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Coordinating programs and sharing resources within the region has always been a concern of Extension Directors in the Southern Region. For years the Southern Extension Directors have looked to the four program committees to accomplish this task within their respective program areas of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Home Economics, 4-H, and Community Resource Development. This worked well until the economic, social and political environments in the South and nation began changing so rapidly and frequently that a new structure was required; one that would enable the system to respond rapidly with multidisciplinary issues-based programs. In 1989, the Southern Extension Directors appointed the Southern Region Task Force on Organization to make recommendations on how best the program leadership of the region can be organized to ensure that regional issues are identified and addressed through multidisciplinary programs. The Task Force was composed of: Bill Allen (VA), Jim App (FL), Bill Clinkscales (SC), Laverne Feaster (AR), Warren McCord (AL), Bobbie McFatter (LA), Jan Montgomery (OK), Marilynn Purdie (MS), Walter Walla (TX), Paul Warner (KY), and Ed Yancey (NC). Directors Roy Bogle (OK) and Zerle Carpenter (TX) served as administrative advisors to the group.

The Southern Extension Directors approved the Task Force on Organization’s recommendations at their meeting. This action strengthened the regional committee structure and put into place a mechanism to react more rapidly to regional issues and strengthen state programs. The new structure and regional program planning process now consists of the following elements:

1. Seven regional committees composed of one member from each state: a (a) ANR Program Leaders Committee, (b) CRD Program Leaders Committee, (c) HE Program Leaders Committee, (d) 4-H Program Leaders Committee, (e) Middle Management Committee, (f) Staff Development Committee, and (g) Communications Committee.

2. A joint annual meeting of all seven regional committees to include individual committee meetings as well as joint sessions of all committees.

3. A Southern Region Program Leadership Committee for the purpose of stimulating increased inter-disciplinary program efforts. The committee provides leadership to the identification of emerging issues and, in consultation with the Southern Directors, establishes regional task forces to plan and implement interdisciplinary program efforts. It also plans and coordinates the meeting of the seven regional committees. The Program Leadership Committee is comprised of one elected representative from each of the seven regional committees.

The Southern Region now has a regional committee structure and process that is charged to accomplish the following:

1. Strategic Planning. Coordinating the regional issue identification, development and review process and recommending emerging issues for development as new regional initiatives.

2. Program Leadership. 1) Providing leadership for implementing new initiatives; 2) Planning and facilitating inter-disciplinary Extension programs and responding to regional critical issues; 3) Establishing and
coordinating regional task forces to develop content and educational plans for new initiatives; 4) Developing and recommending a program review process to set program priorities and improve Extension programs; 5) Encouraging multi-state, multi-region and international programming.

3. Personnel and Staff Development. 1) Initiating and promoting a regional system for maintaining professional competence among all employees; 2) Reviewing and recommending improved methods of delivering Extension programs; 3) Encouraging multi-state professional improvement.

An "interim" program leadership committee was appointed by the Southern Directors to plan and coordinate the first joint committee meeting and to work until the committees could select their representatives at the joint committee meeting in the Fall of 1990. The interim committee was composed of Warren McCord (AL), CRD - Chair; Linda Harri man (OK), HE; Elwyn Deal (SC), ANR; Sue Fisher (FL), 4-H; Conrad Reinhardt (TN), Communications; Paul Warner (KY), Staff Development; and Ed Yancey (NC), Middle Management. Director Zerle Carpenter (TX) served as administrative advisor.

The first Joint Southern Region Program Committee Meeting was held on September 5-7, 1990, in Birmingham, Alabama. The meeting consisted of general sessions, individual meetings of all seven individual committees and roundtable discussions. Eleven roundtables were created, one for each of the current national initiatives, core programs, and emerging issues as identified in the November 1989 ECOP report, "New Directions for a New Decade." The representatives from each state and each committee were assigned as evenly as practical to roundtable groups. Under the guidance of a roundtable discussion leader, each group was asked to "regionalize" the assigned initiative by addressing the following: Key program successes and barriers; Potential of the program in the South; What should the major thrust be in the South?; What actions are recommended?; and Who should provide leadership for implementing these actions? The roundtables were also asked to prioritize each of the eleven current national initiatives, core program, and emerging issues as high, medium or low for the Southern Region. They were also asked to prioritize several new southern issues that had been identified by the roundtables.

These proceedings contain the papers presented at the joint sessions and the roundtable reports. Each reader of these proceedings is encouraged to consider their implications in light of his/her responsibility within the Extension system, and apply them appropriately within the context of his/her state and committee.

R. Warren McCord
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"To the doctor, the child is a typhoid patient; to the playground supervisor, a first baseman; to the teacher, a learner of arithmetic. At times, he may be different things to each of these specialists, but too rarely is he a whole child to any of them."

From the 1930 report of the White House Conference on Children and Youth.
Introduction

The author's previous study, All One System, was written to allow people to see that there was an entire interrelated educational system, stretching from kindergarten to graduate school. The nature of the system, however, was perceived only by the people who could see the whole thing—the people who were moving through it as students. Faculty and administrators, dedicated to one segment of the system, had no direct experience with the other segments, and needed to see the interdependence of the segments. To the degree that we now see an increase in contacts and working programs between higher education and elementary and secondary schools, that agenda is moving along.

The present report is on a different tack, attempting to convey an even larger perspective. Figure 1 illustrates this perspective.

**FIGURE 1**

```
CLIENT
   ↓
EDUCATION
   ↓
HEALTH
   ↓
HOUSING
   ↓
CORRECTIONS
   ↓
TRANSPORTATION
```

In the United States, services are performed for citizens by a bewildering array of agencies at the federal, state, county and city levels. These services include among others, education, health care, housing, transportation, income maintenance (including food) and police (including justice). In bureaucracies, as German social scientist, Max Weber, pointed out, means tend to become ends. The essential focus shifts inward, rewarding those activities which maintain the bureaucracies' inner health, regardless of whether or not it is doing what it is supposed to do. This tendency is as strong in armies as in post offices. If a bureaucracy has used pencils for its entire existence, and is suddenly told to substitute ball point pens, a major riot could result. A means (writing instrument) has become an end ("no outsider can tell us how we should run our business").

Over the years, government agencies with the same function have begun to talk to each other more. (In educational, federal, state and local organizations are occasionally inviting each other to their meetings.) While an admirable idea, one of the major outcomes is often organizational maintenance, not improved services.

While it is useful for educators at various levels to communicate, it is no longer enough for the urgent problems we face. Service organizations must begin to see their interdependence across functional lines. The best way to do this is to perceive the client as the most important part of the organizations who provide services to that person, family or group. In contrast to Figure 1, this perspective would appear in a very different way (see Figure 2 above).

**FIGURE 2**

```
CLIENT
   ↓
EDUCATION
   ↓
CORRECTIONS
   ↓
TRANSPORTATION
   ↓
HEALTH
   ↓
HOUSING
```

This model suggests that educators at all levels need to begin to become familiar with other service providers at their level, as they are serving the same children and families as clients. It is painfully clear that a hungry, sick or homeless child is by definition a poor learner, yet schools usually have no linkage to health or housing organizations outside those run by the schools themselves. There are, as Lyndon Johnson observed, "interlocking effects of deprivation."

At a time when service organizations are increasingly strapped financially, this kind of interactive organization holds promise for much more effective and humane deliv-
ery of a variety of services to clients who are the sole reason for the bureaucracy's existence in the first place! It can be done. In Illinois, several state projects have been funded by giving the money to two different state agencies, making them develop a collaborative strategy for their joint project. Parents Too Soon is only one Illinois example. The grants from the Annie Casey Foundation insist that cities show that their agencies are working together to serve clients' needs, or they don't get the money. It may well be that with few increases in funding, we could still magnify the effectiveness of each dollar several times through programs based on interagency collaboration at each governmental level.

At the federal level, it was discovered during the author's tenure as Director of the National Institute of Education (NIE) that the federal government was spending over $400 million in educational research and development in all its agencies, while NIE only had $75 million! The Federal Interagency Committee on Education was designed to consider federal programs in education across agencies, just as the International Geophysical Year was designed for the natural and physical sciences.

Similar examples can be found at city and county levels of government. Indeed, these two levels are where "the rubber meets the road" in terms of service delivery to real people in need of those services. Most federal and state programs pass money through to various local agencies that actually administer education, health, housing and most other programs to individual human beings. It is at the local level that interagency collaboration has the greatest return on tax dollars invested. While the federal civilian workforce has remained the same size, there has been some increase in state government workers (especially state college professors) while local government workers have expanded many times over in order to implement the new state and federal programs (see Figure 3). Many have noticed that in education, health care and social work, those who provide direct services—teachers, nurses, social workers—are at the bottom of the status hierarchy.

### Figure 3

**GOVERNMENT WORKERS**

- Local Workers
- State Workers
- Federal Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** American Demographics, 1986.

In order to see these relationships and the need for collaboration among various agencies serving the same clients, we will review recent information about each one, including the implications for educational services. In each service, we will look at how that organization provides its services throughout the client's life, as All One System attempted to view the educational system. We will also discuss other forces mandating collaboration (such as the movement of cities across state lines).
Since the end of World War II, the word "housing" conjures up in most people's minds a detached, single family home in the suburbs, occupied by a working "breadwinner" father, a housewife mother, and two children of public school age. This kind of family is now 6% of the households in the U.S., a radical decline. In fall, 1988, 18 percent of college freshmen reported that they had a housewife mother. In addition, the idea of housing (actually a cut-down version of the medieval "Lord of the Manor" notion, but limited to a quarter acre plot) was based on the very dominant rights of new veterans to: (1) go to college; (2) own their own home; (3) have three children; and (4) convince their new wives to give up their "Rosie the Riveter" jobs and devote themselves totally to (2) and (3).

Today, the "Leave It To Beaver" household seems very atypical. The American family is now one person smaller than in 1950. Although most of us are married, over one-third of all marriages performed in 1988 were second marriages for at least one partner.

In addition, of the 91,066,000 households in the U.S. in 1988, married couples with children were 27 percent or 24,600,000 households, while non-family households were 28.5 percent, or 25,933,000 households (non-family includes 24 percent one-person households, and 4.4 percent households with persons living unrelated others). To have more non-family households than family households with children is to suggest the striking decline in birthrate that lies behind the numbers.

**FIGURE 4**

**NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER WHITE WOMAN**

(Children per Woman, Ages 18-44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All children</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent children</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, with over half of all of today's new marriages slated to end in divorce, we have 15.3 million children living with one parent, the mother in over 90 percent of the cases. (It is interesting, and seldom discussed, that 1.9 million children live with neither parent, in mostly foster homes, with distant relatives, or have been adopted. Also, 23 percent of all children born today are born outside of marriage.) Of the children living with one parent:

- 50 percent of white children are with a mother who divorced.
- 54 percent of black children are with a never-married mother.
- 33 percent of Hispanic children's mothers have not married.

This is the major reason we have an increase in youth poverty in our nation, now 23 percent of all young children aged 0-5 years. Today, 40 percent of the poor are children and 10 percent are elderly. While poverty rates are declining slightly, youth poverty for children aged 0-5 is increasing. The reasons are based on household income:

- The average income for married couples with children: $36,206
- The average income for female households with children: $11,299
At the other end of the age scale, we have already seen a major shift toward the aging of America, if we look at the numbers of people over the age of 65:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>65+</strong></td>
<td>25,550,000</td>
<td>29,834,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35–44</strong></td>
<td>25,698,000</td>
<td>34,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under 5</strong></td>
<td>16,348,000</td>
<td>18,252,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Elders"  "Baby Boomers"  "Baby Boomlet"

The Baby Boomers’ move into their middle years caused an 8.7 million increase, while people over the age of 65 increased 4.3 million, and the so-called "Baby Boomlet" of the youngest children only increased 1.9 million. The Boomlet ends in 1990, as a much smaller group of women begins to enter the childbearing years. The Boomers are marrying late and having very few children per family (Boomlet), which is why 50 percent of the children born today are first (and probably last) children, while in 1950 only 25 percent of the infants born were first children—75 percent were to families with more than one child. Virtually all of the over-65’s are eligible for some sort of retirement payments. The dependency ratio of elderly to youth has been shifting since 1990, away from youth and toward elderly (see Figure 5 below).

Finally, as we think of the diverse patterns in which we live with (or without) each other, we should consider two more factors, the short-cycle family and the multiple dependent family.

Short-cycle families (see Figure 6 next page) are those which produce a new child every 14 years or so. In Los Angeles last year, I met a 28 year-old grandmother. (She had a 14 year-old daughter who had just given birth.) I asked the grandmother how old her mother was when she was born, and she indicated 14 again. Thus, there is, in Los Angeles, a 42 year-old great grandmother. (No fathers were living with any of the mothers.) This was a white family, in poverty.

---

**FIGURE 5**

**DEPENDENCY RATES OF ELDERLY TO YOUTH**

(Number of Age Range per 1000 Persons Aged 18-24)

but their identity has been reported in quantity by the *Wall Street Journal*, among others.

It may well be that regardless of race, our middle class is not reproducing itself. In the past, women graduated from college and got married, giving us a large middle class of well-educated people and a fairly high birth rate. Currently, without our 16 million immigrants, our population would not have expanded much at all since 1980. Estimates have been made that one-fifth of the females now in college are likely to have no children at all. Even black middle-class fertility is falling, as are fertility rates in almost all of the NATO nations. Into this context, the short-cycle family, almost always a poverty family, has a very great impact.

Longer life expectancy plus more divorces yields the multiple dependent family. Think of a married couple, the Smiths, 60 and 62 years old. The husband has had a stroke and cannot care for himself. The wife’s 85 year-old mother has come to live with them. They have two daughters, the first has been divorced and has a child with partial paralysis who cannot go to school. The second daughter has two children, and she and her husband live in the same house with all the others. The sixty year-old wife is responsible for the care of her mother, her husband, the partially paralyzed son of her first daughter when she is working, and the 4 year-old child of her second daughter who is too young to go to school. This multiple dependent family (shown in Figure 7) is rapidly becoming more common in the U.S.

Being a nomadic sort, we wander around the face of the nation more frequently than any other people. As we wander, we expect our housing supply to wander as well. However, the vast majority of our moves are within the same county—only about 15 percent of movers go out of state. To a large extent, being optimistic by nature, we move toward opportunity (60 percent of moves), while only 20 percent are moves out of an unpleasant situation, and 20 percent are “flat”—neither up or down. To a considerable extent, we can predict population growth based upon job growth, especially in a society of working couples. Migration profiles do not have the precision of other kinds of demographic analysis, but tables like the following do give us a real sense of where new housing will have to be built:

### Job Growth, 1987–2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim-Santa Ana</td>
<td>+46</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>+39</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>+36</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>+31</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (6 areas):</strong></td>
<td><strong>+16</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,215</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>+16</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Planning Association
Tracing the same kind of analysis for the nation, we can look at our major metropolitan areas to see where growth will occur (see map above).

When one thinks of the increased diversity of our living arrangements, one wonders about the quality, affordability and flexibility of the housing in which we live! There are several factors to take into account:

- The 70 million Baby Boomers, born between 1946 and 1964, are now between the ages of 25 and 43. We have failed to anticipate their housing needs, except for the wealthy among them.
- From 1973-87, home ownership rates for young married couples dropped from 38.9 percent to 29.1 percent; single-parent families owning homes went down from 13.7 percent to 6.3 percent.
- In the past 15 years, housing costs have increased three times faster than income, resulting in a decrease in home ownership from 1980-87. First-time home buyers are having severe difficulty, as an average down payment in 1985 was 50 percent of a buyer's wages, up from 33 percent in 1978.
- From 1984-86, households with real income of under $5,000 increased 55 percent, while the stock of low-rental housing units decreased by over one million.
- The federal government has basically stopped building low income housing. The current stock of 4 million low income housing units subsidized by the federal government has stopped growing, and is likely to decline as contracts with developers expire and are not renewed. There are 8 million low income renters competing for 4 million housing units.
- Over 6 million households pay more than 50 percent of their incomes in rent. Another 5 million pay more than 35 percent. In 1975, rentals averaged only 23 percent of income. According to housing specialist Apgar, single parents today pay 58 percent of their
Incomes in rent, young single parents with children living with them are now paying 81 percent of their income in rent in 1988. According to *A Place to Call Home*, released in April, 1989, 43 percent of all poverty families pay more than 70 percent of their annual incomes in rent. The typical poor family of three would have $3,000 left to pay for everything else—medical care, transportation, food.

- Tax breaks for home builders have produced an overabundance of condominiums for the wealthy, suburban mansions, and even second homes for vacations and retirement, but not low income housing. There are presently no incentives for building the latter.

- Although the numbers are sketchy, there is an epidemic of homeless people, estimated by William Grier at 2.5 million in 1988. In many cities, families now compose over 50 percent of the homeless population. Most homeless families are headed by women with two or three children under five.

- Reston, Virginia, a planned community in very affluent suburban Virginia, has been a model in housing for the nation. However, its new community shelter for the homeless has turned away 1,000 people since its opening in 1988. About 20 of its 80 beds are occupied by children.

- Rental housing vacancies have increased from 1.5 million units to 2.7 million during the 1980’s, but over 90 percent of the vacancies are in the high end of the market. Demand for low income units, caused by major increases in Americans who work full-time and yet are in poverty, will push rents on low income units up another 25 percent by 1993, given the realities of demand being twice the supply.

- In 1980, $10.5 billion in subsidized low interest housing loans were made available to first-time home buyers through the Mortgage Revenue Bond Program. The Congressional Research Service estimates that in 1990 the number will drop to $2 billion.

- In 1988, over 4 million Americans worked full-time, yet were eligible for poverty benefits. These people work jobs in the low end of the service economy that pay minimum wage or less, and are very dependent on the small amount of subsidized housing, for which the demand (and rentals) are increasing rapidly. Thus, new jobs in the American economy have created more rich workers, more poor, and fewer in the middle (see charts above).

- We also know that homeless children are much more likely to have anemia, malnutrition and asthma, as well as much lower school attendance. In one study, an estimated 43 percent of homeless children had serious developmental delays.

What does this mean for education? A large number of questions in this area have seldom been asked. Our post-World War II housing stock was designed for a family unit that now constitutes only 28 percent of American households (married couples with children). If we look at the 23 percent of young children in America who are below the poverty line, we can be quite sure that they are hungry quite often, that their mothers are not with them in the afternoon, and that there is no place in their housing that can be set aside for studying purposes. The average woman raising children only has $11,000 in income a year; thus the average child raised by a single mother (and there are 15 million such children in 1989) is living within $1,000 of the poverty point.
It is also quite likely that the child’s commute to school will be long and complex, as will the mother’s commute to work, due to the location of the apartment in which they live. In a one-bedroom apartment, the child’s “room” is likely to be a convertible sofa in the living room, including the television, the phone and other distractions, right next to a busy, noisy kitchen. The school is so far away that the mother is unable to get there in the evenings for teacher conferences and other activities. (And, she is likely to be bone tired after working hard all day, commuting, and making dinner for her child/children.) In addition, rents are such a high percent of this family’s income that any crisis—repairs on the car, for example—can tip the family into the street as additional homeless. Our housing patterns mirror the job structure, with more rich, more poor, and fewer in the middle—the “hourglass effect” (see above).

Although there are few studies of the point, housing, which eats up such a large percentage of the income of the most vulnerable parents, is undoubtedly a major factor in school dropouts and failures. If we as a nation were to develop a strategy for reducing the number of children in poverty (40 percent of America’s poor are children) there are at least two strategies we might pursue: (1) a range of programs for helping people who are in poverty to get out: very expensive and not very successful; or (2) helping people who are not yet in poverty to stay out of it: relatively cheap and, in the McKnight Foundation example, very effective. (Grants of $25–$50 were made available within a few hours, to women whose cars had broken down, who had medical or day care emergencies, etc. Getting the money quickly made the difference, and kept these families intact and operating.)

The second strategy, like preventive medicine, could be based on limiting the area in which potential poverty families are most vulnerable—housing. A range of programs needs to be developed to accomplish this goal—to keep working families with low incomes out of poverty in the first place. Housing is the most important area of vulnerability. If low income children were living in economically and socially secure housing with some rent protection, there is little doubt that most of them could stay out of poverty and in school, while their parent(s) could stay on the job and off welfare. We are just beginning to understand the effects of such a strategy on many other areas of life, including education, health, crime, etc. The costs of housing innovations would be a small drop in the bucket, compared to the benefits of having more kids staying in school to become taxpaying job holders!

In addition to this youth-oriented housing strategy, we need to think of housing as a life-long need. The conservatism of American housing designs and site selections is partially responsible for higher energy costs, long commutes to work and day care, the isolation of women in suburbia, the lack of low income housing and appropriate elderly housing. Other nations are far ahead of us in rethinking housing for the next century—Denmark has 67 communities built on the principle of co-housing, allowing for private residence but sharing a number of functions, such as laundry, children’s playrooms and fields, workshops, guest rooms and a common dining hall and kitchen, in addition to kitchens in each dwelling, allowing the choice of meals in private or with members of the community. Elderly people have much to do in such communities.

In the U.S., we are rediscovering “Granny Flats,” creating apartments for singles out of garages and other attached and detached structures. In England and Australia, you get tax breaks for them, in America you are breaking the zoning code in most places and would be punished. Wealthy suburbs increasingly have low income jobs to be done—janitors, fry cooks, maids—but there is no housing for such people in the community. That is the problem solved by Granny Flats, along with increasing the housing stock for the elderly. The Portland, Oregon group called Shared Housing is also successfully brokering tenant needs with a variety of housing opportunities. But these are isolated examples in a sea of invalid assumptions about who lives in America’s housing.
Here is an area in which all of the post World War II suburbs are coming home to roost. Because of our desire to create suburbs with single family houses, one worker in each one, and car transport to (manufacturing) jobs located downtown, we created a transportation network of road and rail that would function like a hub and its spokes. From your house, you would get to the nearest "spoke" (highway, bus or rapid transit rail) which would deposit you, and almost always your private car, downtown near your job. The Illustration of the Washington, D.C. Metro system mirrors this hub-spoke philosophy.

This is a great system for the wrong people. In Chicago today, more than 60 percent of all commuters are going from a suburban home to a suburban job. "Suburbs" like Irvine, California and Alexandria, Virginia, now contain more jobs than households. Look at our Metro map above, and ask how the people who live in Silver Spring and work in New Carrollton are going to use public transport to get to work! It can be done, but it's not an easy or efficient trip. If we connect these "spokes" so that one can move efficiently from suburb to suburb, using both public and private transportation sources, we will have something that looks like a spiderweb, but it will be the most expensive spiderweb in the world!

This movement of jobs and people to "beyond the beltway" deep suburbs will only further the isolation of big cities, and resegment cities for those who do not have the education and/or finances to make the move to the suburbs. In places like Dearborn, Michigan, polls have shown that for many residents, a trip downtown has become a ceremonial occasion to be engaged in three or four times a year. Dearborn, Irvine, Riverside, Oak Brook—-the list of autonomous suburbs with as many jobs as households is endless. We can now understand one of the most baffling phenomena in modern life—the beltway, usually designed to be the last road to jam up, is now usually the first. The typical car, rather than getting on the beltway for the short ride to the nearest "spoke" to downtown, is staying on the beltway for two or three times as many miles, going all the way from suburban home to suburban job. If each car stays on the road for three times as many miles as expected, you have the equivalent of three times the number of cars on the road; ergo, gridlock.

Let's look at how the 96 million workers in 1980 got to work (see table page 10). Unfortunately, this 1980 Census data is the most recent available.

Although there may be a big increase in walkers and bikers in the new Census numbers, due to be published after this publication is released, a good guess is that the private car will continue to dominate commutation, although carpooling will be up on those roads that give specific lanes to carpoolers during rush hour. In addition, employer-operated vanpools may have made a significant dent. We'll have to wait and see.

Some things are certain. First, proven oil resources matched with demand indicate that there is no chance that we will run out of oil in the next decade. (Prices could double, however, but there will be oil to buy, at some price.) Second, as the number of people living alone increases, there could even be an increase in cars with only the driver. (Even if, as in Wyoming, most drivers own a car and a pick-up truck, it is theoretically impossible for the owner to drive both simultaneously.) In two-income families, most will have two cars. It also seems certain that massive capitalization of large-scale new transit systems is not in the cards for most cities. (The current Los Angeles beginning is not matched with a determination to get to some predetermined goal. Western cities, with their lower population densities, present difficult problems for mass transportation.)

Is it also certain that our transportation system is not going to find solutions to the travel needs of 30 million people over 65, nor to the transportation problems of about 10 million handicapped adults. (One of the shining lights of our much-maligned public schools is the excellent transportation service which transports about 23 million students each day, at a cost of $5.7 billion in 1985. If only their mothers had such a system to get them to work!)

Largely created by pressures from the automobile, we now have homes that are a very long way from jobs, jobs that are an equally long way from day care centers, and schools that are equally far from jobs, homes and day care centers. (Why we don't have more day care centers in office parks and work places generally escapes me.) The only one of these routes that is generally handled very efficiently with public transportation is the ride from home to school. School buses have a wonderful advantage in not being dependent on fares for any of their revenue.
### THE JOURNEY TO WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of all Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>3,924,787</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway, &quot;El&quot;</td>
<td>1,528,852</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>554,089</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>167,333</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>82,145,851</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>62,193,449</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>19,065,049</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>468,348</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>419,007</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to work</td>
<td>5,413,248</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>2,179,863</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>703,273</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Because most metro transit systems are run by people with political connections, raising fares is inherently painful to them. We generally have increases in ridership on public transport and a simultaneous decline in passenger revenues per mile.

Our mass transit system is also designed to operate at peak volume for only a few hours a day, creating imbalances in staffing and scheduling in a very labor-intensive business. In spite of suggestions that mass transit operate on a more regular schedule, pulling in other transportation systems during the four or five peak hours to supplement their services (including jitneys, dial-a-ride services, and even off-duty school buses), there are few working examples of this admirable idea.

The taxicab industry is one of the few "wild cards" in the transportation mix. When we think of total ridership, as many people ride cabs as ride trains every day. There are numerous examples of public sector contracts going to cab companies for the transportation of special user groups, including the handicapped. In addition, dial-a-ride programs, allowing cabs to transport several people to adjacent locations, holds promise for a variety of services not being covered today.

Handicapped and elderly people (and those who are both) have very special transportation needs that could be met with a dial-a-ride type of system, at a much lower cost than the costs for a single passenger going to any destination offered in a conventional cab. This makes better sense than offering older and handicapped people discount fares on conventional mass transit, although the political advantage of lower fares for groups that are frequent voters can be understood. (Fifty-nine percent of Baby Boomers vote, while 69 percent of 45 to 64 year-olds do! Who would you give reduced fares to?)

The educationally related transport problem most in need of repair is that of low income families with children, in which the mother must get the kids to day care and herself to work. Without a car, these trips can be a most excruciating combination of buses and subways, held together by a fragile thread. If the ride consists of four buses in sequence, one miss can mean a major delay, and that's just to get the kids to day care. Then another complicated sequence to get yourself to work, followed by the reverse at the end of day. If a child is sick, you add to the recipe the problem of getting to medical services by public transportation before you get yourself to work.

With an (old) car, the problems of single parents are reduced but not eliminated. If the car breaks down, or needs maintenance, there may be no alternative public transport. If the mother lacks funds to get the car fixed, or is behind in the rent, that may be the ball game. (This is why the McKnight Foundation program of instantaneous mini-grants was so successful in helping single parent women achieve self-sufficiency on very low incomes.)

One wonders what would happen if schools began to insert their $5 billion bus fleet into the solution of these problems. In some districts, school buses are basically "down" between the hours of 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m., and can be used to transport groups of elderly, handicapped, working mothers on flex-time, and other people in need of transportation, as well as groups of students going on
class trips, etc. While some will argue about insurance limitations, most buses can transport students out of district for athletic contests. If school buses are a public resource, then perhaps they can make a big dent in some of the transportation problems of special publics, as we have proposed.

Our school bus fleet is mainly suburban, leaving students in inner city schools with more walking to subway or commercial bus routes, more travel through dangerous streets. Even with reduced or free fares, the danger level is still considerably higher for city schools. On the other hand, increased population density in many cities means a shorter walk or ride to school, even though the short trip may be risky. (And given the greater frequency of cabs in central cities, plus the large number of single mothers with low incomes, that is an area in which dial-a-ride cab programs could be implemented on a trial basis.)

It is through looking at transportation that we can see how linked our educational system is with other social services. If transportation goes down, so do education, health and government. When we criticize low income mothers for not showing up at evening or mid-day parent conferences, a look at their transportation logistics for that day might give us a little more sympathy and understanding. A universal complaint from such mothers, about schools, banks, city offices, etc., is clear: “Why not be open on Saturday when I’m not working?” Indeed, with appropriate teacher compensation, why not have parents conferences in school on Saturday if it is clear that the mother just cannot get in during the week? As an ever-increasing percentage of our youth are raised by single mothers, the question will become more urgent.
Education and Health

We seem to spend more on health care than any other nation, but the return on our investment ($551 billion in 1988, up from $500 billion in 1987) is mixed in terms of the health of the American people. Thirty-seven million Americans have no health insurance or coverage, and 12 million of these people are children. Of these uninsured children, 87 percent live in families with one or more employed adults. As with our “declining middle” view, the wealthy are consuming more (excellent) health care, leaving fewer health care dollars for the low income family. In 1986, more than 38,000 infants died before reaching the age of one year, or 10.6 deaths for every 1,000 births. Black infant mortality in the U.S. is twice the rate of whites.

The reasons for this situation are very simple—one of every four pregnant women in the U.S. gets no care during the crucial first three months of pregnancy, about 20 percent of white mothers and 38 percent of black mothers. Without care in the first three months, a mother is three to six times more likely to have a premature, low birth weight baby, just the kind who is likely not to survive the first year of life. No esoteric medicine is needed here, just one physical examination for all pregnant women during the first trimester plus a reasonable diet. Again, early treatment saves economic and human costs later on.

In addition, it would be hard to call the U.S. a world leader in low infant death rates for all our people:

**INFANT MORTALITY RATES,** *1986*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland, Japan, Iceland</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark, Switzerland</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Deaths of infants under one year of age per 1,000 live births. Source: Demographic Office of UNICEF.*

Another example of this strange “cost-benefit” characteristic of American medicine is the medical triumph over most major childhood diseases, while growing numbers of preschoolers without immunization threaten a return of these same terrible diseases. The percentage of fully immunized children in the U.S. is less than one-half the percentage in Britain, Canada, Spain, France, Sweden and Israel. Again, a cheap early solution is ignored, risking long term suffering and soaring costs.

In an article reported in *Health Management Quarterly,* Americans were much more disenchaunted with their health care system than citizens of Britain or Canada. Eighty-nine percent of the Americans sampled said that their system was not working and requires fundamental change, while only 10 percent thought the system was working “pretty well,” compared to 56 percent of the Canadians and 27 percent of the British who voted “pretty well” for their systems. (In both Canada and Britain, the government sets medical fees, and virtually all citizens are covered for virtually all costs.) A majority of all income and occupational groups of Americans preferred the Canadian system to their own. The real irony here is that the U.S. now leads all of the Organization for Economic and Cultural Development nations in percentage of Gross Domestic Product devoted to health care.

To be fair, for those that can afford it, “high end” medical care in the U.S. is among the best available anywhere. But certain groups are systematically made vulnerable. First is children, whose parents may not have health coverage, or when they do, the coverage may be limited to the worker and not dependents. Second is older people, as Medicare now covers less than half of elderly health costs. Medicaid is a “safety net” for many, but one must become financially indigent before many of its benefits can be activated. As the dependency ratios shift from three dependent kids to one dependent older person, to about two-to-one by 2010, and moving to one-to-one in the long term future, we can see a major escalation of medical costs, which are concentrated in the last few years of a person’s life.

About 11 percent of America’s school children are enrolled in special classes for the handicapped. Although this is a guess, about one third of these children would have a smaller handicap, or none at all, if adequate medical care had been provided during pregnancy and during the first year of life. (Of the 4,374,000 such children in 1986-87, 1,914,000 are learning disabled, 1,136,000 are speech impaired and 643,000 are mentally retarded. Many of these conditions can be traced to lack of detection of the problem during early pregnancy, from prematurity and low birth weight to the inability of a premature child’s immune system to fight off a variety of diseases, especially those that attack the central nervous system.)

Special education works exceptionally well, and most of the “special ed” students will be able to care for themselves, get jobs and become independent. But the costs for some students can range up to $100,000 a year. One physical exam in the first trimester ($15-$50) plus advice on adequate nutrition for the mother during pregnancy (free during the physical) could prevent our spending up to $100,000 on the same child a few years later, not to mention having another human being who can function at a much higher level. Do we really prefer to keep on spending the $100,000 rather than the $15-$50?
If we add to the mix the vulnerability of youth to drugs, to teen pregnancies, to AIDS transmitted directly or through the parents, to juvenile suicides, to long hours spent in front of the TV, to junk food or no food for poverty kids, there are many reasons to suspect that the health of America's youth will decline in the future.

The Surgeon General has been very effective in his spotlight on AIDS and alcohol abuse, but local action to remedy these problems seems to be slow. Although many schools have added clinics to provide a wider variety of treatments in school settings, it may be time for a locally based coalition of school board, administration, faculty and community leaders to look seriously at the educational benefits of making sure that every pregnant mother in the community gets at least one prenatal exam during her first trimester. The costs are so small, and the benefits and savings so great that every school district would benefit directly by taking this step. Add to this the necessity of having every child protected against childhood diseases, and you have two remarkably cost-effective local projects in which education can work effectively with leaders from health and medicine.
The relationships here are particularly striking, in that 82 percent of America's prisoners are high school dropouts. Although there is considerable variation across states, a prisoner costs about $20,000 a year just to maintain. A college student or a young child in a Head Start program costs the taxpayer about $3,500 each. While one child in six eligible for Head Start is actually in a program, every prisoner gets his/her "entitlement" payment of $20,000. (Think of the educational system we could run in the U.S. if we had $20,000 to spend per student, kindergarten through graduate school!) At the college level, the various Trio programs have success rates as good as Head Start—a young person enrolled in Upward Bound, for example, is four times more likely to graduate from college than a control group who did not participate in the program. Like Head Start, unfortunately, Talent Search (another Trio success) is serving only about 20 percent of the eligible students.

If entitlement means that you get the benefits of the program if you fit a category, then prisoners are the best example of 100 percent entitlement in all of our services! The cost is astounding—in Pennsylvania I have told government leaders that in their state, it is seven times more expensive to have someone in the state pen than it is to have someone in Penn State. Most people can see that the prison system sucks away enormous resources that could be better spent elsewhere, and that anything that keeps people out of prison—like education—is an excellent long-term investment. One does not need to be a liberal to appreciate this analysis, a pragmatist will see it just as clearly.

Here is a good example of how education affects, and is affected by, other systems. If the present rate of high school dropouts (70 percent of sophomores graduate as seniors, on time) could be reduced so that 80 percent graduated from high school, and prison populations could be reduced by a proportionate fraction, billions of dollars in tax revenues could be reallocated to far more productive social purposes. It is obvious that getting more youth through high school is no guarantee of a lowered prison population in future years, but an increase in prison allocations will drain away enough money from education and other sectors that no increase in school performance could be possible. The correlation between high school dropout and prisoner rates is a trifle higher than the correlation between smoking and lung cancer. By and large, states with the best rate of high school graduation have very low rates of prisoners per 1,000 population.

These relationships certainly suggest that efforts in education are very likely to lower the incarceration rate. Florida, for example, leads the nation in high school dropouts and in prisoners per 100,000 population, while Minnesota is 50th in dropouts and 49th in prisoners! All of our top ten states (shown in the table below) with the best graduation rates are below the national average of 228 prisoners per 100,000 population, excepting only Kansas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEN STATES WITH THE BEST GRADUATION RATES, 1987</th>
<th>PRISONERS PER 100,000 POPULATION</th>
<th>1987 RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minnesota 90.6% graduate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wyoming 89.3%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. North Dakota 88.4%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nebraska 86.7%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Montana 86.4%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>33rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Iowa 86.2%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>43rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wisconsin 84.4%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>39th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ohio 82.8%</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kansas 82.1%</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Utah 80.6%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>41st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five are among the ten states with the lowest number of prisoners. (Ohio, by the way, has done extraordinarily well in improving its high school graduation rate, being the only large population, urban, manufacturing, ethnically diverse, established poverty state in the top ten.)

In thinking about the cost-effectiveness of various systems, consider the performance results of Head Start participants 16 years after the programs were completed, compared to a control group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD START YOUTH AT AGE 19</th>
<th>Head Start</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Employed</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduates</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in College</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been Arrested</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Welfare</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is spectacular performance for 16 years after the treatment was initiated. In fact, a dollar invested in Head Start saves you $7 in later services you don’t need to provide (like jails). Fully funding Head Start would be the most cost-effective way to reduce high school dropouts and welfare recipients, as well as astronomical jail costs, while increasing high school and college graduation rates.

How well does the prison system perform when compared to these education programs? A Justice Department study released in April 1989 showed that 63 percent of the inmates released from prisons are rearrested for a serious crime within three years. Indeed, recidivism rates were highest in the first year—25 percent were rearrested within six months, and 40 percent within the first year. There is an abundant amount of evidence to show that the best and most cost effective strategy is to keep people out of jail in the first place. Of those under the age of 25 who had 11 or more prior arrests, 94 percent were rearrested. Jails rehabilitate a very small percentage of inmates.

Between 1980 and 1986, U.S. state and federal prison populations rose by 65.7 percent, from 329,921 in 1980 to 546,659 prisoners in 1986, of whom 523,922 were sentenced to more than one year in 1986, undoubtedly much of the increase in arrests are drug related. The total cost of criminal justice activity in 1985 was $45 billion, up from $22 billion in 1980! Our higher education system, the envy of almost all the world, cost only $98 billion in 1985, up only from $62 billion in 1980. While our investment in prisons doubled, our higher education investment increased only one-third. Is this how we remain competitive as a nation?

The best way to reduce our criminal justice expenditures (little return on that investment) is to invest in our educational system, particularly at those points that maximize our return on the investment—early childhood programs of the Head Start variety plus adequate day care, increasing high school graduation rates with increased performance, and increasing access to college for every one able to profit from it through TRIO and Upward Bound.

Already, many states are working through a strong juvenile justice association, to link up in useful ways with their educational leadership. The role of truant officers and juvenile court justices as linkage points between the two systems seems to be a valuable approach. There are few empire builders in the prison business—most leaders would rather not spend the millions required for new prison construction. However, given our current operation of prisons at 116 percent of capacity, there seems to be no other short term solution. The best long term solution is to increase the ability of the educational system to ensure that young people will not drop out of high school.

Prisons do not age-grade their services past a rudimentary "juvenile" and "everybody else" division. As our population ages, we may even find that the increase in life sentences with no parole will mean a group of elderly prisoners, in need of very expensive medical services provided in jail cells! Violent crime tends to decrease by age, either due to declines in testosterone levels or because most of the violent are in jail or dead. The age of violent criminals has declined some, meaning that 17-year-old murderers are more frequent now, and will have longer periods of incarceration during their "active criminal life" than one whose first crime is committed at age 26. The increased years of prison will, of course, be paid for by the taxpayer.

During the period 1980-87, of all taxpayer-funded social services, investment in our prison system has increased faster than any other, including education, transportation, health care, (depending on whose numbers you use) housing and welfare. The U.S. incarceration rate is the highest in the world, with the exceptions of South Africa and Russia. What kind of social policy is this?

FEDERAL AND STATE PRISON POPULATIONS CONTINUE TO GROW

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1986.
Projections: United Way of America Environmental Scan Committee.
A Brief Look at Education’s Future

School demographics suggest that even with the “Baby Boomlet” entering elementary schools, the nation’s under 18 population will actually decline between 1990 and 2010, as the Boomlet is concentrated in only five states, and will be replaced by a much smaller group. The map below shows the change in each state’s high school graduate population from 1986-2004.

If we concentrate on a small number of very large states, we can see another pattern: half of America’s people (and half of America’s children) live in only nine states, all either very high or low growth (see Table A, page 18).

Clearly, California, Texas and Florida will increase in total population, Federal dollars and children! Table A was carried past the top nine—with half the people—to make another point. Massachusetts used to be 10th, and is now surpassed by three southeastern states which have experienced major growth. (Western states like Arizona and Colorado have grown in percentage, but still have comparatively small total populations.)

Return to our Big Nine States in Table B for a moment. If we begin to look at the school age populations predicted for these states in 2010, we see some truly astonishing things. We will have 62,644,000 school age kids in the U.S. in 2010, of whom 32,392,000 will live in our Big Nine states. Of that 32 million, 15 million will be minority. Remember that the Big Nine total of 32 million is half of all the kids in the U.S. Thirteen states plus D.C. will have more than 40 percent of their students from minority backgrounds. Remember also that 2010 is only 21 years away, not much time to make sure that in the Big Nine, all young people get a good education and a good job! If we fail, the economies of these states will be close to ruin. And in all states, 38.2% of all students in 2010 will be minority.

In addition, the rich states are getting richer and the poor ones poorer (see Table C). A glance at the bottom ten will reveal an important new development: regional patterns of state wealth have changed considerably. Regional comparisons by the U.S. Department of Com-

Changes in Number of High-School Graduates, 1986–2004

Source: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.
### TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE BY RANK</th>
<th>1988 POPULATION</th>
<th>GROWTH, 1980-88</th>
<th>GROWTH RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. California</td>
<td>28,168,000</td>
<td>+19.0%</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New York</td>
<td>17,898,000</td>
<td>+1.9%</td>
<td>40th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Texas</td>
<td>16,780,000</td>
<td>+17.9%</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Florida</td>
<td>12,377,000</td>
<td>+27.0%</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pennsylvania</td>
<td>12,027,000</td>
<td>+1.4%</td>
<td>44th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Illinois</td>
<td>11,544,000</td>
<td>+1.0%</td>
<td>45th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ohio</td>
<td>10,872,000</td>
<td>+0.7%</td>
<td>46th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Michigan</td>
<td>9,300,000</td>
<td>+0.4%</td>
<td>47th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. New Jersey</td>
<td>7,720,000</td>
<td>+4.8%</td>
<td>30th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine state total: 126,686,000 of U.S. total of 245,807,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6,526,000</td>
<td>+11.0%</td>
<td>17th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6,401,000</td>
<td>+17.2%</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>5,996,000</td>
<td>+12.1%</td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5,871,000</td>
<td>+2.3%</td>
<td>37th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

### TABLE B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINORITY KIDS</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>TOTAL KIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>8,520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>5,418,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>3,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>3,862,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>1,935,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>2,684,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>2,094,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>2,349,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>2,260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Demographics, May, 1989.
TABLE C
PER CAPITA INCOME, HIGH AND LOW STATES, 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$22,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$21,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$20,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$19,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$19,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$19,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$19,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>$18,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$17,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$17,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$12,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$12,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$12,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$12,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$12,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$12,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$12,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$12,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$11,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$10,992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Jobs in the middle of the wage scale tend to offer more regular benefits and more chance of upward mobility than jobs at either extreme (see chart below).

Regional Comparisons Ranked by Per Capita Income

1. New England
2. Mid-Atlantic
3. Plains
4. Southwest
5. Southeast
6. Rockies

A generalization that seems to hold for the end of the 1980s is that states and families are getting more unlike each other in terms of income—more rich, more poor, and fewer in the middle.

In 1988, about 8.5 million people worked full time, yet were eligible for poverty benefits. This is a relatively new condition—many more poor families, as well as homeless families, in which there is one or more full-time workers. The bargain we have made since World War II is: If you work full-time, you shouldn’t be poor. After WW II, the world’s manufacturing capacity had been bombed to the ground—except for ours. We made cars and refrigerators for the world, with no competition. In the Fifties, a poorly educated man could work in a factory, have two cars in the garage, three kids and a nonworking wife, and the kids could go to college. We have assumed this to be the norm, when it was actually an aberration which we have never seen before, and never will see again.

The service workforce, now more than half of the jobs in our economy, is skewed to the low end of wages, while manufacturing (still a steady 20 percent of jobs) has more jobs in the middle of the wage scale than at either extreme (see chart below).

PAY LEVELS

All Service Jobs

- <$15,000: 41%
- $15-30,000: 39%
- Over $30,000: 20%

All Manufacturing Jobs

- <$15,000: 28%
- $15-30,000: 46%
- Over $30,000: 26%

Look at the jobs that are increasing the fastest as a percentage of total jobs (see Table D below). If we look at where the largest number of new jobs are and will be, we get a very different picture (see Table E below). According to the well done analysis, Workforce 2000, by the Hudson Institute, we can anticipate that the U.S. will add 20 million new workers to its workforce from 1980 to 2000, and that 82 percent of the new workers will be a combination of female, nonwhite, and immigrant. If these groups continue to be clustered at the low end of the service economy, the country will be the poorer. However, as white fertility levels continue to decline, it is imperative that we educate minorities, immigrants and women well enough so that many of them can take on well-paying jobs in high and midtechnology. (Only about 18 percent of the new workers from 1980-2000 will be white males.)

We are also entering a truly international era in economic development. American companies like Ford have become very sophisticated about international manufacturing and marketing, and America's skills in pluralism should stand us in good stead during the next century both as a manufacturing giant and as the choice of two-thirds of the world's immigrants. We can make pluralism work.

### Table D

**Most Rapidly Growing Occupations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Percent Growth in Employment, 1978–90</th>
<th>Number of New Jobs by 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Occupations</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>21,980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Machine Mechanics</td>
<td>147.6</td>
<td>96,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal Personnel</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>39,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Systems Analysts</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>203,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Operators</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>151,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Machine and Cash Register Servicers</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>153,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programmers</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>40,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero-astronautic Engineers</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>41,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation and Service Workers, FAST Food Restaurants</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>491,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Interviewers</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>35,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Preparers</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>19,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review.

### Table E

**Largest Numbers of New Jobs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Growth in Employment (in thousands) 1978–1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janitors and Sextons</td>
<td>671.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses' Aides and orderlies</td>
<td>594.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Clerks</td>
<td>590.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashiers</td>
<td>545.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiters/Waitresses</td>
<td>531.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Clerks, Office</td>
<td>529.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Nurses</td>
<td>515.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation and Service Workers, Fast Food Restaurants</td>
<td>491.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>487.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckdrivers</td>
<td>437.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review.
New Forces for Getting Together in the 1990's: Moving Metros

One of the most fascinating things about demographics is the study of metropolitan areas in the U.S. They are moving. Most cities and metro areas actually wander around, quite like amoeba, extending a feeler here or there, and then pulling themselves along. Sometimes, they crawl across state lines, making governance very difficult. The largest example is "Boswash," the single area of very dense population that extends from north of Boston in New Hampshire to south of Washington almost to Richmond, where one-sixth of our population lives. In many respects, this is the biggest "city" in the world: 42.5 million people live in 25 linked metro areas packed into 1.2 percent of the U.S. land area. Goods, services, people and ideas are transported with great speed and efficiency in this very high density corridor. It functions because the densities mean it has to. (There is an urgency about large numbers of people. The Japanese are efficient, not because they're so smart, but because they're so dense. Remember that New Jersey is denser than Japan.)

Cleveburgh is actually a single area of high density which happens to flop over a state line. (If you're from Pennsylvania, you can call it "Pittsland" if you can pronounce it.) But who governs it? The answer so far seems to be "nobody, but it's working pretty well." Another example is the second largest metro area in Illinois, which happens to be St. Louis.

About 35 percent of the St. Louis metro area is in Illinois. From the perspective of the Belleville (IL) Public Schools, it is not clear whether this is a benefit or not. Belleville Township, where the author has spoken, is an excellent "small town" school system, disturbed by what is seen as "big city" influences moving toward them from St. Louis.

If one were to ask in a geography lesson, the name of the largest metro area in Arkansas, one would be surprised at the answer: Memphis! About a quarter of Memphis is located in Arkansas, and 10 percent is in Mississippi, making Memphis the largest metro in two states it doesn't even belong to.
One more example will suffice. What’s the largest metro area in Iowa? The answer happens to be Omaha, most of which has now wandered across the border into Iowa.

Now that you’ve got the hang of it, think of Missouri, with Kansas City and St. Louis attaching it to neighboring states. Think of Portland, Oregon, moving toward Seattle (WA) at about three miles a year; Cincinnati, whose airport is in Kentucky; Minneapolis-St. Paul, closely connected to Wisconsin in many ways; Louisville, Kentucky, in which three of the seven counties making up the metro area are in Indiana; the combined metro area of Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton, stapling three states to a common waterfront area—the list is virtually endless. State lines are very permeable, more so than governments.

THE NEW COLLABORATION—WATCH THAT TIGER!

These matters are of more than academic interest. With the 1990 Census will come the most frantic, energetic efforts at redistricting the nation we have ever seen. It’s the law that states and cities must redraw their boundaries after each ten year Census—that’s all congressional districts, all state legislative districts, all city and county-based jurisdictions such as city and county councils and school boards. The two major parties obviously see this as the most important battle of the decade.

In all past decades, these major decisions have been made by a few pols, probably smoking cigars, with a map and a grease pencil, in some very nonpublic places. But, thanks to TIGER, (Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing System), that situation has changed forever. The Census Bureau’s TIGER will make the 1990 Census available on compact laser disks which can be read and played with by most home computers. Thus, everybody who wants to, can now play this vital game. Who wants to play? Every special interest group that operates in any state. As a result, there will be thousands of districting plans for each state in the 1990’s, and more court adjudications than we have ever seen before. The bad side is that the spectacular gerrymandering that took place in California, for example, could happen in any state or district in the 1990’s. The good side is that TIGER will allow anyone to spot a fraudulent plan instantly. In the 1980’s, the districting maps were drawn by people and checked out by massive mainframe computers. In the 1990’s, the maps will be drawn by desktop computers and checked by people. (If you want to pay for it, TIGER has the ability to draw a picture of America for each state, city, county, zip code, census tract, neighborhood, or block.)

In addition to TIGER, we will be deciding which cities become metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), which many small cities want desperately to become, which of those will become combined metro areas or CMSAs, and which states will gain in seats in the House of Representatives and which will lose. (South and West win, Northeast and Midwest lose.) Population shifts have great influence on political boundaries, on federal and state moneys for everything from hospitals to highways, on how cities will be allowed to combine forces, even across state lines.

As we think about running schools and colleges, and wonder how much money there will be, what the geographical service areas will be, what the students will be like, whether enrollments will decline or increase, whether we will build new facilities—all of these, and many others, will be decided to a considerable extent by population dynamics. The more educators are familiar with these demographic tools, the less likely they are to be unprepared.

In addition, it seems likely that as information about population dynamics becomes more widely available, leaders may look to new forms of collaboration based on how their clients and constituents actually spend their lives. People working in Massachusetts often live in Rhode Island and New Hampshire because housing and taxes are lower. To admit this is to admit that these states will have to develop patterns of action that are more collaborative than in the past—Boston is an important resource for at least three states, all of whom have a stake in its future. This example can be multiplied many fold, including the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha combined metro area.

Some of the educational issues here are major ones. How can suburbs be made to see that if they continue to take the money away from core cities so that these cities cannot provide services for their citizens, the suburbs will suffer in the long run? (Two-thirds of the income generated in the city of Chicago is taken home to the suburbs to be spent.) As jobs also move to the suburbs, this relationship gets even more vital. In areas like Louisville, Kentucky, in which the Jefferson County Schools now enroll both suburban and city students, one can see the great benefits of that organization, both for desegregation and for high quality instruction for every child.

How do we deal with school districts which have genuine allegiances to several states or cities? How about “magnet” schools which attract students from other districts or states? (Early evidence in Minnesota suggests that the major reason parents put their children in “choice” schools is for convenience and commuting, not because of the perception of superior instruction.) One senses that the 1990’s will show an increased amount of collaboration between schools, school districts, businesses, states, and agencies that serve children at each of these levels. One reason for this increase will be better information on the people who are actually served by social programs, and how, in a time of limited funding, services can be teamed up to provide better delivery at the lowest cost.
The Reform Movement Flunks the Demographics Agenda

We have now had almost a decade of school reform. A tentative look at the results so far would include the following:

- "Threshold" exams for kids and teachers, establishing "minimal competence" levels which, if not met, will mean that the child gets held back or the teacher doesn't get hired.
- More difficult curricula.
- Choice plans, assuming parents will choose the "good" schools for their kids and shut down the "bad" ones.
- Restructuring schools to give the individual school more control over its destiny.

Our look at demographics suggests the following as the most urgent educational needs for the nation:

- Focus attention on the improvement of our "bottom third" of students.
- Reduce youth poverty, currently 40 percent of all poor.
- Prepare at-risk children for school by mandating Head Start type programs for all eligible children.

- Get more young people to graduate from high school and college.
- Enlarge the talent pool of high achieving minority and poverty children.
- Develop programs for youth who are at risk from several causes simultaneously—school failure, drugs, pregnancy, and arrests.

How well has the reform effort done on our demographic agenda?

- No increase in high school or college graduation rates.
- No reduction in youth poverty.
- City schools are today more segregated for Hispanic students than they were for blacks, according to Gary Orfield, of the University of Chicago.
- There is no gain in scores of the "lowest third."
- No increase in equity funding, providing the resources that give every child a chance to actually attain the higher standards that some 40 states have adopted.
A New Tack

We propose that, based on our analysis, legislative leaders at federal, state and local (city council) levels begin to exert pressure on their education, health, housing and transportation bureaucracies to begin working on the demographic agenda we have outlined. Although the work on interagency collaboration is relatively new, we do have some success stories, in the form of the International Geophysical Year, which brought federal scientific agencies together; Head Start, which combines health, nutrition, parent involvement and education; and the 200 “education compacts,” with the potential of collaboration between business, schools and higher education, to guarantee a job or college experience for every graduate of the schools.

Although this task could be taken on by legislative groups alone, it makes better sense to proceed through a budget-based strategy, working with the executive (President, Governor or Mayor). If the executive announces his/her preferences for jointly funded and implemented projects, the legislative budget committees at local, state and federal levels could begin to frame budget proposals based on shared funding across agencies, which the executive could support at budget submission time. Here are some techniques that have been useful:

- Hold joint committee hearings in areas of interagency collaboration (health and education, housing and transportation).
- Fund projects across agencies and assign oversight accountability to joint committees.
- Require joint budget presentations of agency leaders in interagency projects.
- Establish a common set of legislative—executive goals, to be implemented in part across agencies, with accountability and timelines spelled out (a management plan, if you will).

It would seem that large infusions of new funds for social programs are not forthcoming from any level of government. That being the case, we simply have to get more mileage out of the resources and organizations we now have. Interagency collaboration is one logical solution to a number of the issues we have raised in this book. It should be clear that improvements in one area can actually improve other areas simultaneously, producing a “win-win” game instead of a “zero-sum” game. If health wins, education wins as well. If education wins, prisons win as well.

The problems are important while the demographics suggest that a limited amount of time is available for their solution. At the center of all our social agencies sits a client who must be housed, transported, educated, fed and kept healthy. For every agency, it is the same person, the same client.
IT IS CHEAPER, EASIER AND MORE EFFECTIVE TO:

1. Keep people from falling into poverty in the first place rather than to get them out later.

2. Keep all kinds of families intact rather than arrange adoption and foster care facilities later.

3. Keep students performing at grade level by "front loading" resources toward those most at risk, rather than telling them at the end of third grade that they failed when no effort was made to provide the resources that could have meant success.

4. Keep people out of prisons rather than trying to rehabilitate them later.

5. Keep low income people in an expanding supply of affordable housing rather than increasing the number of homeless families, often with children and one or more full-time workers.

6. Keep mass transit so that low income workers can continue to have jobs, housing and some freedom.

7. Keep kids from getting sick (or hungry) rather than providing massive programs for curing (or feeding) them after the damage has been done.

Although these points are obvious, it is estimated by the author that we spend in general fifteen percent of our money on prevention programs and sixty-five percent on rather ineffective "cures" in all social service areas.
Major Sources Used In This Report

I. Housing


*Utne Reader,* May/June, 1989. (Special on housing).

II. Health


III. Transportation


IV. General


*Cendata:* The U.S. Census Department’s online database, accessed through CompuServe, and continuously updated.

*American Demographics,* May, 1989.
WHERE DO AGENCIES PERFORM BEST AND WORST DURING A PERSON'S LIFETIME?

1. Health:
   Best—“High tech” medicine for those that can pay, particularly those in middle years.
   Worst—Health care for the very young and very old who do not have insurance or compensation plans. Those less than one year old are more at risk of dying in the U.S. than in any other OECD nation. Many handicapped children in school could have had their handicaps reduced or eliminated through proper medical care while their mothers were pregnant.

2. Housing:
   Best—High priced condos and second homes for affluent people in their late forties and fifties.
   Worst—Eight million working poor compete for 4 million low income housing units. About 2 million people are homeless. Little thought to housing for elderly citizens, like “Granny Flats.” Little thought to housing needs of single parents raising 15 million children; i.e., study space.

3. Transportation:
   Best—Private, nonpublic (corporate jets, charters), high density fixed destination rail in new settings (BART in San Francisco, METRO in Washington), school buses (22 million riders a day).
   Worst—Multiple bus routes that single mothers use to get kids to day care and themselves to work. Housing is too far from job, which is too far from school, which is too far from day care. Some subsidies for elderly, handicapped on mass transit rather than flexible; “dial-a-ride” strategies which could meet elderly, handicapped needs better.

4. Corrections:
   Best—Low recidivism (one punishment, no more offenses, especially good for youthful offenders, high access to the straight world of jobs, housing responsibility).
   Worst—Overcrowded jails spending about $20,000 a year to house each prisoner, six times what we spend on a college student or Head Start child. Sixty-three percent of prisoners are re-arrested within three years of their release. Prison populations increased by more than 60 percent during 1980-87. Most prisons do not rehabilitate.

5. Education:
   Best—Early childhood programs like Head Start, but only one slot in program for every six eligible children. Special education for handicapped students is excellent, but expensive—(prenatal care of the mother during first trimester of pregnancy could reduce the number of handicapped children strikingly and cheaply). Suburban schools are doing well, including suburban minority students. Higher education in America is excellent in terms of quality, participation rates, but not graduation rates.
   Worst—Low high school graduation rate, tough problems arise in junior high, or “middle schools.” Hispanic kids are in more segregated schools than blacks have been, kids are becoming very diverse by ethnic background, teachers and curricula are not. Inadequate day care, Head Start eligibility levels not matched by program slots—youngest kids are the most “at risk.” Little attention given to educational needs of citizens over forty—almost half of our citizens.
SOCIOECONOMIC CHANGE AND THE RURAL SOUTH

James Hite
Professor, Agricultural Economics
Clemson University

Introduction

Harold Hodgkinson’s presentation has shown us the demographic omens for our future. They are not favorable to rural America or the rural South. Indeed, as one with a deep commitment to agrarian values, I find them chillingly frightening. Yet I agree with Hodgkinson that demography is perhaps the only social science in which predictions about the future (at least in its broad outlines) can be made with a low margin of error. Time will work out the details of the future as it goes along, but the broad demographic parameters of the world in which Extension must operate in the decades ahead can already be seen by anyone who dares to look and not blink.

My purpose is to build upon Hodgkinson’s presentation, focusing particularly upon socioeconomic change in the rural South. But what is rural? As Hodgkinson pointed out, we no longer have a good functional definition of rural. For statistical purposes, all parts of the country are usually considered to be rural if they are not located within a Standard Metropolitan Area (SMA), and we divide the world into "metro" and "non-metro." This is a gross delineation because there are small towns and open areas within many metro counties. Yet social scientists who examine socioeconomic data know that there are very distinct differences in economic activities between communities that are near to major metropolitan centers and those that are remote. Hence, the metro/nonmetro dichotomy has a certain empirical validity.

I will divide my comments into four major sections. I will begin by focusing upon the South as a special region within the United States where rural lifestyles and rural values have deep cultural significance. I will then turn to an examination of the way in which the agricultural technology of the land-grant institutions have impacted the rural South and discuss the response of the rural South to those impacts. Next I will review briefly the changing global environment which threatens to unsettle the economic, social, and political order that emerged in the rural South in the third quarter of the twentieth century. Finally, I will focus on the state of rural institutions in the South and the challenges that Extension faces in assisting rural communities to adjust to this new global environment.

The Rural South as a Cultural Entity

Almost since it was first settled in the 17th century, the South has stood apart in its economic base and cultural attitudes from the rest of what became the United States. In the
first place, the South was, until the twentieth century, the only part of the country which depended almost entirely upon commercial agriculture for an economic base. Indeed, I contend that in a historical sense commercial agriculture was largely invented by the tobacco planters in Virginia and the rice planters in South Carolina. After the invention of the cotton gin, the South became the domain of King Cotton. Even in those parts of the upland South where plantation agriculture never really took hold, the way in which people made their livings closely tied to the plantation. In my part of hilly East Tennessee, for example, we did not grow cotton, but we bred mules which we sold to cotton farmers, and so our economic well-being was tied to that of the cotton South.

But other parts of the country—the Midwest, for example—also remained largely rural and agricultural. What is unique about Southerners undoubtedly owes something to our historical dependence upon commercial agriculture, but that dependence alone is not enough to explain regional uniqueness. One of the most distinguished of Southern historians, U.B. Phillips, argued that it was the presence of a large black population in the South that made the region different. Without question, the problems of working out social accommodations between whites and blacks has preoccupied Southerners throughout most of their history. Moreover, the blacks brought cultural attitudes out of Africa that eventually affected the attitudes of all Southerners, black and white. Yet the presence of large numbers of blacks in the South is a direct outgrowth of labor-intensive crops of the South’s commercial agriculture, and so to the extent that the racial mix of the population accounts for the differences in the South and the rest of the nation, the explanation is merely a refinement on the argument that the South is different because it has historically been dependent upon an agricultural economic base.

There are other explanations. C. Vann Woodward argues that the South has retained cultural distinction because it contains the only sizeable population in the U.S. with a historical memory of having lost a war and felt the heel of an occupation army. While Woodward’s hypothesis has appeal in explaining why the South retained cultural distinctions, it does not even pretend to explain why that cultural distinction emerged in the first place and was strongly enough felt to trigger a bloody civil war.

In recent years, a new hypothesis has been advanced, particularly by Professor Grady McWhiney. McWhiney argues persuasively that the white South is ethnically different from the mainstream American population, and that the difference can be traced to the predominantly Celtic ancestry of white Southerners. It has long been known that the Southern frontier was settled largely by people of Scotch-Irish extraction. McWhiney examines surnames in Census records in Southern and Northern counties and compares those surnames to those found on tombstones in the Celtic and Saxon areas of the British Isles. The statistical evidence is convincing that, unlike the rest of the United States where persons of Celtic heritage constitute a significant but not overwhelming proportion of the population, persons of Celtic heritage represent 70-80 percent of the Southern population. White Southerners, at least, have been—and to some extent, still are—genetically different from other Americans.

As a farm boy who has spent all of his life around cattle, I am inclined to believe that genes are very important. But this is not the place to argue "nature versus nurture." The Celtic heritage is not just biological; it is also cultural. McWhiney uses notes made by travelers in both the Celtic areas of Britain and the American South to show that outside observers found the lifestyles of Celtic peoples on both sides of the Atlantic remain remarkably similar for generations after the
two trans-Atlantic branches of the tribe had split. The best way to describe that lifestyle, using a modern term, is to say it was what is now thought of as a "redneck," with all of both the positive and negative connotations implied. It was a lifestyle based on a culture of the fiddle and the hunt, of an almost clannish sense of kin, of a deep attachment not so much to the land as to the "wild," from which emulated an even deeper aversion to strong government, and of a marked tendency to act on feelings rather than rational consideration. For our purposes, the most important feature of this Celtic culture was that it was (and is) not only pre-modern, but anti-modern.

Few can deny that, anti-modern or not, the Celtic culture of the South has evolved. Some of the rougher edges have been knocked off by the forces of history. Yet elements of old cultural attitudes remain, and they constitute significant barriers against Southerners accommodating themselves to the realities of a rapidly changing modern world. Southerners are rightly considered the most conservative people in the U.S.—perhaps the most conservative people in any industrialized country—conservatism goes beyond politics to social and cultural questions. Anti-intellectualism and distrust of book-learning run deep in the South. Hence, the three-generational process, sketched by Hodgkinson, through which immigrants have traditionally become assimilated into American life has seldom been observed in the South because many Southerners—perhaps most—have spurned formal education. Although belief in education as a means for self-improvement has grown in the South, there remains a very large part of the Southern population—particularly the rural population—that is unconvinced that formal education, beyond the rudiments of reading, writing and arithmetic, has any practical value to them.

Why is this? The Celtic peoples are not incapable of intellectual achievement. Indeed, the list of distinguished thinkers of Celtic descent is very long and impressive—David Hume, Adam Smith, Thomas Jefferson. One appealing hypothesis is that the Celts need practical, existential evidence of the practical benefits of education in the form of familiar role models. A formal education does not have much practical value to survival on a frontier. It had relatively little value in growing a cotton crop. More recently, it has had relatively little value in working in a cotton mill or in performing some other assembly-line task in a manufacturing plant. While most ordinary people could see that those with higher education generally did well in life, those with such educations often had to move far away from kin and friends to cash in on its practical benefits. Moving away from the kinfolds does not appeal to the Celtic heart. It even smacks of disloyalty to the clan and its traditions. Short of moving away, those who stayed in school and got a high school diploma usually did not do noticeably better in the practical things of life than those who dropped out of school as soon as they could and went to work in the mill. Probably subconsciously, the vast majority of the Celtic population of the South calculated the present value of lifetime earnings with and without a high school education and concluded, correctly, that in most instances, the way to maximize those earnings was to take the first possible exit from the schoolhouse.

The same situation, with important differences, also has prevailed in the black community of the South. Blacks, too, have suffered from a lack of on-the-ground role models who demonstrate the practical value of formal education. The most important of the differences in this respect between white and black Southerners is that for most of their history, blacks also carried the handicap of legal discrimination. While certain relatively attractive (relative, that is, to available alternatives) jobs were open to blacks with higher educations—teaching, most notably—there were very real caps on the upward
movement an educated black could achieve. For most blacks, the only available jobs were menial ones where formal education was superfluous. Educating young blacks for roles in life that were legally denied them seemed futile. What's more, it could be a formula for a life of frustration and bitterness. For most Southern blacks in the rural South, an education historically did not pay.

That is not to say that belief in education was totally absent in black or white families of the rural South. A lot of rural Southern families, black and white, pushed their children to escape from poverty by means of education. But, in the rural South, certain long-standing cultural attitudes going back to pre-modern times have been reinforced by the economic and political institutions of the South, and among many Southerners, black and white, educational attainment has not been, and is still not, viewed as being of much practical value. Rural Southerners have had few role models to demonstrate its practical value.

The unfortunate result is that the human capital stock of the rural South is very thin. Even as more and more Southerners have embraced the sort of model for success that Hodgkinson presented, those who obtained educations often found it necessary to leave their native communities to take advantage of the opportunities their educations made possible. So the residual rural population in the South still has had little firsthand acquaintance with role-models demonstrating the practical value of education.

We cannot begin to appreciate the nature of the problems the rural South faces in adjusting to a changing world until we recognize and understand the cultural divide that separates many rural Southerners from American society in general. Some have predicted that the cultural idiosyncrasies of the South would disappear as the region industrialized and urbanized, and as old racial barriers were removed. John Shelton Reed, the sociologist who holds the famous chair in Southern sociology at Chapel Hill once occupied by Howard Odum and Rupert Vance, argues that those idiosyncrasies not only endure, but have proven so robust as to grow like barnacles encrusting the dominant national culture--country music, gospel music, stock car racing, etc. The distinguished English writer, V.S. Naipaul, traveling in the South in the 1980s, sees the culture of the South (even the urban South) as more closely resembling that of Third World countries than that of the modern industrial world--unexpectedly (for him) spiritual and organic, unlike anything else one might encounter in the domain of western civilization.

Because the culture of the South is not modern does not mean it is something to be discarded as quickly as possible. Naipaul admires much in Southern culture, and destroying it in the name of adjustment to the modern world would almost certainly call forth his vehement condemnation, as it might from all who understand the practical value of diversity, whether it be in a stock portfolio, in a gene pool, or in cultures. Multi-layered, white and black, Southern culture has produced a rich literature and innovative music that has become a world heritage. The spirituality of Southern culture gives it a human dimension which is increasingly absent in the modern world. Few of us would disagree that it is fine for people to be both prosperous and happy, but it is better to be happy than prosperous. If the fabric of Southern culture must be ripped apart to make it possible for rural Southerners to prosper in the world that is emerging, many of us might pause and turn our backs on prosperity.

Yet it is not proven that the culture must be ripped apart. In fact, if John Reed is right, Southern culture is quite tough, and ripping it might not be an easy thing to do even if we were intent on ripping. Historically, Extension has been an agent of
and it must be an agent of change again if the rural South has any chance at economic prosperity in the years ahead. But if Extension picks its strategy carefully, it may be possible to affect that change without unraveling Southern culture entirely. One might even add that only by understanding and respecting those cultural values does Extension have any chance of performing successfully as an agent of change.

Agricultural Technology and Southern Change

Let me move to illustrate how Extension has affected change in the rural South. Specifically, I will focus on patterns of change brought about by the agricultural technology flowing from land-grant institutions.

Historically, land-grant universities have focused strategically upon technology that increases the productivity of resources used in agricultural production. Such a strategy was compelling when the average family spent a large fraction of its income on things that had farm origin, particularly those things like food that were necessities of life. If, at the macroeconomic level, fifty percent of the nation’s productivity resources must be spent in producing necessities (as was the case in the U.S. a century ago), technological advances that double resource productivity in agriculture releases 25 percent of the nation’s resources to be used producing other things that may not be necessary but make life more comfortable and satisfying. So the increases in agricultural productivity made possible, in large part by experiment stations and Cooperative Extension, has provided very significant general public benefits in the form of growth in the non-farm economy. One would get little argument from economists in asserting that much of the growth in the U.S. economy during the first three-quarters of the twentieth century is directly traceable to productivity gains in agriculture.

Yet the benefits of this productivity-enhancing technology are self-limiting. As productivity grows, the relative size of the potential public benefits diminish. Consider: If the nation spends only ten percent of its national product on food (as is now the case in the U.S.), technological advances that result in a doubling of agricultural productivity release not 25 percent of the nation’s productive resources for other uses, but only five percent. So as we have inevitably encountered the law of diminishing returns.

Something else has also happened, and it, too, was inevitable. It is a generally known fact that the demand for most agricultural commodities tends to be both price and income inelastic. That means, in the first instance, that increases in productivity will cause agricultural prices to fall, unless demand is growing faster than the gains in productivity. It means, in the second instance, that the income growth in the economy stemming from the general economic growth triggered by increased agricultural productivity will not be sufficient to power proportional growth in demand. So the increased agricultural output made possible by the increased productivity creates agricultural surpluses that hang over the market and drive down prices. In fact, the dynamics of the market are such that prices will be driven down to such levels that only the most efficient and innovative farmers are able to stay in business.

It follows as the night unto the day that productivity-enhancing technology in an industry where producers sell into competitive markets with inelastic demand will cause the industry to contract. Production will be increasingly concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. That is what has happened in agriculture worldwide, but especially in the United States, and most especially in the South.

Why has the farm sector declined more
rapidly in the South than the rest of the country? There are several possible explanations. Among those, however, the most important is that production costs in the South are high relative to other parts of the country. The South, as we have observed, is an old agricultural area. Much of the soil of the South has been subjected to intensive cultivation for two hundred years or more, and soils in many parts of the South were exhausted before modern knowledge about soil conservation was available. The climate of the region is conducive to insect pests. While rainfall is generally abundant, the region is drought prone. Even in years when rainfall is more than ample, it may not come at the optimal time or in optimal amounts. The competitors of Southern farmers in the arid West, assisted by generous federal subsidies (paid in part from taxes levied on Southern farmers) are able to apply water in optimal amounts at optimal times. The result is that in many crops and in many farming areas of the South, agricultural production is profitable only when commodity prices are above their long-run trend lines. Given a prevailing market price, more Southern farmers will lose money on their crop than will farmers in more favorably-situated agricultural regions.

Hence, as the farm sector declined in response to the technology coming from the land-grant university, commercial agriculture virtually disappeared in many of the old, high-cost, farming areas of the South. The Piedmont, for instance, which only a generation or so ago was a major cotton-producing region, is left with only the remnants of any commercial agriculture. It is starkly true that the land-grant universities destroyed the traditional agricultural base of the Southern economy and forced the South, willing or not, to industrialize and urbanize. In doing so, land-grant universities, through their technology development and transfer programs, opened the door to the depopulation of the rural South.

Whether this historic transformation was good or bad depends upon what the alternatives were. In this case, the alternatives were too many people on the land and too little capital, a sure-fire formula for a never-ending downward spiral into deep poverty. Without the experiment stations and Cooperative Extension, we undoubtedly would have a much larger rural population in the South today, but we would also undoubtedly have very many more poor people in the rural South. In the 1950s and early 1960s, large numbers of rural Southerners left the region, out-migrating because there was no room for them to make a living at home and they hoped to find opportunity in the industrialized North. Others found jobs in the branch plants of industry moving South to take advantage of the huge pool of cheap labor. And during a 25 year period, from roughly 1945-1970, even the rural counties of the South made gains relative to the nation in per-capita income. Good or bad culturally, I cannot say, but wrenching as the transformation was to many Southerners, it was clearly good economically. Experiment stations and the Extension Service can claim an important part of the credit for these economic gains.

The rather remarkable fact is that today most counties in the rural South depend upon manufacturing, not agriculture, as the chief component of their economic bases. Whether rural industrialization was a feasible economic development strategy for the South was hotly debated in the 1940s. Admittedly, some parts of the South have been more successful than others with rural industrialization because some were luckier in their situation, some wiser in their public policies. Yet time has proven that the proponents of the strategy were right. Rural industrialization was a strategic concept that was compatible with Southern culture because it allowed a goody portion of the surplus farm labor to find nonfarm jobs near to their native communities, close to kith and kin. And it was successful because it took advantage of
opportunities arising out of the public works programs of the New Deal and the unique global position of American industry at the end of World War II.

The U.S. in a Global Economy

This latter point is worth contemplating because it illustrates how important the global environment is as a factor in determining socio-economic conditions in the rural South. Fortunately, Southerners have always had some conscious sense of the way in which their economic well-being was tied to world affairs. In the times of rice and cotton agriculture, foreign markets were critical, and world events, such as wars, could play havoc with the incomes of ordinary Southerners. As a result, Southerners, despite their sometimes chauvinistic culture, have supplied the nation with some of its most influential internationalist statesmen—Woodrow Wilson, Cordell Hull, J. William Fulbright, Dean Rusk.

In the years just after World War II, the United States was the only nation in the world with a large industrial plant intact. We were the only major industrial country that was not bombed. Anyone in the world who wanted to buy industrial goods had little choice but to buy them from U.S. manufacturers. Moreover, there was great pent-up domestic demand for industrial goods that had been unavailable during the war. American industry faced strong demand and had an opportunity to exploit world markets virtually unchallenged by competitors. Realizing this potential required that industrial capacity be expanded to mass produce standard products. The South had a great potential labor pool that could be released from agriculture by application of new agricultural technology, and these workers, generally skeptical of labor unions, would gratefully accept wages below union scale. Right-to-work laws in Southern states assured industrialists that branch plants built in the South would be subject to minimal production interruptions due to strikes. Some insightful Southern leaders—in business, in government, and in the colleges and universities—saw the opportunity and seized it. Aggressive campaigns to attract branch manufacturing plants to small Southern towns were undertaken, and in less than two decades, the region's economy was fundamentally transformed.

Could it have happened at any other time? I doubt it. First, the industrialization was possible only because of the very special world situation that existed in the post-World War II era and which gave American manufacturing a historically unique opportunity for expansion. Secondly, investments in infrastructure represented by New Deal programs, especially rural electrification and highway construction, made rural manufacturing in the South a feasible possibility. If the infrastructure had not been in place, manufacturing in the South would, of necessity, have been urban focused. Finally, World War II itself affected the rural South, expanding the geographic and economic horizons of millions of rural youth serving in the armed forces, bringing large federal defense investments to the region that created non-farm jobs, and giving rural Southerners new role models.

This period of post-war industrialization and expansion continued until sometime in the 1970s. Some would place the end of the post-war period in 1973 with the first oil crisis; some would place it in the recession of 1981. It is not necessary to determine an exact date for its close. But it has come to an end. While branch plants continue to be built in the rural South, the total number of manufacturing establishments in the U.S. is actually declining. Throughout the South, manufacturing employment as a percent of all employment is shrinking, almost as farm numbers have shrunk. The basic problem is that the United States no longer has
a clear comparative advantage in the manufacturing of mass-produced standardized products. Such activities are labor intensive, and it is difficult for U.S. manufacturing firms to compete with offshore firms that have an even greater supply of cheaper labor than is found in the rural South. Unless the U.S. dollar is relatively cheap in international currency exchange markets (making U.S. exports cheap and foreign imports dear), a growing number of manufacturers operating in the rural South find their profit margins squeezed beyond endurance.

All of this should hint to us that the global economic environment has changed since the heydays of U.S. dominance in the years after World War II. When we look at the national economic statistics, we can see clear evidence of that change. The post-World War II world is no more. Germany and Japan have re-emerged as strong industrial powers capable of giving U.S. firms tough competition. The U.S. lead in technology and capital is no longer comprehensive. In the post-war period, the U.S. was a capital surplus nation that could well afford to invest in many places and many activities with a certain cavalier attitude toward risks and rates of return. In the 1980s, the U.S. became a capital deficit nation, forced to borrow overseas to pay for consumption and to finance our growing national debt. The U.S. no longer saves enough to cover depreciation of capital and make new capital investments. It is no exaggeration to say that in the 1990s every dollar that goes into experiment stations and Cooperative Extension budgets, state or federal, must ultimately be borrowed from foreign lenders. Indeed, we shall have to borrow from overseas to bail out our failed savings and loans, repair our crumbling roads and bridges, and expand our infrastructure to meet the needs of the growing urban populations.

During the 1980s, the counties of the rural South, taken as a whole, ceased making relative gains in per-capita income compared to urban areas or the nation as a whole. The gap between rich and poor, country and city, which had been narrowing, began to open up again. Why? There are two main explanations:

1. Primary commodities—farm and forest products and minerals—which are the principal products of rural areas worldwide, increasingly were in over-supply, thanks in large part to the diffusion of U.S. agricultural technology overseas. So the prices of the things rural areas have to sell dropped relative to the prices of things rural people want to buy. We economists call this an unfavorable turn in the terms of trade for rural areas worldwide.

2. To compete with overseas manufacturers, American industrial firms either retooled, substituting capital for labor and reducing their work forces (as in the case of textiles), or shut down U.S. operations and moved their assembly lines offshore (as in the case of electronics). Many of those counties that had achieved modest success with rural industrialization found their gains slipping away as factory jobs dried up.

This latter problem has been well documented in the Southern Growth Policies Board report, *After the Factories*. And it was a problem found (in general) to be more severe the more remote the county from a major metropolitan area.

The problem is aggravated by the nation's capital deficit. To draw in the foreign money needed to finance our high national level of consumption and our high public sector spending. Federal Reserve officials have been forced to keep interest
rates relatively high. These high interest rates, in turn, cause foreigners to want to hold U.S. dollars, and so the exchange rate on the dollar is bid up, making it difficult to sell rural-produced goods, whether agricultural or manufactured, over-seas while making foreign goods relatively cheap here.

At bottom, this changing global environment means that the rural South can prosper only if it can find something to sell that the rest of the world wants, and it can sell a better or a cheaper product than would-be global competitors. But, of course, that is what the rural South has always had to do to prosper, whether it was selling tobacco, rice and cotton, or soybeans, or textiles and apparel. What is really new is that we have lost our old competitive advantages, in some cases because others have caught up with our technologies and in some cases because our federal government has made serious mistakes in economic policies.

Some parts of the South, most notably Florida, have found they have natural advantages in offering tourist and retirement services. Florida, after all, was one of the most rural states in the nation only a half century ago, and has emerged as a so-called "megastate" largely by selling its climate and geography. Some other parts of the South may be able to do the same. There is evidence that the coastal areas of Texas and the Carolinas can profitably participate in this market. But successful participation in this tourist and retirement market may require natural environmental amenities, like Florida's beaches and winter sunshine, that many parts of the rural South lack. So retirement and tourist development, while feasible in some parts of the rural South, is probably not a general region-wide solution to the economic dilemma of the rural South in the 1990s. Even if it were, there are downsides to tourist and retirement-based economies as troublesome in their own ways as the pollution that sometimes comes with industrialization.

Some parts of the South, most notably the Mississippi Delta, have pioneered new enterprises like aquaculture. Vegetable agriculture is promoted by some as a viable alternative for some parts of the rural South. Superficially, these forms of alternative agriculture have appeal in that they are geared to growing markets. They will generate profits for some early innovators. But if they are initially profitable, they will also attract more and more producers until the same supply problems that plague traditional crops are likely to suck away those profits. That is how a free competitive market works.

The general prescription for the rural South--at least the consensus prescription among elites--is to increase human capital through massive investments in education. There is almost no argument that the thin human capital in rural communities is a major deficiency hampering their competitiveness in the global economy. But even this prescription may be inadequate, particularly in face of the South's deep cultural apathy toward formal education, noted earlier, and the out-migration of educated role models from rural areas. Even if a general improvement in the level of education can be obtained across the rural South, the result may well be similar to that from a general increase in agricultural productivity--further depopulation of the countryside.

There is a long-running debate among regional economists between "people" v. "places" as targets in regional development policy. Stripped down, the human capital/education prescription represents a "people," not a "place," approach to the problems of the rural South. The prescription could allow Southerners to achieve material gains, yet simultaneously aggravate the problems of rural communities as "places." Whether there is any other alternative that preserves some hope for rural Southern places to remain viable communities, I do not know. Our basic knowledge regarding how rural
economies fit into a global market system is too thin to suggest such alternatives, and there is a critical need for fundamental research in regional economics that can help to augment that basic knowledge. But in the meantime, those of us concerned about the future of the rural South and its commodities as (to use the words of Jim Barker, our Dean of Architecture at Clemson), "important repositories of our cultural heritage and identity," must make do with ad hoc approaches. Not being able to foretell what dark destiny Fate may have in store for rural communities, the best that can be done is to build local leadership capacity and make sure those leaders have the tools to build whatever future Fate makes possible for their communities. Toward that end, the leadership development programs recently begun by Extension in many states serve an important strategic function.

Rural Institutions in Crisis

Socioeconomic changes within and outside of the South places enormous strains on rural institutions, particularly the institutions of local government. Rural governments everywhere in this country, but especially in the South, are governments run by amateurs. County councils and commissions, town councils, school boards, water boards, and all the other local governmental institutions are made up of lay citizens who hold down other jobs and, at most, are able to give public affairs their close attention for only a few hours a week. Most such boards of lay citizens are not served by sophisticated technical staffs. Large technical staffs add to overhead costs, and rural governments, serving relatively small populations in communities with relatively small tax bases, are unable to spread overhead costs as widely as governments in urban areas. Consequently, in an increasingly technical and bureaucratic world, these amateur rural governments are disadvantaged by lack of practical ways to use new technology and modern management so as to achieve efficiency in the delivery of public services.

Like small and middle-sized farmers, many rural governments are too small to realize economies of scale. So to render the same quality and quantity of any given service to a rural household means a significantly higher cost than is realized in rendering the same quality and quantity of the same service in an urban community. For example, our research indicates that if a water supply system serving 10,000 or fewer customers is to be financially self-sufficient, the monthly water bill for a family of four will be somewhere between $60 and $100 per month. Yet a water system serving 50,000 or more customers can make the same amount of water available to that family for about twenty dollars. Because many rural residents cannot afford to pay what it costs to supply them water, and because many rural water boards lack the accounting skills to determine what their true costs are, few rural water systems charge high enough rates to survive as viable entities unless they are subsidized out of state or federal treasuries.

There are similar problems in providing health care in rural area, in providing good schools, and in taking care of waste and in providing police protection. In some cases, rural communities can function well enough with less of these services than would be acceptable in congested urban areas. But not in every case. As the federal subsidies, particularly revenue-sharing, have been phased out and rural governments left their own to finance services, problems have started to arise. In South Carolina, we have had two small town water systems go broke since the beginning of 1990. Rural hospitals are struggling to stay open. Rural governments are being forced to choose between allowing all roads to fall into disrepair, or abandoning some roads and bridges, leaving the people who live along them isolated. The capital deficit condition of
the U.S. economy offers no realistic promise that a new program of subsidies can rescue rural governments. Even when limited subsidies are available, it seems reasonable to expect that the metro areas with their concentration of population and votes will elbow out rural communities and take the lion's share of whatever money may be available.

In its broadest outlines, the problems faced by rural governments in the South are not unlike those faced by family farmers a couple of generations ago. Those family farmers could not afford to have their own research and development departments, to conduct field trials to see what varieties of cultivars worked best under different growing conditions, to have their own staff agronomists, entomologists and plant pathologists to tell them what they must do to nip problems in the bud. All of these things added to overhead costs, and family farms were too small to spread such overhead costs. Publicly-funded experiment stations served as their research and development departments and spread the overhead costs across the entire tax base; the Cooperative Extension Service provide the staff expertise and spread that overhead costs in the same way. Today, experts on the faculties of land-grant universities have some of the solutions needed to problems faced by small rural governments, and with research, could probably find solutions to many of the remaining problems. But there is no good means for getting these experts together with the people in the communities who need and can make practical use of the knowledge that is already present. The question arises, therefore: can the land-grant university transform itself, using its Experiment Station and Extension Service as key assets, to serve rural governments in the same way it has served family farms?

Conclusion

So what can Extension do?

I suggest that it is unlikely that the problems of the rural South can be solved adequately with one general formula. Because each community occupies a different point in space, and because location is a very important element in determining economic opportunities, different communities will need different, customized approaches to their future. Local initiatives at the grass roots are likely to be critical. Leadership capabilities in the rural South must be strengthened so that such initiatives can be forthcoming. Once strengthened, that leadership will need backup support in the form of access to the best information available on a wide range of technical and policy issues. Extension can play an important role in both building rural leadership capacity and in providing backup support for those leaders. Indeed, if Extension does not do these things, it is difficult to see any other institution that can and will.

After more than twenty years working within the land-grant university system, I am well aware of the institutional rigidities that make it difficult for Extension to adapt to such a new role. Major structural adjustments are required, not the least because the range of expertise needed to backup rural leaders will be much broader than that in agriculture and home economics which has been Extension's traditional subject matter. In the 1990s, most states will not find it politically possible to give Extension a lot of new resources. It seems unlikely that Extension can grow into this new structure; it will have to reshape itself largely with the resources Extension now controls. Yet if Extension—indeed, if the whole of the land-grant university—does not find a way to achieve such a restructuring and reshaping, it risks become an archaic institution serving an increasingly small and narrow constituency and with an eroding base of political support. In my judgement, failure to adapt to the socioeconomic changes in the rural South will result in the destruction of the Cooperative Extension Service.
But there are more compelling reasons for Extension to respond to these changes than its bureaucratic self-interest. Extension has a moral obligation to rural people growing out of its role in the technological revolution that now makes it impossible for the rural South to sustain itself with an agricultural economy. Rural people have been persuaded to have confidence in Extension as an organizational friend that can be turned to in time of need. A survey published in the August 1990 issue of the Progressive Farmer not only shows that rural people prize their way of life, rural people have come to depend upon the Cooperative Extension Service in the same way they depend upon family, neighbors, and the church as a base of support in dealing with stresses. Bud Webb, our Extension Dean and Director at Clemson, is fond of saying that Extension "must dance with the people that brung them," and I take that to mean Extension has a moral responsibility toward the people who have come to depend on it. As their needs change, we cannot, with honor, walk away from that moral responsibility, difficult as it may be to shoulder.
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I am very pleased to have an opportunity to participate in this meeting. I really think we will look back sometime down the road and say this was a very historic meeting. As you know, this is the first time we have had a joint meeting of all the program people in the region. I'm not going to talk about our committee structure--Dr. Carpenter is going to do that. From my perspective, as one Director in the region, I am very pleased with the committee structure we have and the potential for what it will mean. I hope, as you look around the room, you will appreciate the fact that the Southern Directors, as a group, and I believe I can speak for them, recognize the importance of this meeting. There is a tremendous investment in this meeting. Every state and almost every program area of every state, is represented here, so you should know the Directors put a great deal of emphasis and have great expectations for what might come out of this meeting.

I am not sure why I'm here, or who I am supposed to be representing--I assume the Strategic Planning Council. I represent the Southern Region on that group. Let me say up front, there are two things you should be aware of. One is that you are going to get the "gospel according to Bud Webb," so take it for what it's worth. I have a way of expressing personal opinions without identifying them sometimes as personal opinions, so you'll have to sort out fact and fiction as you go along. I am also going to be very basic. I know I will be redundant for some of you, but I think as we look at the changes which have occurred in our system, we should not assume that we all understand the hows, the whys, and the wherefores, but that we do know what the intent was and make sure we are trying to head in the same direction.

As you know, ECOP is part of NASULGC. I am going to focus on the changes within ECOP, the committee structure, and what I believe that has meant and what it can mean for the system. Those are the linkages that I think we are primarily concerned with this morning. As far as having input to ECOP, let me say up front, and I think you're all aware of this, each region has three Directors on ECOP. The Directors from the Southern Region currently serving in that capacity are Denver Loupe from Louisiana, Zerle Carpenter from Texas, and Ted Jones from Arkansas. At the Land-Grant Meetings in November, I will replace Denver. Next year Dr. Carpenter, Dr. Jones and I will be the people to contact if you want some input directly into ECOP. That is why three Directors from the region are on that committee. Also, with the new committee structure, the Strategic Planning Council has been charged with the responsibility of doing some strategic long-range planning for the system, both ES-USDA and the individual state. One Director from each region serves
on the Strategic Planning Council. I have had the pleasure of being the Director from the Southern Region. I have said to a number of groups, if there has been an assignment I have thoroughly enjoyed since I became Director, serving on the Strategic Planning Council has certainly been one of those opportunities. There are an awful lot of committees, task forces, and blue-ribbon groups you serve on and don’t feel like you’re contributing a great deal. Some of them are actually a waste of time. However, I have thoroughly enjoyed this one. I think one of the interesting things, and we joke about this frequently, is that the four Directors on the Council probably are not the four most typical Directors you could find in this country. Rachel Tompkins at West Virginia, Ayse Somersan at Wisconsin, Fred Poston at Washington State, and myself, are the four Directors that have been on the Strategic Planning Council.

Let me talk about the Strategic Planning Council just a moment. It is cochaired by the chair-elect of ECOP which, at the current time, is Dick Fowler at Delaware, and by the Associate Administrator of ES-USDA which, of course, is Mitch Geasler. When the Strategic Planning Council was first formed, we struggled trying to find our identity and our mission. I think we went through some of the same experiences that both the Program Leadership Committee and the Personnel and Organizational Development Committee went through. I will be up front with you in saying that we are still fine-tuning and making some adjustments as we go. I know I speak for the Strategic Planning Council, and I think I speak for the other two committees in saying that our niches are beginning to fall into place. We have established better communications. There is a liaison from each of the other two committees that meets with the Strategic Planning Council. Our primary thrust has been to develop and evaluate the national initiatives. ES-USDA and the individual states can then market interdisciplinary programs to OMB and the Congress.

I’m not going to spend a great deal of time and, as much as we have debated it on the Council, we could spend a tremendous amount of time talking about national initiatives and base programs. Let me simply say that in the Council’s view and in my view, national initiatives are those things, by definition, in which the system is going to give significantly increased emphasis. They are, in addition to and not in lieu of, base programs. The thing that is going to carry the system is our base program. We cannot follow that definition and maintain a national initiative, as a national initiative, for a long period of time. We may significantly increase the level of effort in a particular area and maintain that, but there is a very finite amount of time in which we will be putting significantly more effort into a particular area for any given period of time. One of the major challenges, I think, and there has been a lot of debate about the relationship between national initiatives and budget requests, was for the Strategic Planning Council to try and get our programming and budget requests more in sync. We have traditionally, and this has certainly been true at the national level and I think in most states at the state level, waited until an issue was on the public agenda and was a real initiative or an issue before we tried to make a budget request for it. Usually we are talking about a two or, many times, three-year lead time to get that into the system, particularly at the federal level. If we are going to be effective in selling and marketing our Extension programs and in gaining federal support, (and at the state level if we are going to get local support), I think it is critically important that we do strategic planning far enough in advance that, before an issue is on the public agenda and is a national initiative, we get it into the budget request. We are making some progress in this area and I feel pretty good about it.

The Strategic Planning Council has asked the Program Leadership committee to develop a number of white papers, primarily to give more information and pull together what information is known in particular areas.
Those may, or may not, become national initiatives. Some of you may have served on the Waste Management Task Force which was limited to municipal solid waste--a national initiative. We had a white paper on Global Climate Change--Global Warming. That has not become a national initiative and I don’t think will become a national initiative. The relationship between those three committees is beginning to be understood by people on all of the committees. I think we are doing an excellent job of developing some strategic plans for the Cooperative Extension System. There is a question about whether or not ES-USDA and ECOP can bring the system along as rapidly as the Strategic Planning Council is saying the system needs to change. That is a very basic question and one I think is critically important to us. Design engineers with General Motors say they can change the thought of the American car-buying public in three years. If they phase style changes over a three-year period, they can make you buy whatever style they put on the market, if they don’t try to do it all at one time. There has to be some phase-in of our system as we change and address the kinds of issues that were presented to us this morning and those challenges relative to the kinds of issues we have been addressing in the past. Most of us are vitally concerned, in this region at least, with those issues and those problems which are unique to rural America. That presents an even greater set of challenges, particularly as we look at the relationship between rural America and the urban area.

Let me reemphasize or summarize the linkages that I think are critically important, not simply because I am representing the Strategic Planning Council here, but because that is the body, nationally, where ES-USDA, ECOP and the system comes together from a program planning or strategic planning standpoint. I think that is the critical point where individuals and individual states need to have some input. Again, each region has one Director serving, and that is a critical position. There are also representatives, of course, on both the POD and PLC committees. You can come through them to the Strategic Planning Council because of the liaison and the linkages between the three committees of ECOP. As I said earlier, there are three Directors from each region on ECOP, so you can have input there.

The system is looking very carefully at the way in which we can most easily and most rapidly adapt to the change in demographics we are facing. I don’t think anybody in the system has a monopoly on ideas. A state Director who thinks he has all of the good ideas is not only stupid, he is doomed for failure. We have a Department Head at Clemson who talks about the "collective wisdom" of a number of people addressing issues and having input. I think that is probably even more critical to the Extension System than it has ever been before. We all have input to help us as we weave through the changes that are occurring. Retrain, redirect, seek new resources--a new support base. As Jim Hite said, "Our traditional support bases are diminishing, in many cases, and we have to find other areas in which we can make a contribution." Again, if the system is able to change and to build these linkages that are so critical, I think the opportunities for Extension to have an impact are greater than they have ever been before.
ES-USDA CHALLENGE AND LINKAGE
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I want to comment very briefly on budgets because I know that's on your mind. I want to talk a little about where we are in the transition towards a new direction. Then I want to simply open up and review a few topics that I've already mentioned to three or four of you. I'm going to talk from the Extension Service perspective. I could spend all my time talking about stuff that's not on your mind at all, and I could fill the time. Some of you know that I have the capability to do that, but that would be totally irrelevant if it's not what you want to talk about.

First of all, I'll follow up on a comment made earlier that there's no new federal money. I think we in the Extension system have turned a corner, and I think there is some new federal money. You know the old statement, "We've come a long way, baby." If you look at a 59 percent proposed budget cut not many years ago to the House mark up of the budget, there's a very positive progress. We've got to clearly take that as a signal that the new direction of the system is working. Now, I agree with Zerle Carpenter, chairman of the budget committee, who has had a great deal of impact on the budget. Putting money in the formula, 3d and 3c is a good idea. When I was a director, I loved that. If you have all the money in 3d and 3c in the federal administration portion of the budget, it makes life a lot easier. The reality is: that's not the way they make the decisions. They simply are not going to do that. I think many of you are experiencing that at the state level. At the federal level, Congress is simply not going to do that. ECOP and the budget committee are arguing very strongly that we need to increase 3d and 3c to maintain our purchasing power. That's what supports our base; that's what base programming does. We're arguing that and at the same time we're arguing for increases in line item budget. It's a two-way street. They're willing to give a little bit on 3d and 3c if we will guarantee delivery on those line items. They're not in the mood to say here's a little money; go out and do good things on this topic. They're going to give us money, and they're going to tell us what kind of response they want. It's a little bit like the golden rule. You need to have the gold to make the rule. It's putting us in a very different posture with the state partner in the system. We are doing our best to keep the state partner involved.

ECOP has made some tough decisions. The process has recently brought ECOP into a different role. All of you should have seen the first draft of the guidelines for the new Plan of Work for the next four years. It clearly delineates what we want in terms of information. There's an overview asked for, and then there's a whole series of items for you to respond to if, in fact, you are planning to participate in that. The first part is on the national initiatives. Then there are those 3d line items like EFNEP and others. If you want to get EFNEP funds, we want to play. That's not new. There are some other things in there that we wanted information on—things that we as the federal government need to know. The only one of that list of 23 that we expect every state to develop is a plan on water quality. That's the decision that ECOP made when the Office of Management and Budget came to ES and said if they gave us the responsibility for this program and could secure
some money to do that, would the states do it? ECOP made the decision—yes, the states will do it. We, being ES and myself, went back to OMB, and said "yes, we'll take the responsibility. Don't give it to the Environmental Protection Agency—we'll take it and the states will respond." So the guidelines say that we expect every state to have a plan on water quality. That puts us in a different position than we've been in. The budget process is pushing us towards that, and I think it will continue.

Right now, the House version of the budget is a very positive budget. It has a significant increase, not as much as we'd like, but it has an increase in 3d and 3c for the first time in a long time. It also provides us with some new money for some new initiatives like Youth at Risk for seven and a half million; we asked for 10 million. We're working on the Senate for a five million dollar increase on water quality, and one and a half million dollars on food safety, all of those being new money. So, in total, it's a good budget. It'll provide us with some opportunities to do some things. That's the good news.

The bad news is that we have Gramm-Rudman. Starting October 1, the beginning of the fiscal year, actually October 15, is when they will initiate the sequester of the Gramm-Rudman, if nothing is done in the meantime. All of you have heard all of the horror stories of what's going on in the federal partner. That's all part of the process of covering ourselves in case we have no alternative. We have issued letters to every staff member in the ES. I got mine and had to sign for it; John Vance got his; Nancy Salford got hers. We all had to sign a statement saying that we had received this letter telling us that beginning October 1 the federal government has the option of furloughing us, which is really on-leave without pay. Our projection is that we in ES can make it through the first pay period after the first of October. There are some people that you wanted to come to this meeting that aren't here. That's because we're trying to save a few bucks between now and the first of October that we can carry over. That carry over is what's going to get us through that first pay period. After that, we are going to have to go on furlough three days out of every ten working days. That's a thirty percent cut in my take-home pay. I'm not looking forward to it, but that's where we are. That is the alternative that we have to balance the budget. We, as the Extension Service, federal partner, have to balance our budget every pay period. We can't stretch it out and say well, we're going to get a 30 percent cut, but it won't last forever; probably just six or eight weeks, so we'll just stretch it out over the first six months—we can't do that. They're going to allocate us the money on a pay period basis, and we have to balance our budget every pay period. My job's going to change in the process because every expenditure is going to have to come to my desk for approval. That is not one of those things that I bargained for. But this is the way we have to manage in order to balance every pay period.

A lot of things can change. Congress comes back today. If the Senate marks up the bill, then we use the Senate markup versus the House markup and whichever of those is lower. If they pass the budget bill, then we use the new budget bill and if the new budget doesn't agree with Gramm-Rudman, then we go into a sequester on the budget bill. They also have the option of repealing Gramm-Rudman, which is being talked about. They have the option of doing all sorts of things such as going home for election and then coming back and finishing the budget. We have an ace in the hole on that one. If they put us in a sequester, and everybody has to take this cut, that also includes air traffic controllers. If Washington National closes down, they're not going to be able to get home for election. What I'm saying is: we don't know what is going to happen. We do know whatever happens Nationally will be applied to the letter of credit at the state. You will not have the restriction of having to balance in a short period of time. That's the only difference. Right now we're projecting 31.9 percent cut, October 1, if nothing happens. That's the worst scenario at this point.

All of the other agencies, FCS, ASCS,
Farmer's Home, all got the letter about a furlough. I'm getting at least two or three calls a day from the states. Your agents are not included. Whatever is done to balance your budget is your Director's decision based on state policy and university policy. All we know is that you are going to have fewer federal funds to deal with within those policies. Our policies at the federal level do not necessarily apply. When I see where we are, probably one of the biggest challenges I think we've got to the system is to continue the new direction or the transition for a new direction.

The process of communication is also going through a transition. The "who" that we communicate the "what" to is changing. Traditionally, everything has gone to the Director or Administrator—and only the Director or the Administrator. Communication is clearly the biggest challenge. When I got your program, just as an example, I saw that you used the old national initiatives. My first thought was, "Well, my God, have the new initiatives not gotten to the South?" I understand how the program was put together and all that, but there is a significant change in the list of national initiatives. We have developed a concept of base programming. Some of the old national initiatives have been moved into what is being called base programming. It's critically important. This is the business we're in. It's what's basic to our mission. The critical, significant issues coming out of base programming are what constitutes the national initiatives, but they're not going to be forever. They're going to come, and they're going to go. We'll see issues as fairly short term and transitioning fairly rapidly. That doesn't mean that we resolve the issues. Hopefully, it means that we make a significant impact, significantly improve the program content and then move the issue into base programming. The base program related to that issue is elevated to a higher plane and continues on a higher plane. I think the farm financial crisis is a good example. We didn't have the national initiatives at the time, or we didn't call it that anyway. But we did go through a process that significantly changed programming. We moved that issue to a higher level. The farm financial crisis has dissipated to some degree, but our programming continues at a higher level. I think we'll do the same thing in other areas that are now national initiatives.

We're not going to have a satisfactory, long-term resolution to groundwater based on the water quality initiatives. I'm sure it will be taken off the list of national initiatives before we can claim solutions of the groundwater problem. That doesn't mean work discontinues; that doesn't mean the program stops, it simply says water quality becomes part of the base program. It goes to a higher level of importance and hopefully, a higher quality.

Some of you were involved in a little survey that we did. We have a little publication called The Mission and Vision and the Function of ES, USDA. It contains the mission statement for the Extension Service, a vision statement, and then it has some other functions. One of my responsibilities in ES is to work internally, and I was concerned about how well we are performing those other functions. So I did a little survey asking the Directors and Administrators and those of you who got a copy to simply score from one to five how well you think we're performing specific functions. Then we asked what you saw the strengths and weaknesses of the ES system as related to those particular functions. We've taken the results and put together a very aggressive action plan to improve our performance on those functions. It's been an interesting process. But it is moving and moving fairly well. The one overriding thing that came out of it was clearly a lack of understanding or an unwillingness to accept the theory of the Extension system being a partnership.

We, in ES and ECOP, support the concept of a partnership in the management of the Extension system. For most federal agencies, that's foreign. Neither the Soil Conservation Service's federal office, state office, or local office is a partnership. It's a line agency. When a memorandum comes out, it goes into the book; it goes into the operating
manual; it goes on the shelf, and that's the answer to the question. ES doesn't function that way, nor do we accept or expect that various performers in this partnership act as silent partners. Let me tell you up front, ES, contrary to some people's wishes, is not a silent partner. We intend to participate in the partnership. We are working very closely with ECOP and the ECOP committees: four in number—Budget, Legislative, Program Leadership, and Personnel and Organizational Development. We interact very closely with ECOP and those structures.

The Extension Service is very active in the Strategic Planning Conference. I happen to be co-chair. We think the Strategic Planning Conference plays a critical role in stretching the system. I don't get upset when everything that we propose in the conference is not accepted. Hopefully, it will make the system think. Also, don't think that the Strategic Planning Conference is bashful about coming back and trying it again. You can compare it to a rubber band. The longer it stretches, the more progress you make, but it could break. We aren't going to break it, but we're not going to leave the rubber band completely limp either. There's no future for the system in doing that. We in ES have responsibilities in program leadership. We want to meet those responsibilities in the context of leadership and within a partnership. We need to communicate; we need to interact. We need to share in decisions and move forward in the mode of participating in a partnership—not as a line agency and not as three independent levels in the system.

As we go forward, we think there's a significant future for the system. There's a lot of opportunity to make progress. There's opportunity to improve budget cutting. With Gramm-Rudman, we will get over that hump. It may not be totally comfortable while we do, but we'll get over it.

In your packet there's a copy of the New Directions for a New Decade statement. That publication is in the process of being reviewed and reprinted. We're joking about that right now. The first one was New Directions for a New Decade and implied that was what we were going to do for the next ten years, the decade. We're debating about entitling this next one, New Directions for the Next Six Months. I think it's very appropriate since the system is in transition. It is a system that's dealing with change, and I think the system needs to recognize that and participate in that change. It's not easy. We recognize that, but it's one that we put a high priority on and want to continue.
REFLECTIONS, PROJECTIONS, AND CHALLENGES
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The question was asked of me, "Do you ever look back on Extension?" I look back, but I look back less and less. I've been asked, "Would you do it differently?" Yes, I'd do it differently. I've been asked if I made any mistakes. I made a bunch of mistakes, and there's testimony here to that. I was asked, "Was Extension ever wrong under my leadership?" It was dead wrong sometimes under my leadership.

It's interesting that I was not given a topic, somewhere along the line I think that says something. The topic I choose to talk about, though: If I had it to do over again. I've been asked, "Would you do anything differently?" If I had it to do over again, here's some things that I would do differently. I'd be less serious, and I'd have more fun. I'd do less traveling, and I'd eat fewer hamburgers. I'd ban afternoon social hours and start them at lunch. I'd spend less time on the current year calendar and more on next year's, and I'd forget last year's calendar. I would be less sensitive about my own turf, my own pet issues, and my special interests and be more concerned about the real issues. I'd spend more time with those with real needs and less time with those with political and self-serving needs. I'd be less tolerant of incompetence, selfishness, special interest, tunnel vision, and narrow minds who continue to do things the way they have always been done just because they've always been done that way. I'd be less willing to allow erosion of Extension's autonomy in lots of ways. I'd be less willing to allow the erosion of Extension's autonomy in setting its own goals with grassroots involvement. I would be less willing to allow erosion to the point of centralizing and taking control of funding and programming and autonomy. I'd be doing it better because I have perfect 20/20 hindsight.

I say all that simply to say this: I want to visit a little bit with you informally and offer some observations about what I heard this morning, what I've seen, and what you're doing here. I offer my observations on what I think are some challenges this system faces down the road.

I have to tell you a little story to illustrate how glad I am to see the make up of this group sitting in the room together. Two real memories come to mind as I reflect on that. One of them was the Southern Directors group. A very progressive group of people. Really progressive and sensitive in letting somebody put forth new ideas. I never got a motion seconded in 11 years, not a single one. I remember Zerle Carpenter at his first meeting. I pop up and make a motion on something and couldn't even get a second. The first thing I knew Zerle said, "I second the motion." They laughed him out of the room!
I remember also when I finished my year as chairman of the Southern Directors, the motion was made to commend me on a good job. Wally Moline from Arkansas said, "I move we table that motion." I also remember one particular session in Oklahoma when we must have spent 45 minutes arguing among ourselves about whether the soybean workers should be able to get together or not. That bothered me at the time, and I think it bothered all of the group, but that was the structure we had at the time. Something needed to be done about it because while we were not dealing with trivia, we were dealing with matters that could be easily delegated to other people who, number one, knew more about them and secondly, were in a better position to make objective decisions.

I remember the 1983 budget process when I had the frustration and privilege of chairing the national budget committee. I remember we went through a real struggle. This is not a criticism of home economics, for those of you in home economics, I think, will say I tried to support what you do. But in the budget process that particular year, the home economists were unhappy because they felt like they weren't getting their "share" of the money for new programs in Extension. Any other year it could have been any other group. After we finally got something together, threw in a little bit on computers that were already obsolete, I went before Jamie Whitten to present the budget on behalf of the Extension Budget Committee. When I finished, I remember what Mr. Whitten said to me. I think I have it written down exact. He said, "Young man, (that was the last time I was ever called 'young man') let me explain something to you. Our phones up here don't ring on Extension home economics. In fact, our phones are ringing less and less on Extension." He said, "What you've got to do is go back and figure out something to ask for help on that our phones do ring about." If you stop and think about that, that's heavy. At the next meeting of our joint committee on ECOP, the Extension Budget Committee met in a little place called Galilee, Rhode Island, a little fishing village some of you no doubt know. We wrestled with Jamie Whitten's comments and some other frustrations of the past three or four years. Out of that, something was born called national initiatives. I think you are still wrestling with those issues. But the point is, we were forced to look at things in total if we were going to get anything. I think you're on your way toward getting some things.

So I was glad to see all of you here under one roof, in one room talking about Extension programming and not talking about turf protection and those kinds of things. I dare say, though, before the afternoon is over there will be a little of that to happen. But in the process, hopefully, this morning when you look at the radical changes, dramatically radical changes taking place here, you'll recognize that some of those things that we have been doing so well, we just might need to evaluate and think about doing something else in their place.

The message from me, I think is simple, and I ought to quit at that but I'm not going to. For goodness sake, see the big picture! See Extension as one program and recognize your inherent interdependence on each other. This must be done if you're going to continue to survive as a system and with what you're doing.

I thoroughly enjoyed the speakers this morning. I really enjoy stopping and thinking about where we are and what the challenges are for the future. There is only one negative about this morning. A speaker talked about the three mega states--Florida, Texas and California. When you stop and realize that John Woeste and Zerle Carpenter are in charge of two of them, we've got problems. I've heard the three mega states mentioned many times, but I didn't realize how dramatically close we are in some things demographically.

Let me give you my perspective of the South. I think you have to understand where we have been, where we are today, and where
we're going. Basically, I look at it this way: there have been three evolutions of the Sunbelt, especially in the South. The first era of this evolution was the time prior to this century—the time prior to the year 1900. The time that was characterized by meager resources and limited opportunities, isolation from the rest of the country, let alone the world. Henry Grady, a noted journalist from Georgia, made the observation a long time ago as he came back from the funeral of a colleague in Cherokee County, North Georgia. He said, 'I've just been to the funeral of a friend who was buried in the North Georgia mountains. His suit came from New York, his shirt came from New Jersey and his shoes came from Chicago. His casket came from Pittsburg, and the only thing furnished by the South was the hole in the ground. That is the first era, prior to 1900.

The second era is the first half of the century, 1900 to 1950. There was an agrarian economy. The primary crop, cotton, was low in yield. Politics were controlled by the Courthouse crowd, and those who spent their time cursing Washington, on their way to Washington to get money. That happened in the first half of this century. It was the time of the mill village division, and the stagnant, segregated educational system. Economic development could be simply categorized this way: organize a Chamber of Commerce, stick a sign in the closest pasture to town, and send somebody North to get a sewing plant. That was our idea of economic development in that era.

The third era consists of the last forty years, 1950 to 1990. The moving van started stopping in the South. The South was discovered, and transportation linkages were developed and in some cases segregation ended. Political reform in some cases came about. Diversity in the economy began to happen. In the process of all that, we also were discovered and became internationalized. It is hard for a little old country boy that grew up in Greene County, so far back in the woods that every family had to have his own Tom cat, to realize that Georgia now has over 1,200 firms owned internationally, employing over 70,000 people. We're not the sleepy little Southern agrarian community that we used to think we were.

The fourth era, I want to suggest to you, is the next ten years, between now and the year 2000. There are some things that indicate growth is slower. The economic situation is not as fervent as it was. But add those things that the South can contribute to the world with some visionary leadership, and I think some things are going to happen. In the process of putting that into a framework, I recently read a book that talks about communication in the 21st Century. It shocked me. It starts by saying we went from the spoken word to the written word in 50 million years. Moving from the written word to the printed word took about 5,000 years. Then from the printed word to the sight/sound media like telephone, telegraph and radio took about 500 years. From the sight/sound media to the modern computer took fewer than 50 years, and every computer operating in the world today will be obsolete before the year 2000. Everything in the South in the next ten years is going to change, well not everything, Baptist preachers in the South never change. We can talk a long time about why the South has been sleepy all of these years. I'm suggesting to you that we're going to have more change in the next ten years than we've had in the last fifty years. There are a lot of reasons for that, but I think you saw and heard that this morning so I'm not going to repeat it to you.

Let me talk to you about four or five challenges I think the system has. I don't think it is wrong for me to start with the funding structure. I saw it coming in the early 80s. If I had to tie it down to a particular year I'd say 1982. That is when revenue sharing ended and when Reagonomics started. It is now called something more sophisticated than that, Federalism. Stop and think about that particular time in 1982: we had 44 states in this country with a budget surplus and now
the country is overridden with tremendous debt—out of control debt as far as that is concerned. In the process of Federalism, though, what was previously done as a nation was passed onto the states—program after program after program. We didn’t pass along the controls nor the funding. We just passed along the responsibility and the cost. That is changing the Extension funding system. We now have states with less revenue and mounting costs because of the increased growth of services demanded in the Southern sunbelt states. In addition to all that growth comes something called crime. With crime there comes a crying need for prisons. As one of the speakers said so correctly this morning, the way we deal with crime is to build prisons and put people in them. In Georgia we are building prisons so fast that we can’t count them. Raising taxes in the process, but we are building prisons as a process of controlling crime in Georgia. I bet that is going on in other areas as well. That is impacting Extension funding.

Health care is totally out of control. Prior to 1982, the states were not participating much in health care. Now if you look at the budget in your state and the line on health care and what it is costing your state, you can see it is costing your Extension program something as well.

Education is tremendously behind in the Southern Region. We’ve been in education, and yet we seem to always want to put education way down the list when it comes to doing something about correcting the ills of the Sunbelt in which we live. It’s interesting to look at the figures in Georgia right now. In the last three years we’ve put over a billion dollars of new money each year into education—new money. The figures just came out, and we flunked miserably. We got an F on the SAT scores, 47th was our rank. We got an F on dropouts. Thirty-six percent of our kids in this day and time don’t graduate from high school, and that is irresponsible. This is where we are in the Sunbelt now, and those kinds of things are going to impact on the funding system. Extension is a part of education, but Extension is not perceived as having any of the answers. You’ve got to turn that one around.

A second challenge beyond funding—management of the interior and exterior politics. I don’t think there is any question, but one of the great reasons for us being a system is the political structure and the political network that was behind it all along. I don’t mean to minimize that in my comments here. One of the things I think this does to us is that we’re bound to that traditional support base. If we’re not careful our programs are going to be quickly perceived as too traditional. We’re going to be married to the rural few and unknown to the urban many. In the process, urban control brings about all kinds of things in terms of strategy of thinking about the priorities of funding. One of the things that Zerle Carpenter has been talking about is the urban counties and the need to learn. In my judgment we’re going to make an impact in urban communities, but it has to have an economic measurement or it is going down the drain. I am convinced of that. We have to deal with the economics of life and the programs of a special nature in urban areas.

Another dimension of management of external politics is what I call "the need to come to grips with reallocation." I know every Extension administrator sitting here, and I assume all of you wrestle with that one every day. I don’t know any particular answer to the problem because I’m certainly not standing here saying that we depoliticize the system. That is certainly not the answer but maybe the education of the political structure is what we need to do. I use the classic example. In the whole herd dairy buyout in Georgia a few years ago, we sold 21 percent of our herds. Pure logic would suggest to me, assuming some reasonably fair previous allocation of those dollars, that I would be left free to reallocate those 21-percent dollars from dairy to some emerging thing like forestry or forest production or whatever the case may be.
One of the things I learned in life the hard way is if pure logic is your best position you are going to get the hell beat out of you. I did. That is not the way it is done. We have got to figure out some way to involve the political structure in helping determine those priorities and freeing up the opportunities. When the obvious and logical need for reallocation comes about— I don’t have the answer for that. I think it has to be found, and you’ve got to wrestle with it in some way.

I had the privilege to see every Extension Service program in the Northeast Region of this country. As I watched them hold on to too much of the agrarian base, or if you will, the traditional base, I kept thinking that the South sooner or later would face that problem with an Extension budget. I want to suggest, ladies and gentlemen, you’re probably there now. I’m not saying for one moment that you drop agriculture, you had better not, but if you hold on only to that and don’t reallocate some resources, you’re going to be in trouble as far as your funding structure in general is concerned.

I would say just a word about the management of internal politics. The definition of internal to me is land-grant system. I remember like it was yesterday when the Extension system lost control of its own sponsored lay leader national meeting. That was a sad day for the Extension system, because we began immediately to lose our ability to involve people at the local level, to determine priorities and to relate resources to those needs. That is not the only place Extension is losing ground. I see it now in one university, and I hear of it at other universities: essentially the Extension system is being down graded because of the perception that it is overfunded; that it is full of slush money, and that you have more than you really need in a proportionate section. Now I know that is not true. I’m simply saying the Extension system has to deal more effectively with the internal political structure as it relates to the family thing called land-grant than it has done in the past. It is a real challenge. What you are doing here in terms of loyalty to the one instead of loyalty to the subdivision is the key in that particular area.

The last example I will use is relevant to what you are doing. I read something not long ago from Lord Salisbury. Robert Blake’s biography made this observation. “The commonest error in public service is sticking to the dead or dying program.” Put another way by another author, “There is nothing anywhere in public service that is any worse than getting better and better at doing more and more of something that doesn’t need doing at all.” I’m not here to suggest you’re doing something better and better that doesn’t need to be done at all, but I think this particular writer is giving us a good scriptural verse for the afternoon session that you are dealing with.

The last thing I would leave with you is simply this: the development and strategies are going to be heavy for us. Develop some strategies to share your talent with others. Now hear me out on this one. Develop some strategies to share your talent and do it at your initiative. There is no question you’re a great resource. This country will never be able to pay the debt for what this system has done. It is a great heritage, a tremendous knowledge base, an unbelievable networking system. Yours is a track record that is unsurpassed in informal education anywhere in the world. My suggestion is that we have been forced to the point that we find ourselves far too reactionary and defensive about ourselves. I think back on my career, and see some cases where I did that. Some of the emerging issues are things that we’ve done all along. Look at the University of Georgia School of Environmental Planning for Environmental Protection. The Extension Service has been doing a lot of environmental planning all along, but now we are on the defensive. I bet you are writing reports— look what we’re doing in this area. If you want to keep control or at least maintain more control, keep out in front of what others are doing, get more funding and continue to insure that money,
and also get more recognition. Then you might be willing to go to biotechnology or to the water people or whomever it is and say, "Look at what we're doing—we need your help." Be willing to share a little bit of your talent and your networking skills and even in some cases some money in order to buy up front some of the things you need to protect the back. That is a little bit heavy, and you say I'm too radical anyway. I really believe had I done it that way and if the College of Agriculture at the University of Georgia had been more sensitive about doing that too, we wouldn't have been dealt out of the environmental education school that is being developed there.

I'll close with this. He who tooteth not his own horn, the same shall remain forever untouted. It has a pretty good scriptural base. I was down where we're building a new church the other day, and a mural was found that had been in hiding somewhere in the bowels of the church. It is a beautiful antique, about twenty feet long. I was outside with a contractor. I noticed a bird kept flying into the window where the landscape faced the outside because he saw nothing but the landscape. The little devil almost killed himself because he'd get up and fly back again and again. I would suggest that maybe somewhere along the line, Extension has been too much like that bird. In the process of our in-fighting and in our failure to recognize our talents and our base and our strengths, we've been gambling among ourselves all too much. Talking among ourselves to the point that we lost sight of the mission that Extension was put in place to accomplish.

I don't always do this, but one of the things I learned a long time ago in the Toastmaster's Club is to always try to close with a quote from a great American. Al Capone once made the observation that "when you go through life, whatever you're involved in, if it's meaningful at all, you should have three things with you. The first thing to have is a gun; the second one is a smile; the third one is a plan. He said if you ever get in a bind, and you've got to get rid of one, throw that gun away and stop shooting. If that doesn't work, quit smiling and get serious because you can't gladhand your way out of everything. The third one, and the only one that's fundamentally important, is don't ever get caught in any situation without a plan. I'm not here to suggest to you as a hindsight with 20/20 perfect vision what your plan ought to be. I am here to suggest that you're indebted to this country for what you are, but this country is indebted to you far beyond that. Your best days are still in front of you. Thank you for the privilege of being here to share with you a little bit of my philosophy but more importantly to get to see all your smiling faces.
I SAW AND HEARD, BUT WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

R. J. Hildreth
Managing Director
Farm Foundation

Thank you for the opportunity to "see and hear" the first Joint Southern Regional Program Leader's Committee meeting. Also, thank you for asking me to speak to you about a title of which I never have heard or experienced before.

As I considered this unique title, it occurred to me that I had to define a criteria for "mean." Only with a criteria can I comment on what I "saw and heard" in a manner that may make sense and be useful to you. The criteria I have selected is the development and delivery of Extension activities that lead to learning experiences. These learning experiences (education) should make sense and be useful to the users of Extension who are recruited, participate in your programs, and deal with the problems facing the citizens of your states and the nation.

Much of what I "saw and heard" dealt with issues and education. It seems rather clear that federal funding for base Extension programs will not increase. The most likely way to obtain increased federal funding is to focus on issues deemed important by Congress and those who influence Congress.

However, issue programming is not a new idea. In the history of Extension and the land-grant university, program areas and subject matter departments developed in response to important issues. This took time. I recall the view in my family and the central Iowa community in which I grew up that book learning was not useful for farmers. A few years later I was encouraged to study agriculture at the land-grant university. As Extension faces the future, issues are changing. Rigid subject matter areas and Extension program areas need to adjust and change and, most importantly, focus on present and future issues rather than the past. As Hodgkinson suggested, there is need for more collaboration and less competition within Extension, across program areas, subject matter departments, states and even regions. No longer can Extension workers view other program areas as the enemy that siphons off funds from their program area. Protection of "turf" by programs or states is not useful and if continued will likely lead to the demise of the Extension System. Rather, the focus needs to be cooperation across program areas on issues and problems important to the users of Extension and other citizens.

The structures of the Extension System (ECOP, ES, Southern Directors, program leaders and subject matter departments) are means and not ends in the development and delivery of educational programs that deal with issues and problems important to citizens as individuals and in groups.

In the discussion of issues, a common theme surfaced: the need to establish linkages with other parts of the university and other
organizations. Many opportunities exist, but there needs to be agreement on the content of the issue by users and providers of Extension education. Linkages are also means established to achieve an end.

As you discuss the issues at this meeting, you will find a considerable amount of overlap. How do the issues relate? How can synergism between the issues be created? It is my view that overlap of issues is a bad thing only if it is unrecognized.

Many Extension programs in the past provided solutions to problems of Extension users. Issue programming is different in that most issues have more than one solution, but often not one best solution. Thus, Extension's recommendations are not useful for issue programming as past Extension activities. The issues-consequences educational method is one public policy education has used successfully for some time. The method of defining the issue, stating alternative solutions to the issue and outlining the consequences of the alternative solutions; then stepping back and letting the Extension user decide which is the best alternative.

I observed paradigm shifts in the U.S., Southern region and state Extension Systems. The present and the future will not be like the past. Such shifts are difficult and unsettling to individuals, especially supervisors, as well as their organizations. There may be some small comfort to know that Extension organizations in other countries are facing similar shifts. In the Nordic countries, the United Kingdom and Ireland, agricultural extension is in the ministry of agriculture. Extension in these countries must obtain fees from the users of Extension to cover not only materials and meals at Extension meetings, but most of the costs of program delivery. In other words, Extension must, in the main, pay its own way in these countries with fees from the users. Home Economics extension workers in Prince Edward Island, Canada, have had a title change from Extension home economists to Extension marketing representatives. The home economists assist the Prince Edward Island Department of Agriculture to work with commodity and producer groups to develop marketing strategies, including components of market research, commodity promotion and education, quality demands and public awareness of the agri-food industry. They also have a role of working with farm families that encompass "people" aspects of financial and retirement planning. My major point in reporting these changes in Extension in other countries is to make the point that Extension worldwide is going through a paradigm change.

I "saw and heard" a growing diversity in the organization's priorities and styles of the state Extension service systems. It used to be an Extension worker/administrator would feel guilty if they found out another state was doing something they were not doing. I see a growing diversity as the result of the attempts in the various states to respond to the educational need of their Extension students as well as funding and university organization realities.

What can be said about "base programming" versus "initiative programming?" It appears to me these concepts are important administrative tools, that is, they are means and not ends. Support of either or both requires educational programs on problems perceived important by the citizens and users of Extension.

Coalitions and joint ventures between Extension and other organizations, both public and private, as well as between states appear to be growing. Such coalitions are important only because Extension no longer has a monopoly on informal education. There are many actors providing informal education on the scene. Cooperation and coalitions can leverage limited Extension resources to achieve education on problems/opportunities important to citizens. A good example is the potential, as well as existing, efforts between Extension and the Small Business Administration (SBA), even though there is
some tension between Extension and the SBA.

The necessity and importance of working on issues perceived to be problems by the user of Extension were mentioned often in the above remarks. Most Extension workers try hard to respond to the needs of Extension users. You who are administrators have direct contact with users and rely on the feedback of field workers. County and state advisory committees are used. However, all of these efforts are filtered through Extension workers. Would it be useful to do random sample surveys of Extension users? A recent statewide survey of Wisconsin farm households provided insights into their education training and information needs (Saupe and Eisenhauer). Information or training to reduce input costs and on using new technologies and conservation techniques were the greatest needs, followed by information on government assistance and developing marketing, farm bookkeeping and financial systems skills. The needs of spouses were reflected by the level of involvement in farm household responsibilities. Almost all performed child care and household tasks and 84 percent are involved in bookkeeping and farm records. Over half take care of a vegetable garden, care for animals, run farm errands or do field work. Two-fifths of the farm operators and about one-half of the spouses worked off the farm. Thus, education regarding entering and succeeding in non-farm labor market is also important to Wisconsin farm households.

As I review the objectives of this conference, it is my judgment that you worked hard to achieve them. Clearly communication and planning increased among Extension program leaders. A common understanding developed of program planning environment in the South. Plans were made to improve Extension programs through the sharing of ideas and resources and the planning of regional actions. You did regionalize national issues and identify new issues of importance to the South. However, much remains to be done. More planning is needed and the plans made need to be implemented. Multi-state activity can be increased as well as multi-program activity.

Education has been defined as "the process of moving from cocksure ignorance to thoughtful uncertainty." I believe you end this meeting in a useful stage of thoughtful uncertainty. I conclude my comments as did Jerry Lamber of Clemson University in his presentation to the ANR and CRD Committees with the following quotation. "There is no heavier burden than a great opportunity."

FOOTNOTE

JOINT SOUTHERN REGION
PROGRAM LEADERS COMMITTEE MEETING

Roundtable Reports

During the discussions, facilitators asked questions to stimulate discussion and to provide input into the final reports that are presented on the following pages. The discussion questions were:

1. Identify key program successes and barriers. Include state, regional, national efforts, as appropriate.
2. What is the predicted future of this program in the South? If a priority program, what are its major thrusts in the South?
3. What actions are needed? Who should provide leadership for implementing this action (state, region, national)?
4. For recommended regional actions, provide rationale and general strategy for the action.
5. What other high-priority issues not necessarily related to your assigned topic do you propose for Extension programming in the South? Describe.
COMPETITIVENESS IN AGRICULTURE
INTERNATIONAL MARKETING

Leader: B.E. Caldwell, North Carolina
Recorder: Donna Graham, Arkansas
Participants: Carolyn Carter, Louisiana
Ben T. Powell, Tennessee
Conrad A. Reinhardt, Tennessee
Greg Taylor, Texas
Victor Rodriguez, Puerto Rico
John Huddleston, Virginia

1. Identify key program successes and barriers. Include state, regional, national efforts, as appropriate.

   Successes:
   --Moderate success in most states
   --'Going Global' program is a good beginning

   Barriers:
   --Lack of awareness that producers exist in global market
   --Traditional methods of marketing
   --Lack of coordinated regional effort
   --The title limits the scope

2. What is the potential future of this program in the South? If a priority program, what are its major thrusts in the South?

   --Massive potential
   --Developed markets can be improved; lots of potential in processing and opportunity markets

3. What actions are recommended? Who should provide leadership for implementing this action (state, region, national)?

   --Incorporate international components into the 4-H curriculum in all projects
   --Change the image that this is not just international agriculture, start using terminology such as food and fiber system so that this will be perceived as a total extension effort
   --Need specialists/expert assistance in international area
   --Training programs need to enhance an international understanding translated to local programs
   --Local programs need to emphasize the international component during traditional training programs
   --The international marketing concept should include the potential for small and home based businesses
   --Include the family component in international marketing
   --Staff development in global economics
4. **For recommended regional actions, provide rationale and general strategy for the action.**

   A regional task force should be created composed of staff development personnel, economists and communications specialists to:
   --develop an awareness of existing programs
   --develop ways to communicate the facts and broaden the community perspective of international marketing
   --develop a regional structure for training programs
WATER QUALITY

Leader: Bill Waters, Louisiana
Recorder: Pete Pepinsky, South Carolina
Participants: A. Ray Cavendar, Alabama
Betty Youngman, Arkansas
Sue Fisher, Florida
Paul Warner, Kentucky
Raygene Paige, Mississippi
David Barrett, Virginia
Moises Cordero, Puerto Rico

1. Identify key program successes and barriers.

Successes:

--Visibility in news media as a current issue
--Development of interdisciplinary teams and interagency cooperation in several states
--External funding (in addition to USDA funds) in several states
--4-H and/or Home Economics have become involved in several states
--Using a USDA grant, Florida has developed a library of materials designed for access by different age groups

Barriers:

--Other agencies (state or federal) want to take the lead and/or credit. In some cases, state agencies with funding choose who they work with. CES may be in or out.
--Interdisciplinary programming is not always working. Ag specialists are not always sharing with 4-H and Home Economics. Some State Program Leaders are not familiar with everything that is available from the Water Quality working group in their state.
--Proceedings of regional conferences are slow to be distributed within states. Extensive bibliographies have been developed, but knowledge of their existence is limited.
--Level of cooperation with other USDA agencies varies by state.

2. What is the predicted future of this program in the South?

--Water quality will remain a major issue in the South. More emphasis is needed in the 4-H and Home Economics areas. We need to do more to focus youth programs on this area.
--Most of the current emphasis has been on "quality" aspects. Future emphasis will focus on quantity and sharing of a scarce resource.
--Most of the current focus of the program is towards reduction of nonpoint source pollution. More emphasis is needed on household use, conservation, etc. More emphasis is needed on operation and maintenance of rural and small municipal water systems.

3. What actions are recommended?

--More action is needed at the state level to improve interdisciplinary effort.
--Expand the program from agriculture to households and youth. Kids need the vocabulary of the
water issue.
--Reallocate more resources at the state level to this initiative.
--At the regional level more efforts are needed to develop teaching materials and to share with all
states an inventory of what is available.
--Broaden beyond ag applications to show emphasis on other areas. Network with youth programs.
Water quality needs to be a team effort of all Extension.

4. Regional actions.

--Need to develop and share more data bases. Access to existing databases needs to be expanded.
--More effort is needed to tie in the water quality issue with the Family Community Leadership
efforts in home economics.
--The region needs to decide what kind of regional committee is needed. Currently we have both
a technical committee under ANR and a task force that crosses program lines.
RURAL REVITALIZATION

Leader: Ray Campbell, Oklahoma
Recorder: Mark Peterson, Arkansas
Participants: W. L. Strain, Alabama
Mark Peterson, Arkansas
Maurice Cole, Florida
Chris Langone, Georgia
Kenneth Cook, Mississippi
Martha Johnson, North Carolina
Philip Breeze, Virginia

1. Identify key program successes and barriers. Include state, regional, national efforts, as appropriate.

Successes:

--Multiple program approach (NC)
--Economic development programs
--Community Pride Program - 4-H
--Environmental projects - 4-H
--Leadership development programs for adults and youth
--Impact studies
--Infrastructure development
--Clean water ways for recreation
--Problem identification by the people themselves
--New enterprises (catfish, goats, etc.)
--Joint organizational efforts, such as with the Southeast Educational Laboratory and Arkansas Rural Academy Team
--Satellite programs
--Georgia 2000 program
--Networking with other agencies
--Attracting outside funds (e.g., grants)
--Agriculture in Rural Communities Program (AL)
--Waste disposal program
--Home Based Business Seminars

Barriers--Institutional:

--Lack of commitment and subsequent lack of resources from Extension administration
--Lack of expertise in all areas of rural revitalization
--Rural Revitalization issues are diverse and all interrelated
--Duplication of effort
--Extension needs to change with the time
--Lack of agreement about issues--who should address and how
--Lack of identified support/clientele group
--Difficulty in defining "RURAL"
--Image of Extension does not support rural revitalization
--County agents remain in their agricultural paradigm
--Extension is only one of many players
--Youth Speaker Bureau

Barriers—Local:

--High School dropouts
--Community power structure does not support community involvement
--Lack of leadership

2. What is the predicted future of this program in the South? If a priority program, what are its major thrusts in the South?

--There is currently a window of opportunity for rural revitalization, with rural revitalization on the national and many state agendas.
--It is important that we take a long term perspective, seeking to address the most critical needs of rural communities, not just to compete for funds.

3. What actions are needed? Who should provide leadership for implementing this action (state, region, national)?

--A clearer definition of rural revitalization/definition or delineation of issue, retrain field staff; distribute more widely the report, "Revitalizing the Rural South"
--Listen to local people to serve as a basis for our issue prioritization and program planning
--See the big picture and target particular needs

4. For recommended regional actions, provide rationale and general strategy for the action.

--Network with other agencies, such as Rural Enterprise Centers and the Southern Rural Development Center
--Provide a facilitative role in local community development efforts, fostering leadership with followers and subsequent action
--Empower community leaders to empower citizens to take action
--Reexamine the term "Rural Revitalization"—does it have a stigma?
--Demonstrate the interdependency of urban and rural areas
--Identify and reach out to new audiences
--More sharing across states (target a few issues each year)

5. What other high-priority issues not necessarily related to your assigned topic do you propose for Extension programming in the South? Describe.

--Education: Extension as a facilitator, as a reference for sources of resources, and as a provider of programs on how to improve education
--Rural community services/infrastructure
1. Identify key program successes and barriers.

Nutrition, diet and health programs are not new. Focus on food safety and quality is timely in view of public perception and national funding.

**Successes:**

Some successes in food safety and quality are establishment of state task forces, work on food safety emergency preparedness, national teleconferences, family living seminar (NC), Food Safety teleconference (GA).

**Barriers:**

Public perception is chemicals, pesticides in food, while researchers are concerned with microbiological hazards. Not enough work done with the media to present objective assessment in case of food safety emergency. Willingness to take risk, and liability for extension personnel are concerns, as with any other controversial issue. Regional sharing of materials and technical expertise. Reactive rather than proactive, particularly in emergency situations. How we can reach county staff with ready-to-use information.

2. What is the predicted future of this program?

The national initiative (food safety and quality) is likely to continue for the foreseeable future. The base program will be with us for a long time.

3. What actions are recommended?

--Support Southern Region Task Force Report on Food Safety and Quality
--Support regional materials development and set up a procedure for handling regional publications
--Each state create an interdisciplinary task force on food safety and quality to include field staff
--Continue base programs in nutrition, diet and health, including EFNEP and food preservation
--Design a Southern Region interdisciplinary food safety and quality meeting
--Support a national nutrition, diet and health meeting for FY92 or 93
--Develop and distribute emergency preparedness material dealing with food safety and quality Refer this task to Southern Region Task Force
--Design food safety and quality materials for 4-H/Youth
--Recognize importance of food technology, food processing handling and packaging; eating disorders of youth
--Become more proficient in risk management/taking risk using public policy education techniques

4. **Recommended regional actions, rationale and general strategy.**

A Southern Regional Task Force on Food Safety and Quality has been formed with home economists, ANR specialists and administrators represented. This task force is charged with exploring linkages, inventorying educational materials available, and exploring opportunities for regional cooperation. It will produce a situational statement and goals, identify research status, and prepare a proposal for funding in the southern region.

Regional actions suggested in 3 above should be pursued.

5. **Other high-priority issues (related and unrelated to the topic) for Extension programming in the south?**

Health issues: Rural health; Agri-health; Injury prevention; Health facilities/care; Health policies; Stress; Screening

Other issues: Parenting; Aging; Child health (including infant mortality); Education and dropouts (Stay in School as a slogan in all programs)

Parenting/Caring Relations:
--Needs assessment of parenting education (survey)
--Should be related to Youth at Risk Initiative
--Child health should be a part of this issue
YOUTH AT RISK

Leader: Glenn Krohn, South Carolina
Recorder: Nelson Jacob, Texas
Participants: Wiley Futrell, Louisiana
Larry Graves, Mississippi
Lynda Harriman, Oklahoma
Robert Herbst, Kentucky
Jim Moseley, Louisiana
John Wilson, Mississippi
Diana Lugo, Puerto Rico

1. Identify key program successes and barriers.

Successes:

--Mentoring and tutoring programs
--National Drop-Out Center at Clemson University
--Substance abuse programs
--EFNEP model for family intervention
--Teen mother training
--Youth as Resources/Prevention Education
--PAL (Parent Assisted Leader) Program—working with pregnant teens

Barriers:

--How to involve parents
--Mixed messages from mass media
--"Youth at Risk" has a negative connotation—use of term "Visions for Youth" in South Carolina
--Staff competency in terms of training and background
--Strength of commitment from total system—university level
--Fear of "sensitive issues"—teen pregnancy/sex education/AIDS education
--Lack of a common frame of reference in dealing with the term "youth at risk"
--Many youth do not have "significant other" to play parenting role

2. What is the predicted future of this program?

Based on status and trends, we must focus on youth at risk. We need to establish alliances with school systems and churches, as well as other youth-serving organizations in the areas of school drop-out, substance abuse, parent education, illiteracy, self-esteem, juvenile crime, and reading skills.

3. What actions are recommended?

--Clearer definition of "Youth at Risk;" emphasize research to identify census of Youth at Risk
--Utilize electronic media
--Focus on prevention
--Extension homemakers should be involved in Youth at Risk programming
--Teach reading skills in collaboration with the schools, teen parent education programs, taking educational programming to limited resource families, a la EFNEP model, emphasize the importance of working with youth from birth through teen years in a continuous set of programming strategies, hiring staff with appropriate competencies and/or training of present staff; utilization of resources of "total university," with support from highest level; Extension support, not necessarily initiate literacy programming

4. Recommended regional actions, rationale and general strategy.
   --Consider policies to broaden base of academic skills from which we are hiring professionals
   --Need to produce bilingual materials at the reading level of the target audience
   --Need to produce teaching material for non-literate clientele
   --Need to deal with "real" social issues—reading and literacy skills
   --Regional conferences designed to bring together youth development professionals from diverse organizations/agencies

5. Other high-priority issues (related and unrelated to the topic) for Extension programming in the South.
   --Needs of low-income farmers
   --Solid waste management
   --Duplication of local government services
   --Establish Southern region task forces to propose specific initiatives
ALTERNATIVE AGRICULTURE OPPORTUNITIES

Leader: Jim App, Florida
Recorder: Curtis Absher, Kentucky
Participants: Thomas Burch, Louisiana
Randy Cofer, Georgia
Tony Dozier, Alabama
James McPhail, Mississippi
Ronald Shearon, North Carolina
Alva Youngner, Georgia

1. Identify key program successes and barriers.

   Successes:
   Aquaculture, small family operations capitalizing on market niches, roadside marketing, diversity; home-based businesses such as bed and breakfast operations, recreation and leisure, hunting leases

   Barriers:
   Lack of markets, critical mass (they can produce it, but have nowhere to sell it)

2. What is the predicted future of this program?

   High priority in the South--new products with value added; new markets (domestic and international); new information and management systems like sustainable agriculture, integrated pest management and integrated resource management; some work has been, and should continue to be, to help people find work off the farm.

3. What actions are recommended?

   Any alternative enterprise or management system must begin at the local level with an identified need. States must share information if there is a lack of regional or national data bases--and there usually is. We must take a business management approach to any recommended new enterprise. Business management training across state lines must precede production. We must expand production and marketing research programs in enterprises and "non-agricultural" activities from which people can make a living.

   Rationale: Rationale is simple--resources are diminishing.

   Actions: We must bring non-traditional audiences into our client groups and expand our support base. We must pool our research efforts and research resources. We must have an organized sharing of program successes, specialists and educational materials at meetings such as this or at annual meetings of program leaders.

   More planning to build in evaluation.

   Blend into the "competitive agriculture."
4. Other high-priority issues (related and unrelated to the topic) for Extension programming in the South?

--Farm family and farm financial management need to be integrated
--Risk management (risk/benefit) education for consumers should be intensified
--Environmental impacts of cropping systems
--Competitiveness of agriculture
--Public policy issues
--"Campaign" approach to informing civic and government leaders, parents and voters of the consequences in terms of costs relative to education and school dropout and health care (pre and postnatal)
BUILDING HUMAN CAPITAL

Leader: LaVerne Feaster, Arkansas
Recorder: Rick Maurer, Kentucky
Participants: Logan Louderback, Kentucky
Meatra Harrison, Texas
William A. Shmel, South Carolina
James Smith, Alabama
Joseph Waldrum, Arkansas
Ed Yancey, North Carolina
Leticia Colon, Puerto Rico

1. Identify key program successes and barriers.

   Successes:

   --Ag and community leadership
   --F. C. L.
   --State-wide literacy conference
   --Youth self esteem programs (Up to Me, Chin Up, Excell program, LIFT)
   --Job Skills
   --Today's M.O.M., P.A.L.
   --Affirmative Action Intern Program
   --Science and Technology Mentoring Program
   --Beginning Scholars Program

   Barriers:

   --Funding
   --Lack of parent involvement
   --Difficulty of impact and process evaluation
   --Clientele demands for traditional programs
   --Focus on individual characteristics rather than community or structural conditions

2. What is the predicted future of this program?

   We feel that the future for these programs in South is great. Extension in the region has excellent clientele involvement and support. Suggest we continue to phase this program into base/core program.

3. What actions are recommended?

   We must do more interdisciplinary programs within Extension as well as more networking with other agencies and organizations.

4. Recommended regional actions, rationale and general strategy.
We must provide more interstate sharing of programs, materials, and impact/process evaluation.

5. Other high-priority issues (related and unrelated to the topic) for Extension programming in the South?

--Adult literacy
--Drop-outs
--Early parenting (teenage mothers and fathers)
--Demographic changes
--Race, Nationalities
--Leadership
--Parenting (parents involved in children's lives)
CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Leader: Travis Poole, Virginia
Recorder: Dan Ezell, South Carolina
Participants: Deloris Ellis, Virginia
Clark Garland, Tennessee
Charles Johnson, Arkansas
Roy Lessly, Tennessee
Tom Rodgers, Georgia
Don Springer, Florida
Jimmy Richardson, Mississippi

1. Identify key program successes and barriers. Include state, regional, national efforts, as appropriate.

Successes:

--(TN) Conservation farms demonstrated soil loss and financial management benefit
--(FL) Conducted joint water quality training with SCS. Also conducted warming conference
--(GA) Extensive training of youth in water quality, and environmental education, to include xeriscaping, etc
--Farm chemical monitoring programs in progress
--(All states) Educational mandate of CRP program and subsequent farm planning; also implemented ICM (integrated crop management) pilot programs with ASCS
--(AR) Water quality with reforestation
--Also some emphasis of disposal research and education with 1890 at Pine Bluff, (AR)
--(SC) Heavy emphasis on wildlife and foestry management education with particular attention to profit
--(VA) Forestry and wildlife as value added; water quality mandatory; 4-H Congress on environmental theme
--(All States) Recycling education being conducted in all states; waste management emerging as issue in all states

Regional Success:

--Reduction of pollution in Chesapeake Bay
--Coal region development, a research and education program to improve future of the coal region, includes reclamation

Barriers:

--Other agencies generally designated as lead agencies
--Relationship of agency staffs does not always promote networking/collaborative work.
--Conservation by its nature requires interdisciplinary effort
--Clients are not ready to accept conservation; regulation in some cases may be changing attitude

2. What is the predicted future of this program in the South? If a priority program, what are its
major thrusts in the South?

The roundtable group feels the area is too broad for focused programming. In addition, many of the focus areas such as water quality and waste management have been removed. Therefore, it appears that many of the conservation and natural resource areas should be incorporated into program areas such as youth, agricultural production, home economics and community development.

There are areas that relate to the South and must be covered. These include:
--Pesticide disposal
--Environmental education
--Wildlife/forestry management
--General conservation
--Estuary conservation

3. What actions are recommended? Who should provide leadership for implementing this action (state, region, national)?

--States should seek short-term faculty to implement some of the thrusts; existing program areas should be point of delivery; leadership education should be the vehicle for teaching
--Strengthen the youth component in environmental education
--Middle management should foster agency relationships; encourage local FAC to function
--Youth specialists should review relevance of program materials
--Conservation area should be delivered through a systems approach

4. For recommended regional actions, provide rationale and general strategy for action.

Regional program committees should provide program leadership to get multi-state involvement and move action from networking to a total collaborative effort. The regional program committees should seek seed money (at regional or national level) to enhance team approaches which would in the end reduce overlapping of individual states. Where issues exist in several states, the regional program committees should facilitate their communication.

The above are recommended because resources are limited and states cannot afford duplication.

5. What other high-priority issues not necessarily related to your assigned topic do you propose for Extension programming in the South?

--Programming for the aging population is needed. Home Economics Program Committee should develop strategies.
--Cultural diversity will become a problem and Extension should be proactive.
--There will be a changing local governmental structure and Extension should be developing ways to address their needs.
--Literacy--Foster existing literacy efforts through communication action (for example, through EH organization).
FAMILY AND ECONOMIC WELL BEING

Leader: Sue Badenhop, Kentucky
Recorder: Norma Roberts, Louisiana
Participants: Ned Browning, Mississippi
Ray Humberd, Tennessee
Jan Montgomery, Oklahoma
Robert Soileau, Louisiana
Cliff Taylor, Florida

1. Identify key program successes and barriers.

Successes:

--Budget management, financial planning teams--interdisciplinary between agriculture, farm
management and home economics family management, stress management, done in most states
--Youth/elderly coalitions
--Newsletters for selfcare children sent through Human Services Department
--EFNEP model used for teen parenting
--Networking with businesses and industry for resources (i.e., videos)
--Networking across state lines with other Extension resources

Barriers:

--Family infrastructure is far away or missing for caring for elderly
--Brain drain from rural communities takes away leadership potential
--State Extension staff tied to academic departments and the department plans are unable to provide
   rapid responses to county and people issue needs
--Extension staff (state and county) not equipped to handle all of the issues

2. What is the predicted future of this program?

Family and economic well-being will be a major issue because of the growing minority and elderly
populations in the Southern region. These population groups are likely to be low income (first
generation immigrants) and low education level (high dropout rates).

3. What actions are recommended?

--Need a mechanism for sharing resources, both people and materials, within the region; also, a
   better communication mechanism to know what is happening
--Need for public policy education related to these issues
--Need for bilingual materials for the growing hispanic population; Puerto Rico is a potential
   resource for Spanish materials

4. Recommended regional actions, rationale and general strategy.

--Develop a prevention program for children and youth for their socialization. Rationale: prevention
programs cost less than correction programs; children need socialization to provide them with a framework for functioning in society; the action should include an integrated plan for working with family members from birth to the grave and include 4-H, CRD, Home Economics

--Need programs directed to the dependent elderly and their care
--Promote child health (home economics program committee) as an initiative and move to national initiative agenda
--Appoint a Southern Region task force on the working poor
--Action to include all program areas
--Consider more emphasis on economic aspects
WASTE MANAGEMENT

Leader: Mike Levi, North Carolina
Recorder: Barry W. Jones, Texas
Participants: Sara Bagby, South Carolina
John Beverly, Texas
Randall Barnett, Kentucky
James W. McKee, Tennessee
Jim Rutledge, Oklahoma

1. Identify key program successes and barriers. Include state, regional, national efforts, as appropriate.

The Southern Extension System has primarily focused its efforts in solid waste management on agricultural dimensions of the problem such as animal waste. Awareness of problems and need for an Extension response in many non-traditional program areas is apparent. There is a need to shift from an agricultural orientation to community orientation in order to meet new demands. Successes in non-traditional programs are beginning to emerge. Many states are organizing interdisciplinary teams. Networking with other state, regional and national agencies concerned with waste management is being put together. Political pressure to deal with the issue is growing.

2. What is the predicted future of this program in the South? If a priority program, what are its major thrusts?

Solid waste management has become a national initiative for the Extension System. The initiative as it emerges in the Southern region will demand interdisciplinary programming in agriculture and natural resources, community and rural development, 4-H and home economics. This programming will need to draw on all the resources of the land-grant system, demand networks and linkages with a number of agencies and organizations and call for cooperation with a number of governmental and social organizations across the South.

The components of the program are:
---waste stream analysis
---product degradability
---source reduction
eenviroshopping/precycling
yard waste
---composting
backyard; commercial-yard waste, municipal solid waste, sludge
---recycling
---household and small business hazardous waste
---incineration
waste to energy, and volume reduction
---landfills
---financing

3. What actions are recommended? Who should provide leadership for implementing this action?
-- A regional focus on development of a comprehensive waste management program for the
management of residential and municipal solid waste materials currently going into landfills
-- Support from directors and administration for interdisciplinary programming on waste management
-- Establish a state waste management program team including representatives of four program areas,
  county staff, middle management, staff development and communications in each state (possibly
  combined with the water quality team)
-- Allocate or reallocate resources to waste management
-- Develop an incentive system for specialists and agents to work on waste management problems
-- Provide mini-grants to support innovative programs by agents and specialists
-- Provide funds for state and regional program materials to support new initiatives
-- A solid waste effort includes educational programs on technical, economic, financial,
  environmental, sociological/psychological, community development, public policy and legal aspects
  of the issue
-- Networking should be encouraged with all organizations that have expertise in solid waste
-- Training for agents that leads to dedication to working on waste management problems
-- Expand Southern Waste Management Task Force to include middle management, communication
  and staff development
-- Move toward proactive stance to become a major player in facing the issue
-- Include in the plan an evaluation component and identification of research needs
-- Encourage communication with water quality groups
-- Develop position (white) paper on each issue and establish interdisciplinary task force to develop
  recommendations on regional actors (similar to Waste Management Task Force)

4. For recommended regional actions, provide rationale and general strategy for the action.

   As a starting point, schedule and hold a 3-day regional workshop on waste management in early 1991
   directed toward training the trainers to facilitate the development and delivery of integrated waste
   management programs at the county level. Provide information to states on available waste
   management program materials and develop recommendations for additional needs.

5. What other high priority issues not necessarily related to your assigned topic do you propose for
   Extension programming in the South? Describe.

   -- Look at paring down the number of issues, too many issues
   -- Extension needs to labor more on setting priorities
   -- Elderly at Risk will become an issue soon
   -- Day Care in rural areas
   -- Crime
GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Leader: Howard Ladewig, Texas
Recorder: Shirley Gerkin, Virginia
Participants: Wallace C. Cummings, Arkansas
Kevin Hayes, Oklahoma
Roy Carriker, Florida
Doug McAlister, Virginia
Dalton Proctor, North Carolina
Doris Tichenor, Florida

1. Identify key program successes and barriers.

2. What is the predicted future of this program?
   
   Current status of emerging issue: not clearly an issue; diversity of opinions and research findings contradictory

3. What actions are recommended?

4. Recommended regional actions, rationale and general strategy.
   
   --Cooperative Extension Service should have Strategic Planning Council is developing a white paper and should conduct regional meetings of interested parties to frame and focus the issue
   --CES should be prepared to provide awareness program on the concerns that the proposed Global Climate Change could have. In addition, CES should establish its credibility on the subject
   --In the absence of credible research, CES should emphasize proven Natural Resource Management practices

5. Other high-priority issues (related and unrelated to the topic) for Extension programming in the South?

   For all issues, those affected by the plan should be involved in the making of the plan. Specific attention should be given to the following points:
   --sound program development principles (including target audiences and media)
   --marketing strategies
   --avoid image/connnotation pitfalls
   --evaluation research procedures
   --identification of staff development needs to program successfully (including issue termination)

   --Animal Welfare
      Strategic Planning Council should sponsor a white paper to frame the issue and conduct regional meetings of interested parties
   --Managing Change Within Extension
      Develop strategies to manage change related to:
      --audience diversity
-- staff development for different assignments
-- tactics to diversify existing resources
-- educate traditional clientele of new directions
-- new/different roles of administration
-- diversifying political base
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