VEGETABLES SOLD FROM FARMS IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1954
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Source: U. S. Census Report
FIGURE 12. CATTLE AND CALVES IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1959

1 Dot = 1,000 Cattle and Calves

Source: U. S. Census Report
FIGURE 13. WHOLE MILK SOLD FROM FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1959

1 Dot = $20,000

Source: U. S. Census Report
FIGURE 14. HOGS AND PIGS IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1959

1 Dot = 2,500 Hogs and Pigs

Source: U. S. Census Report, 1960
reductions have had little effect on total crop production.

Illustrating this fact are the following cases (note Table 7):

1. In 1954, Evans County produced 1,870 bales of cotton from 3,110 acres, the yield being 288 bushels per year. In 1958 this same county produced 1,920 bales (an increase of 50 bales) on 1,950 acres of land (a decrease of 1,160 acres).

2. In the case of corn in Evans County, 254,000 bushels were produced in 1954 from 17,650 acres. In 1958, however, an excellent yield of 468,000 bushels were obtained from only 15,600 acres. Thus, in five years, production had nearly doubled in spite of a reduction in acreage harvested.

3. In like manner, yields per acre of cotton in Tattnall County increased from 265 bushels an acre in 1954 to 438 bushels an acre in 1958.

4. In Tattnall County, 702,400 bushels of corn were produced from 43,650 acres in 1954. Five years later the same county produced 1,238,200 bushels on reduced area of 38,100 acres.

Such increased yields take place on farms which are larger in size and where the farm labor supply is smaller than in preceding years. This is shown in Table 8 and in Figures 15 and 16.

Are Tenants and Sharecroppers Protected? The "Soil Bank" law specifically provides for the protection of the interest of both landlord and tenant, whether cash renter or sharecropper.

Contractual arrangements specify in what manner the land owners and tenants or sharecroppers are to participate jointly in payments. These arrangements are to be supervised by the local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee. (No non-white committee members are in the five counties under study.)

Figure 17, page 56, depicts the number of Negro farm operators in the five selected counties in 1959. The number of these farmers ranged
## TABLE 7
TRENDS IN COTTON AND CORN PRODUCTION IN EVANS AND TATTNALL COUNTIES, 1954-1958

### COTTON PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Evans County</th>
<th>Tattnall County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotton Harvested</td>
<td>Yield Lint Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotton Harvested</td>
<td>Yield Lint Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CORN PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Evans County</th>
<th>Tattnall County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corn Harvested</td>
<td>Yield Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corn Harvested</td>
<td>Yield Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>17,650</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>17,640</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>17,050</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Georgia Crop Reporting Service
FIGURE 15. TOTAL POPULATION IN FIVE COUNTIES, 1960

Source: U. S. Census Report
FIGURE 16. PER CENT CHANGE IN TOTAL POPULATION IN FIVE COUNTIES
1950-1960

Source: U.S. Census Report, 1960
FIGURE 17. NUMBER OF NEGRO FARM OPERATORS IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1959

Source: U.S. Census Report, 1960
from a high of 147 in Tattnall County to a low of 17 in Wayne County.

Of equal significance is Figure 18, page 59, showing the number of Negro tenant farmers in the selected counties. These range from a high of 78 in Tattnall to a low of 3 in Wayne County. The percentage of tenantry among Negro farm operators is shown in Figure 19, page 60. Here, too, is a reliable index of farm security and satisfaction, namely: a high rate of tenantry is equated with rural insecurity.

The percentage of Negro tenantry fluctuates from a high of 65.9 per cent in Toombs County to a low of 5.8 per cent in Long County. It would appear that Long County with its limited emphasis on commercial agriculture presents the brightest picture for Negro farm ownership in the area.

Very few, if any, sharecroppers who are non-white share in "Soil Bank Payments" with their former white landlords. The basic reasons for this are (a) apathy of the sharecropper caused by his not knowing his rights, (b) ingrained reluctance and fearfulness to press formal charges against former landlord, (c) the self-victimizing practice of nomad-like moving and exchanging of landlords from year to year, and (d) a latent and strong desire to give up sharecropping and farming in order to live more fruitfully. The sharecropper makes contracts with the landlord on a year to year basis. Economic security is indeed a stranger in his quarters.

Plight of the Tenants.-- Figure 20, page 61, shows that the non-white holds an inconsequential place in the economic control and management of his community. The appraised property value for Negroes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Average Farm Size (Acres)</th>
<th>Farms Owners Operated</th>
<th>Farms Tenant Operated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattnall</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toombs</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Georgia Department of Agriculture and United States Census Reports
FIGURE 18. NUMBER OF NEGRO TENANT FARMERS IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1959

Source: U. S. Census Report, 1960
FIGURE 19. PERCENTAGE OF TENANCY AMONG NEGRO FARM OPERATORS OF FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1959

Source: U. S. Census Report
FIGURE 20. PROPERTY VALUATION BY RACE IN FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES, 1955

Appraised Property Value for Non White in Numerator
Appraised Property Value for White in Denominator

Source: 1955 Digest - Georgia Department of Revenue
does not even remotely approach that of the whites in any of these
counties. Where Negro property value is highest, $436,816 in
Toombs County, the value of property owned by whites is $6,868,470,
an amount 15 times greater. In Long County Negro property valuation
is $111,226, while that of the whites is $1,517,773, an amount 13
times greater. Poverty, ignorance, discrimination, extortion and ex-
ploitation have characterized the plight of the rural non-white since
his emancipation from slavery. For a while a psycho-religious
adjustment was made to his disfranchised environment (a better life
was looked for after death). Today, however, a better life and a
higher standard of living is sought on this side of the grave. Note
that in Table 8 and Figure 21 the trend of tenants from farms
definitely antedates that of the "Soil Bank Program."

Decline of Tenantry in Five Selected Counties.— Table 8 presents
the data on farm size and nature of farm operation in the five counties.
In 1949, for instance, there were 777 farms operated by all tenants in
Tattnall County, by 1954 this number had declined to 619 and by 1959
the number was less than 50 per cent of that of the former ten-year
period. The equivalent trend has taken place throughout each of the
five selected counties in this study.

Figure 21, page 63, shows that in Toombs, Tattnall, Evans, and
Long Counties non-white rural population in 1960 was but approximately
half that of 1950. Significantly, the decrease in Tattnall County was
from 1,930 to 1,182, while in Wayne County there was a seven-fold
decrease in non-white rural population, namely from 240 in 1950 to 32
in 1960.
FIGURE 21. TOTAL NON-WHITE RURAL FARM POPULATION 1950 AND 1960

Numerator represents 1950 figure
Denominator represents 1960 figure

Source: U. S. Census Report 1950 and 1960
Thus, Figure 21 shows graphically the striking decline of non-white population in the counties; while Figure 18, showing the actual numbers of Negro tenants in the area, reveals that only 3 Negro tenant farmers are in Long and 8 in Wayne Counties in 1959.

Enrollment in Schools in Areas of Predominant Rural-Farm Environment.— Table 9, page 65, shows the enrollment and average daily attendance records of schools in the 1954-1959 period. The high school at Reidsville and Evans County High School underwent consolidation in 1956. A significant upsurge of pupil enrollment resulted. A considerable percentage of the non-white population of Evans County is definitely semi-urban and rural-non farm in occupational status; employed mainly as domestic servants in the numerous motels along Federal Highway 301, and as naval stores and pulpwood laborers.

The basis for selection of the schools in the presentation of the table showing impact of the Land Bank Program, Table 10, is that these are located in areas of relative high rural-farm non-white population.

Figure 23 shows new classrooms constructed in schools selected for study in the five-county area from 1954 through 1959. A total of 46 were constructed in Tattnall, 19 in Evans and 6 in Long County. Significantly no new classrooms were constructed during these years in Toombs County. Yet, in spite of instances of consolidation and construction of new physical plants, there is still shown the effect of the exit of Negro farm personnel. Figure 22 shows the loss of teachers in the schools selected for study. These ranged from a loss of 4 teachers in Tattnall County to 1 each in Long and Wayne Counties.
TABLE 9

ENROLMENT AND AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN NEGRO PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN FIVE COUNTIES, 1954-1959

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattnall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenville</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reidsville</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toombs</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Offices of County Superintendents and Principals of Schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattnall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenville</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toombs</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screven</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>413</td>
<td></td>
<td>413</td>
<td></td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Offices of County Superintendents and Principals of Schools.
The data are presented and analyzed for the following schools:

1. Walker High School, Ludowici, Long County
2. Collins Elementary School, Collins, Tattnall County
3. Seckinger Elementary School, Glenville, Tattnall County
4. Dickerson High School, Vidalia, Toombs County
5. Screven Elementary School, Screven, Wayne County


Tattnall County (Collins Elementary School).— The enrollment of pupils in the Collins Elementary School ranged from a low of 239 in 1957-1958 to a high of 304 in 1955-1956, with a mean enrollment of 270 for the five-year period. The enrollment in the school for the other years ranked as follows: 296 in 1954-1955, 258 in 1956-1957, and 256 in 1958-1959.

FIGURE 22. CHANGE IN NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS IN TABLE 10 SHOWING IMPACT OF THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM, 1954-1959

Source: Office of School Principals
FIGURE 23. NEW CLASSROOMS CONSTRUCTED IN SCHOOLS SELECTED FOR STUDY IN FIVE COUNTIES, 1954 - 1959

Source: Offices of Principals of Schools in County
Tattnall County (Glenville Seckinger Elementary School).— The enrollment of pupils in the Seckinger Elementary School ranged from a low of 307 in 1958-1959 to a high of 525 in 1955-1956, with a mean enrollment of 438 for the five-year period. The enrollment in the school for the other years ranked as follows: 479 in 1954-1955, 446 in 1956-1957, and 433 in 1957-1958.


Wayne County (Screven Elementary School).— The enrollment of pupils in the Screven Elementary School ranged from a low of 231 in 1958-1959 and a high of 263 in 1954-1955, with a mean enrollment of 243

CHAPTER III
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Rationale.-- The "Soil Bank Program" had its beginning under the Eisenhower Administration in 1956. It had two parts: acreage reserve and conservation reserve. Under the first, a farmer agreed for one year not to grow crops such as corn, wheat, or cotton on land normally used for the purpose; he would be then paid by U. S. Treasury on the basis of the estimated net profit he would have made on the crop had he planted it. It is that half of the soil bank plan that the House struck down after only one-year trial at a cost of $260 million.

At the same time the House recommended the other half of the president’s plan; the conservation reserve, under which a farmer contracts for a period of one year to stop growing surplus crops on land which can be planted in trees, pasture, or put to certain other conservation uses. The Treasury pays the farmer a subsidy during a transitional period.

The most telling argument against the acreage play was that it failed to lower production. Another was too much of last year's $260 million went to large corporation-type farms, such as: McCarthy and Hildebrand (California) $29,773; J.W.B. Farms, (Colorado) $45,817; and Gorvey Farms (Cal and Koso) $61,354.

Governmental agencies, in rendering services to a group, often affect the operative capacities of other bodies by virtue of their
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relationship. Such is the case of the "Soil Bank Program." This program, in rendering service designed to curb farm prices and overproduction of farm products, had created problems which far outweigh the services rendered. These problems are related to school attendance on the part of the students and unemployment on the part of parents and other adult patrons of the community in question. These adults, unable to find satisfactory employment as a result of the squeeze put on them by the "Soil Bank Program," find it necessary to become rehabilitated to other vocations.

This study was concerned only with the "Soil Bank Program" as it affects the adults and students as they are concerned in their relationship with school, and not the ramifications remotely related to the school program.

The nature and characteristics of the "Soil Bank Program" are as follows:

1. A program designed to curtail overproduction of farm products.
2. A program designed to maintain an acceptable price program for farm products.
3. A program which benefits and pays off the landowner or landlord for a planned program of the use of available acreage.
4. A program which results in increased migration from the farm-rural areas to industrial-urban areas.
5. A program which encourages unemployment and depopulation.
6. A program which adds to burdens of urban centers.
7. A program which indirectly and without design encourages unemployment and depopulation.

\[1\] Ibid., pp. 5-6.
The source of the proposed problems of this research can best be definitized in the series of questions which follow:

1. Why institute a farm program costing millions of dollars which aids the landlord, but at the same time displaces the majority of dedicated farmers who are not landowners?

2. Why should the federal government institute a program to depopularize rural counties while adding to the social and economic burdens of urban centers?

3. Why should the federal government, in these times of emphasized equality and integration, deliberately discriminate against the landless Negro in the deep South?

4. With reference to children in the rural community, why should the federal government institute a program which would result in their being forcibly transferred from new consolidated school buildings with more than adequate facilities to crowded urban schools with double sessions and less than adequate facilities?

The above discussions of the government's concern and action in meeting the challenge of changing and crucial socio-economic patterns; the definitizing of the nature and characteristic of the "Soil Bank Program" in meeting a social challenge, together with crucial questions pertinent to the "Soil Bank Program" constitute, in the writer's opinion, the valid frame-of-reference for the research project here under study. Two important factors facing the "Soil Bank Program" are (a) the decreasing school attendance and school closing down, and (b) the loss of farm labor, the shift of population to urban centers, and the redirection of adult pursuits for those remaining.

Evolution of the Problem.— The inauguration, growth, extent, and impact of the "Soil Bank Program" which has seriously impaired and/or has tended to impair the educational program in the five selected
coastal counties projected the problem for this study.

Further, during the past two years the writer has been a principal of a school in one of these counties vexed by the impact of the "Soil Bank Program" and has witnessed at first hand the shifting educational and economic patterns provoked by the "Soil Bank Program."

Therefore, he deemed it would be quite fruitful to use this socio-economic problem of his and adjacent counties as the problem for his thesis research.

Moreover, since the writer is a school principal and lives in a community fully impacted by the above described "Soil Bank Program," he has come to have a pointed interest in the exploration of all facets of this program with its concomitant social forces as they have influence upon the educational enterprise in the school community.

Contribution to Educational Thought.— It is felt by the writer that the continual loss of students from the schools of rural communities as a result of the "Soil Bank Program" will result in the loss of the many prospective workers who would ordinarily remain in these areas. If a too large proportion of these students are taken from any one community, it will sap that community of its potential leadership in the various spheres of life, i.e., education, religion, industry, and the like. It is felt that this study will show the immediate and probable future loss of desirable young people who will be deprived of the opportunity of maturing into full citizenship within the environs of their childhood and youth. Further, it is felt that the continuing loss of adult citizens and their economic value strikes at the stability
of the local tax base for the support of schools in those communities with a full-fledged "Soil Bank Program." Therefore, the findings of this study might well serve to focus attention upon the crucial need for educators and citizens to come up with a newer formula for determining the financial support of schools in areas being continually depopulated by the impact of the "Soil Bank Program."

Statement of the Problem.--- The problem involved in this research was to develop an analysis and interpretation of the impact of the "Soil Bank Program," with reference to: extent of the program, its effects upon school attendance and operation, the shift of population, and acreage curtailment, in five selected coastal-wise counties of Georgia for the period of 1956 through 1961.

Limitation of the Problem.--- The major limitation to the successful approach to this problem inhere in:

1. The availability of the pertinent data.

2. The willingness and ability of prospective subjects to submit pertinent information.

Purpose of the Study.--- The major purpose of this research was to determine and interpret the extent to which the impact of the "Soil Bank Program" has effected beneficially and/or adversely the educational enterprise and population-economic patterns in the five selected counties: Toombs, Evans, Long, Tattnall, and Wayne; Georgia, 1956-1961.

The specific purposes of this research were to determine:

1. The overall extent of the "Soil Bank Program" in the five counties during the 1956-1961 period.

2. The number of farmers taken in by the "Soil Bank Program" during the five years of 1956-1961.
3. The extent of population decline in the five counties during the five years of 1956-1961.

4. The shift in school populations in the counties during the five years of 1956-1961.

5. The direction and extent of population mobility caused by the "Soil Bank Program" during the 1956-1961 period.

6. The kind and amount of farming curtailment in the five counties during the five-year period of 1956-1961.

7. The extent of the decrease in rural elementary and high school enrollment during the 1956-1961 period of the "Soil Bank Program" in these five counties.

8. The extent to which displaced farm workers have found employment in the town of the respective county or elsewhere during the period of 1956-1961.

9. The extent to which "pockets of population" in the rural areas of the five counties have disappeared or have been crucially decimated during the 1956-1961 period.

10. The implications, if any, for educational theory and administration practice as may be derived from the analysis and interpretation of the data.

**Definition of Terms.**—An official government document entitled A General Explanation, The 1960 Conservation Reserve, states:

The Conservation Reserve of the Soil Bank provides for the withdrawal of cropland from production more nearly in line with demand. At the time it provides that farmers establish and maintain sound conservation practices on the land they put in the Reserve.1

**Locale and Research-Design of Study.**—The significant aspects of the Locale and Research-Design of this study are indicated below:

1. Locale and Period - This study was conducted at the Collins Elementary School, Collins, Georgia, during the school years 1960-1961 and 1961-1962.

---

2. **Research Method** - The Descriptive-Survey Method of research, employing the questionnaire, school records, Federal and State Records, and interviews, was used to gather the necessary data required to fulfill the purposes of this study.

3. **Subjects** - The subjects of this study were: (a) the identifiable farmers (owners, renters, sharecroppers); (b) the school pupils; (c) the County clerks and Chambers of Commerce; and (d) the County Agents and Home Demonstration Agents, in each of the five selected counties within the purview of this study.

4. **Instruments** - The data-gathering instruments were: (a) United States Bureau of Census Reports showing trends in population movement in the five-county area, (b) United States and Georgia State records of the production of basic farm commodities, (c) United States records of the "Soil Bank Program" during the 1960 period, (d) interviews with important and knowledgeable participants, and (e) a specifically designated questionnaire on the crucial elements of the "Soil Bank Program" as affecting average daily attendance in schools and decline in total school population.

5. **Criteria of Reliability** - The criteria of reliability for the statistics basic to the analysis and interpretation of the data were: the genuineness and accuracy of the responses to the questionnaire items, the accuracy and reliability of official Federal and State records, the validity of the reactions during interviews, all of which, constituted the sources for the data.

6. **Procedure** - The following operational steps were pursued for accomplishing the purposes of this research:

   a. The related literature pertinent to the problem of this research was summarized, and incorporated in the thesis copy.

   b. The anticipated subjects were contacted in order to orientate them to the purpose and needs of the research.

   c. The questionnaire of the "Soil Bank Program" was constructed and validated under the direction of competent staff members of the School of Education, Atlanta University.

   d. The administration of the questionnaire and holding interviews with the "Soil Bank Program" participants. The examination of the United States Records.
The assemblage of the collected data into appropriate tables and graphs as the basis for the interpretation of the data.

The data were statistically treated with reference to the frequency and per cent of the data items. Wherever indicated, the other types of statistical treatments were utilized.

The formulation of the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations were incorporated in the thesis copy.

Summary of Related Literature.—Many farmers who fall in the marginal or submarginal category eke out a precarious living which is substandard and barely on the subsistence level. In all fairness to the federal authorities, one must admit that definite concern has been shown for those million and a half farmers who receive less than a thousand dollars a year from all sources. (This is about 40% of the total number of farmers in the nation). The "Soil Bank Program" has been one among several devices resorted to assist in solving the farm problem.

1. In the short run the "Soil Bank Program" has been beneficial to land owning farmers. They received cash money from the government for allowing their fields to lie fallow. Over-all production, however, of farm commodities have not declined for cash benefits were used to defray the costs of more intensive cultivation of allotted acreage.

2. The tenant and renter because of the program has had to seek employment elsewhere. This has hastened the trek of families from the farm to industrialized towns. This in turn has had an adverse effect on the economy of rural counties and rural towns. With reference to schools, in some instances a spur was given to consolidation.

3. In a number of instances there has resulted accelerated depopulation of rural counties. Thus the "Soil Bank Program" has aggravated rather than helped the problem of surplus farm production.
SUMMARY OF BASIC FINDINGS

Findings— The summation of the findings of the research derived from the data gathered through the use of United States records of the "Soil Bank Program", United States Bureau of Census Reports, farm production records, and the questionnaire is presented under the appropriate categories immediately to follow.

Participation in the Soil Bank Program by the State of Georgia (Tables 1 - 3)

The data show the type and extent of Georgia's participation in the "Soil Bank Program." Technical terminology of the headings, however, require explanation. A grand total of 1,050,686 acres are in the "Program." Of this total 61 per cent or 641,389 acres comprise whole entire farms (producing no crops whatsoever) placed in the "Program." Farm owners receive payments nevertheless for such land held out of production. Under the heading "Part-Farms Regular" 389,565 acres, or 37 per cent of total acreage in the "Program" is land normally allotted for the production of crops under acreage restriction (cotton, peanuts, or tobacco).

"Part-Farms Non-Diversion" refers to acreage not given to production of restricted crops. In this category are 19,732 acres, which is 2 per cent of the total acreage in the "Soil Bank."

"Maintain Present Cover" refers to 53,547 or 5 per cent of the total acreage placed in the "Soil Bank" whereon acceptable conservation farming is already in progress (young forest or improved pasture).
By far the greater portion, 997,139 or 95 per cent of the total acreage, is in the category "Establish and Maintain New Vegetative Cover."

Of the "New Vegetative Cover" the item "Trees" is by far the more popular item accounting for 688,834 or 69 per cent acres of the "Establish and Maintain" category.

"Adequate Cover, Cost Sharing" item is inclusive of 305,431 acres or 32.7 per cent of acreage to be "Establish and Maintained." "Cost-sharing" refers to the practice of the government defraying part of the cost of conservation land improvements. Examples are such items as dams to control water runoff, or irrigation practices that save or make more effective use of water or reduce soil erosion on land now in agricultural production. However, aid is not given when new land is brought into production.

For the state as a whole only a very small acreage, namely 514 acres or 0.05 per cent of the total acreage is included in contracts wherein the government is not to assist in cost of improving land.

A very small portion in the "Soil Bank Program" is included in three categories: (a) Dam, Pit and Pond with 259 acres or .02 per cent, (b) Wildlife Cover with 1,991 acres or .2 per cent, and (c) Wildlife Marsh Management with 110 acres or .01 per cent respectively of the total acreage.

Annual Payments and Terms of Contracts
(Table 2)

The data show annual payments and terms of contracts by the United States Department of Agriculture with 15,159 farmers. These annual
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payments when projected reach their highest amount in 1968 when more than $4 million will be paid Georgia farmers. There is great fluctuation in the amount of payments from year to year, no noticeable trend being evident; nevertheless, there is a total low payment of $6,212,48 in 1960 and a projected total high payment of $4,259,730.61 in 1958.

Types of Farm-Use Payments
(Table 3)

The data reveal that two-thirds of all payments in 1960, $7,917,817, went to farms where owners had placed all of their eligible acres in the program. On such farms, all the cropland is out of production—including the allotted acreage of major surplus crops. Nearly $4 million was paid owners who had placed a portion of their farms in the "Bank."

Participation by Individual Counties
(Table 4)

The data presented show the "Degree of County Participation" in the "Soil Bank Program." Total number of contracts ranged from a high of 82 in Toombs County to a low of 12 in Long County. The highest percentage of total cropland acreage in the "Program" is in Evans County, with 8 per cent; and by contrast, Tattnall and Wayne Counties each has only 1 per cent of total cropland acreage in the "Program." Toombs County has the greatest number of acres, namely, 5,962, receiving as annual payment the sum of $75,451. Here, too, is found the greatest number of whole farms placed in the "Program" which comprises a total of 4,811 acres. A total number of 173 contracts, comprising 9,083 acres, provide total payments of $111,698 to farmers of the five-county area.
Agricultural Land Use Pattern
(Table 5 and Figures 2, 3, and 4)

The data reveal that much of the land of the five selected counties is too low and wet for profitable farming while other areas have a favorable reputation for fertility. Long County with an area of 257,920 acres has but 38,885 acres or 15.1 per cent of its total area classed as farmland. Although Long County has twice the area as Evans County, the smaller county, in turn, has more than twice the area in farms. Evans County has 80,545 acres of 67.7 per cent of its total area classed as farmland. Tattnall County readily reveals its superior position among the five counties in that the acreage of its farms is one quarter larger than its nearest rival and neighbor, Toombs County.

Agricultural Trends in Five Selected Counties
(Figure 5)

Low natural fertility is the general characteristic of the five-county area. Hardly any of the land can be classed as "excellent" and only a little can be classed as "good." Tremendous quantities of artificial fertilizer are needed to insure adequate yields. The data reveal the effectiveness of scientific measures in increasing the value of farm products sold in the five-year period, 1954 to 1959. Tattnall County is most outstanding in the greatest overall value of farm products sold, namely, $4,424,008 in 1954 increasing to $5,989,777 in 1959. Each of the counties showed a significant increase in total value of farm products produced in the five-year period. Evans County showed greatest relative increase. Valuation in 1954 was $1,760,634; in 1959,
however, this had increased nearly two-fold, namely, $3,018,615. Even Long County with little emphasis on farming showed a significant increase, from a value of $486,547 in 1954 to $629,452 in 1959.

Nevertheless, the present level of agricultural activity in the five counties was little dreamed of two or three decades ago. Progress has indeed surpassed all reasonable expectations. This is due primarily to science, engineering, and technology applied in fields, pastures, barns, and woodlots. Many intricate and perplexing problems have been solved, such as those relating to soil fertility, marketing, and the production of higher yields. The problems seem never ending, however, for it would appear that the solution of one farm problem only creates several more. Solving the problem of increased production is now attended with the burden of acreage allotment due to overproduction.

Acreage Allotment System and the Soil Bank
(Table 6 and Figures 5 and 6)

Rigid regulations affect the planting of crops, namely: peanuts, cotton, and tobacco, which are under the government allotment program. Should there be some questioning on the part of a government representative, the burden of proof falls on the individual farmer. If the farmer has underplanted, he loses base acreage allotment. If he overplants, he is required to pay cost of remeasurement as well as destroy a portion of the planted crop in question.

The "Soil Bank Program," however, presents no such headaches. The individual landowner without toil, with prospects of low yield or low
price is indeed willing to cooperate with such a program.

Data from the table and figures show the preeminent position of Tattnall County in agricultural activity. Here, too, is reflected the benefits resulting from Tattnall County being chosen as a pilot area in Secretary Benson's Rural Area Development Program. In 1954, Tattnall was one of six counties selected to make a "showplace" presentation of the beneficial effects of improved, scientific techniques in agriculture.

Climatic Pattern of Five County Area
(Figures 7 through 11)

In general, the land-use pattern of the five-county area, has been a logical result of the climatic pattern of the area. Of prime consideration is the heavy rainfall occurring each of the four seasons of the year which strongly influences the presence of dense forests, as well as the lateritic red and brown loamy soils. The same heavy rainfall is the basic cause of numerous and extensive swampy areas, coupled with a fine stream network giving rise to the rounded, well-eroded slopes of the area.

The coastal environment is not conducive to agriculture. A prime example is Long County which is peculiarly non-agricultural in spite of its rural-farm setting. Figures 7 through 11 clearly illustrate this fact. All of the maps depict Long County as poor farming country. This is an area wherein down through the years a reputation for infertility has been maintained. Descriptive names such as "wiregrass country," "piney woods country," and "flatwood swamps" are illustrative of the pine forest environment.
In Long County and for a large portion of Wayne County, farming is less important than forest related activities, such as lumbering, pulpwood, and naval stores. In the case of Wayne and Long Counties, the large scale industrial activity at Jesup and the opportunity for job holding at the nearby Fort Stewart installation has tended to discourage many from looking to farming as a source of livelihood.

Tattnall, Toombs, and Evans Counties occupy the southern fringe area of the Cotton Belt of Georgia wherein agricultural production, down through the years, has emphasized cotton and tobacco as the major commercial or money crops; while corn, sweet potatoes and vegetables have been the mainstay of the subsistence or supply crops.

Figures 7, 8, and 9 present graphic illustration of cotton, tobacco, and peanut production. These dot maps show that Toombs County is preeminent in cotton and peanut production, while Tattnall County is outstanding in tobacco production.

Figure 10 shows that production of corn is emphasized in each of the counties; yet by far the greater quantity being produced in Tattnall. Again as is shown in Figure 11, Tattnall County is outstanding in the sales of vegetables sold from its farms.

The five selected counties lie within that part of Georgia known as the Lower Coastal Plain. The entire area falls within the drainage basins of the Altamaha, the Ogeechee, and the Little Ogeechee rivers.

The average temperature for midsummer is 80°F. While summers are long, the daytime temperatures as a rule are not excessively high. Heat prostrations rarely occur.
In winter, prolonged spells of cold weather are rare. Very seldom does freezing temperatures continue for more than 36 consecutive hours. There is usually an abundance of sunshine during the crop-growing season, although in summer and spring, prolonged periods of cloudiness and heavy rains are common.

Practically all precipitation occurs in the form of rain. The heaviest rainfall occurs when a West Indian hurricane occasionally passes inland from the Atlantic seaboard. No point within the area is more than forty miles from the Atlantic Coast.

Shift from Row Crops to Livestock
(Figures 12 through 14)

One feature of agricultural activity in the five selected counties is the rising importance of livestock production, namely, cattle, hogs, and dairying. Significantly, with the exception of Long County, each county sells approximately the same amount of milk from the farm. Such activity is indeed profitable and does not necessitate as great a labor force as is involved in the production of the traditional cash or row crops of the area. Moreover, the guarantee of profits from operations is greater in any and all activities of meat production than it is in cash crop production.

The Soil Bank and Crop Reduction
(Table 9)

The question may be asked, how effective has the "Soil Bank Program" been in achieving its goal of curtailing production of commodities? Statistical evidence shows that farmers in general have farmed fewer acres so intensively that acreage reductions have had little
effect on total crop production. Table 7 gives a clear illustration of this fact: In 1954, Evans County produced 1,870 bales of cotton from 3,110 acres, the yield being 288 bushels per year. In 1958 this same county produced 1,920 bales (an increase of 50 bales) on 1,950 acres of land (a decrease of 1,090 acres). Such increased yields take place on farms which are larger in size and where the farm labor supply is smaller than in preceding years. This is shown as a consistent pattern in each of the five counties.

Are Tenants and Sharecroppers Protected? (Table 8 and Figures 17, 18, and 19)

The "Soil Bank" law specifically provides for the protection of interest of both landlord and tenant, whether cash renter or sharecropper. Contractual arrangements specify in what manner the land owners and tenants or sharecroppers are to participate jointly in payments. These arrangements are to be supervised by the local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee. (No non-white committee members are in the five counties under study).

Very few, if any, sharecroppers who are non-white share in "Soil Bank Payments" with their former white landlords. The basic reasons for this are (a) apathy of the sharecropper caused by his not knowing his rights, (b) ingrained reluctance and fearfulness to press formal charges against former landlord, (c) the self-victimizing practice of nomad-like moving and exchanging of landlords from year to year, and (d) a latent and strong desire to give up sharecropping and farming in order to live more fruitfully. The sharecropper makes contracts with
the landlord on a year to year basis. Economic security is indeed a stranger in his quarters.

Flight of the Tenants
(Figure 20)

The non-white holds an inconsequential place in the economic control and management of his community. Poverty, ignorance, discrimination, extortion, and exploitation have characterized the plight of the rural non-white since his emancipation from slavery. For a while a psycho-religious adjustment was made to his disfranchised environment (a better life was looked for after death). Today, however, a better life and a higher standard of living is sought on this side of the grave. The data clearly reveal that the trend of tenants from farms definitely antedates that of the "Soil Bank Program".

Decline of Tenantry in Five Selected Counties
(Table 8 and Figure 21)

The data present the farm size and nature of farm operation in the five counties. In 1949, for instance, there were 777 farms operated by all tenants in Tattnall County, by 1954 this number had declined to 619 and by 1959 the number was less than 50 per cent of that of the former ten-year period. The equivalent trend has taken place throughout each of the five selected counties in this study.

Enrollment in Schools in Areas of Predominant Rural-Farm Environment
(Tables 9 and 10)

The data reveal the enrollment and average daily attendance records of schools in 1954-1959 period. In spite of some instances of
consolidation and construction of new physical plants, there is still shown the effect of the exit of Negro farm personnel.

The data are presented and analyzed for the following schools:

1. Walker High School, Ludowici, Long County
2. Collins Elementary Schools, Collins, Tattnall County
3. Seckinger Elementary School, Glenville, Tattnall County
4. Dickerson High School, Vidalia, Toombs County
5. Screven Elementary School, Screven, Wayne County


Tattnall County (Collins Elementary School).— The enrollment of pupils in the Collins Elementary School ranged from a low of 239 in 1957-1958 to a high of 304 in 1955-1956, with a mean enrollment of 270 for the five-year period. The enrollment in the school for the other years ranked as follows: 296 in 1954-1955, 258 in 1956-1957, and 256 in 1958-1959.


The Average Daily Attendance of pupils in the Seckinger Elementary School ranged from a low of 253 in 1958-1959 to a high of 407 in 1955-1956, with a daily attendance average of 377


Conclusions.— The findings of the study appear to warrant the following conclusions:

1. Of the total cropland in the five selected counties, 9,083 acres or 4.2 per cent was put in the "Soil Bank."

2. Reduction in acreage of basic cash crops resulted in a sharp decline of the needed supply of farm labor, particularly that of the sharecropper.

3. Out of a total of 3,045 families in the five-county area, 173 or 5.6 per cent participated in the "Soil Bank Program."

4. Total non-white rural-farm population dropped approximately 50 per cent in a ten-year period; from 5,259 in 1950 to 2,671 in 1960.
5. Parents of school-age children who had been active farmers were encouraged to leave the farm. Many Negro farmers, who were sharecroppers felt that acreage restrictions in basic cash crops of cotton, tobacco, and peanuts prevented them from earning an adequate livelihood as farmers.

6. School enrollment in basically rural farm areas has shown a marked and consistent decline.

7. Various factors other than the "Soil Bank Program" have tended to maintain a trend of migration from rural-farm to urban-industrialized areas; however, the "Soil Bank Program" accentuated this trend and hastened the rate of off-farm migration.

8. In some areas schools in rural-farm environments have found it necessary to reduce their number of teachers.

9. The "Soil Bank Program" has clauses that purport to protect the interests of renters and sharecroppers. In all instances when a cropper's contract was terminated and land subsequently placed in the "Soil Bank" no formal protest was made by the former cropper to share in Government benefit payments.

10. Landowning farmers benefited from the "Soil Bank Program" in that there was an increase in their cash income. Increased income was used to defray the cost of improved techniques thereby increasing markedly the total crop yield on reduced acreage.

Implications.— The implications for educational theory and practice which grew out of this study are presented below:

1. The scope and province of this study has not related to a critique of approving or disapproving the "Soil Bank Program" from the standpoint of agricultural economics or of the conservation of soil fertility; rather, what has been shown is the effect of the "Soil Bank Program" on the rural school program. This has necessitated consideration of the plight of the displaced sharecropper and his hastened migration from the rural-farm to the urban-industrial area. These croppers have an insecure economic status and little hope ever to be farm proprietors.

2. In general, the farmer who owns no land has little attachment for the land he works; neither from the standpoint of sentiment, nor of economics. Moreover his roots of community concern are shallow. Normally, this finds expression in
laxidaisical parent-teacher relationship, little pride of
school's physical plant, hardly any concern with problems
of youth and of delinquency, or even of school plant
beautification, etc. The sophisticated administration
and faculty of the rural school are constantly confronted
with these problems and are not surprised when there is
little support along these lines. However, when a situation
arises such as a federal policy, namely, the "Soil Bank
Program," the principal and teachers stand helplessly by
noting from month to month constant drops in average daily
attendance. Though the physical plants are relatively new
and adequate, there is the tragic specter of half empty
classrooms, a feeling of insecurity on the part of teachers,
in addition to lowered teacher morale.

3. The "Soil Bank Program" is an economic factor forcing a
social change in the traditional acceptance by the rural
Negro of the sharecropper strata in a discriminatory society.

Recommendations.— It is felt that the findings of this research
would warrant the following recommendations:

1. The Federal Government should concern itself with the
unattractiveness of farm pursuits for rural-farm youth. Most
of the people leaving farms are young people. Where, indeed,
can jobs be found, in our industrialized economy, for those
who are largely unskilled and have had little opportunity to
acquire vocational training? Certainly, federal aid to
education is direly needed in rural areas where average
expenditures for education and training is far below that
in urban areas. More specific recommendations are:

   a. Program of Federal-Aid to Education, particularly
      Rural Education.

   b. Program of Rehabilitation Education for adult displaced
      farmers or workers.

2. Industry should be encouraged to follow a practice of large
scale dispersal in rural areas. In so doing, more families
can remain on their farms yet find employment in nonfarming
activities. This must be accompanied with rigid federal
enforcement of Fair Employment Practice Laws—-to guarantee
equitable treatment of all job applications irrespective of
race.

3. The conservation of human resources should in no instance be
subordinate to the conservation of natural resources.
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LETTER

UNITED STATES SENATE
Committee on Finance

October 17, 1960

Honorable Theron Spencer
Principal
Collins Elementary School
Collins, Georgia

Dear Mr. Spencer:

This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter of October 11 which has been forwarded from my Washington Office.

I appreciate your thoughtfulness in writing to me and I am pleased to enclose for your information copy of an official report showing Georgia's participation in the conservation reserve program for the years 1956 through 1960.

I hope that this material will be helpful to you and whenever I can be of assistance, please call on me.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely,

Herman E. Talmadge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Contracts</td>
<td>15,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Whole Farms</td>
<td>9,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres Under Contract</td>
<td>1,050,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres (Whole Farms)</td>
<td>641,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres (Part Farms Regular)</td>
<td>389,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres (Part Farms Non-Diversion)</td>
<td>19,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres (Maintain)</td>
<td>53,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres (Establish &amp; Maintain)</td>
<td>997,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres to be established with C.R. Cost-Sharing in adequate vegetative cover</td>
<td>305,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres adequate vegetative cover to be established at no expense to the C.R. Program</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres to be established in trees</td>
<td>688,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres to be established in Dam, Pit or Pond Practices</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres to be established in Wildlife Cover, G-1</td>
<td>1,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acres to be established in Wildlife Water and Marsh Management G-2</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms carrying out dam, pit or pond practices</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms carrying out establishment of wildlife water and marsh management</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Payments</td>
<td>$12,000,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Payments (Whole Farms)</td>
<td>$7,927,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Payments (Part Farms Regular)</td>
<td>3,980,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Payments (Part Farms Non-Diversion)</td>
<td>102,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Payments for Contracts Expiring in Years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>$6,212.48</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>$16,068.89</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>193,803.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>131,608.57</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>856,313.98</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1,208,595.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>791,872.87</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1,748,491.25</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4,259,730.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,788,129.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LETTER

To:        Superintendents and Principals of Common Schools
          of Long, Tattnall, Wayne, Evans, and Toombs
          Counties.

From:      Theron Spencer, Principal, Collins Elementary
          School, Collins, Georgia

Dear Sir:

    I am attempting to complete my thesis for the Master's Degree
    in Administration at Atlanta University and need your assistance
    very badly. My subject is: "The Impact of the Soil Bank Program."
    I am using the following five Counties in the study - Evans, Long,
    Tattnall, Toombs, and Wayne.

    Please grant me the personal favor of completing the enclosed
    questionnaire and returning it immediately. I have also enclosed a
    self-addressed envelope for your convenience and would greatly
    appreciate having the questionnaire returned by June 4 since I am
    schedule to make a report a few days there after.

    Please accept my thanks for the cooperation, I know you will
    give me in this effort.
A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM ON THE COMMON SCHOOLS OF FIVE SELECTED COUNTIES IN COASTAL GEORGIA

A Questionnaire

For

THE SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS OF THE COMMON SCHOOLS OF LONG, EVANS, TATTNALL, WAYNE AND TOOMBS COUNTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indicate School Pupil Enrollment by years, 1954-1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indicate A. D. A. by years, 1954-1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many new classrooms have been constructed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indicate number of teachers employed, 1954-1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Theron Spencer

Education - Attended Cuyler Junior and Beach High School, Savannah, Georgia. Received B. S. degree in Secondary Education at Savannah State College, Savannah, Georgia

Field of Concentration - Elementary Education Administration

Experience - Served in the capacity of a classroom teacher for a period of six years, Tattnall County, Georgia. Presently employed as principal of Collins Elementary School, Tattnall County, Georgia.

Personal Data - Born in Long County, Ludowici, Georgia. Married, one daughter. Holds membership in The Tremont Temple Baptist Church, Park Avenue and West Broad Streets, Savannah, Georgia, as Financial Secretary and Trustee, Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, G. T. E. A., Masons, Boy Scouts of America (Advisor).