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Littering is a major problem in many areas, turning public roadways into eyesores and costing millions of dollars to clean up. One reason the problem is so widespread is that many people do not realize its extent. When officials in Hanover County, Virginia, decided to do something about the littering problem in their area, they turned to the local extension staff for help.

But how do you make the citizens of an area aware that littering is a major problem? That was the question Hanover County officials asked, and the extension staff took it as a challenge.

The staff recognized, too, that an anti-littering education program presented an excellent opportunity to increase interaction within the total community while also allowing the extension staff to work together on a comprehensive educational program. An educational objective was written and a county program that included citizen participation, group involvement, anti-litter education, cleanup of roadways, establishment of recycling centers and county beautification resulted.

As the program developed, it became known as "Spring Cleanin'!" State and national recognition from Keep Virginia Beautiful and Keep America Beautiful respectively came to Hanover County for the quality of its improvement program and the massive commitment of citizens to the process.

The month of May was designated as the time period when "Spring Cleanin'!" efforts were to take place. Eighty leaders representing community groups, business, industry, communication media, local government and public agencies were invited to a dinner meeting to discuss the program. The leaders were asked to modify as necessary a draft of the proposed plan for "Spring Cleanin'!" and to pledge the support of their respective organizations to the month-long improvement effort. The dinner and discussion approach proved most useful in legitimizing the program with community leaders and in generating commitments and enthusiasm from the group. Leaders invited to this planning session became active proponents of the program and were responsible for much of its success.

Hanover County has approximately 50,000 residents. Since the goal was total citizen involvement, the coordinated effort was expanded not only to include community groups, local government, public agencies, mass media and the business community, but also civic service and youth clubs, churches, and individuals. Fifty-six organizations joined the numerous individual landowners and other private citizens in carrying out the clean-up portion of the program. Also, 75 churches in the county actively supported the clean-up effort.

More than 2,000 trash bags were distributed for use in litter removal efforts, Hanover County banks mailed brochures encouraging participation to 19,000 homes along with customers' monthly bank statements. Over 2,400 school-age children and 286 adults attended programs on litter control. A total of 498 students entered an anti-litter poster contest, and 300 of the posters were displayed in public places throughout the county.

The county media did their part. The Herald-Progress, the local newspaper, printed 15 stories totaling 209 inches on the campaign, while also running a variety of pictures concerning the program. WVEE-FM in Ashland had one 15-minute program on the campaign and scheduled 50 public service announcements to remind area residents of the operation. Youth developed and read the public service announcements as a portion of their contribution.

The results of this planned, wide-spread participation were dramatic. Program leaders reported that 80 percent of Hanover County's 600 miles of roads were cleaned of litter. Seven new beautification projects were reported in the county as a part of the "Spring Cleanin'!" effort. Two recycling collection stations established during the campaign are still in operation and serve as a constant reminder of the fight against litter.

Less tangible, but equally important results were documented by Hanover citizens who told about visiting with their neighbors again, and in many cases, "Spring Cleanin'! was responsible for first time meetings.

Many families found "Spring Cleanin'! to be an opportunity for the family to work together as a unit to make a contribution to their neighborhood or community.

There was no age barrier in the project. Pre-schoolers were filmed cleaning up their play yard and senior citizens were photographed planting trees in a memorial garden as a contribution to the project.

An awards program to recognize individuals, groups and businesses which did outstanding jobs in the program was held at the end of the campaign. Ten adult groups received $100 awards for their efforts while 19 youth organizations received $50 awards. Jefferson cups went to 10 individuals who made outstanding contributions, and five businesses received plaques in recognition of their exemplary efforts.

Virginia's Division of Litter Control of the Department of Conservation and Economic Development cooperated closely with Hanover County in providing resources. An initial grant of $5,494, which was later supplemented by an additional $1,000 from the Division, eased the burden of planning, organizing, implementing and directing "Spring Cleanin'!." Also, an extension volunteer was employed on a part-time basis to coordinate the massive effort necessary to operate an effective program of this scope.

Were the stated goals of the project reached? These goals were to increase awareness of the litter problem, educate youth and adults to not litter, improve the physical environment of Hanover County, encourage recycling to reduce solid waste, reduce litter to a minimum, and restore unsightly areas to their natural beauty. All of the goals were accomplished in part; however, unmet goals provide the basis for continuing "Spring Cleanin'! as an annual happening in Hanover County where citizens are excited by their demonstrated ability to address significant community problems through local initiative.
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The people of Morehouse Parish in Northeast Louisiana are working hard to keep the small farm alive and well. Efforts to help small farmers in this parish (county) began long before the current national concern for survival of small farms.

The Morehouse Parish small farm program got its start in 1959 from a study done by Doane Agriculture, a private consulting group, for a group of interested community leaders. The study showed that 1005 of the 1462 farms in Morehouse Parish contained less than 100 acres and that cotton was the main source of income for most of these small farms. One of the recommendations of the study was that small farmers should consider vegetable crops as a feasible alternative to cotton production because vegetables offered higher returns per acre than cotton.

However, a number of problems had to be solved in order to get small farmers to switch from cotton to vegetable production. Most producers lacked the technical knowledge required for vegetable farming. The marketing system at the time consisted of only a few roadside stands and door-to-door sales. Morehouse Parish farmers were also reluctant to change from their traditional cotton crop to commercial vegetables.

Recognizing these problems, the county agricultural extension agent, John Andrews, took on the task of developing an extension program to help small farmers. Andrews used community and neighborhood meetings to discuss vegetable production, and he set up demonstration plots in principal communities of the parish to show successful vegetable production efforts. Finally, Andrews made numerous farm visits to discuss vegetable production with small farmers on a one-to-one basis.

Progress was slow at first, but each year more and more farmers began growing vegetables as alternative or supplemental enterprises. Vegetables continued to be sold primarily at roadside stands and door-to-door. Then, in 1967, 125 producers entered into a contract cucumber marketing agreement. Producers also raised 60 acres of tomatoes which were sold at a cooperative auction facility in a nearby parish. Many farmers also entered into a contract okra arrangement in 1968.

However, the interest of small farmers in contract marketing was short-lived, primarily because of low returns per acre. Producer participation declined each year.

Faced with this situation, County Agent Andrews and an extension marketing specialist conducted a survey to determine local consumer demand for higher valued vegetable crops. Results of the survey showed that sufficient local demand did exist, but that the existing marketing system was inadequate. The need for a farmers market was then realized.

Andrews met with the small farmers, and together they decided to form the Morehouse Parish Vegetable Producers Association with the goal of establishing a farmers market. To gain community support, Andrews and the producer representatives met with Chamber of Commerce members, police jurors, school board members, and other business and civic leaders. Response was enthusiastic. The local Chamber of Commerce bought a tent which served as the first market in 1972, and sales that year totaled about $175,000.

The next year the producers leased a vacant building and employed a manager with the help of a $1600 grant from their state's economic development district. Produce sales increased to $400,000.

Today, more than 400 families use the farmers market to sell their produce. Sales continue to expand. In 1978, parish small farmers sold an estimated $750,000 of vegetables.

Individual farmers and their families have expressed great pride in their new found success and are vocal in praising the value of the farmers market. Success stories abound. Alfred Bailey is one of the Morehouse Parish farmers whose farm and family life has changed for the better. Bailey, now in his fifties, began cotton farming as a youth on land where his family had lived for 125 years.

After a talk with County Agent Andrews in 1972, Bailey decided to reorganize his farming operation. He rented his cotton acreage to a neighboring farmer with a larger cotton operation. He now devotes most of his energies to the development of a 15-acre vegetable farm growing southern peas, sweet corn, collards, and fresh market items.

Bailey and his family are more than satisfied with the outcome. He now has a daughter enrolled in college. He has invested in farm and home improvements and has become an articulate spokesman for the small farmers in his area. He credits his success to his switch from cotton to vegetable production and to the community effort that provided the farmers market.

Efforts in Morehouse Parish have also been personally rewarding for County Agent Andrews. In recognition of his outstanding extension work for Morehouse Parish, Andrews received the Distinguished Service Award from USDA in 1975. And in 1978, Andrews was honored at the local level when the Morehouse Parish Chamber of Commerce named him Man of the Year.
West Point Revitalization
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West Point, Virginia would not let its downtown die. And efforts to restore and preserve the area are bringing townspeople together and renewing their sense of community pride.

In cities and towns throughout the United States, downtown areas are dying or losing their status as centers of the community, but community leaders and citizens of West Point decided that was not going to happen to their town. With the help of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, West Point residents began a project to "revitalize" their town.

The Virginia Cooperative Extension Service has particularly gone to the special community development project in the six-county area of the Middle Peninsula Planning District. The project's goal is to involve community members in identifying, evaluating and addressing community needs and desires. Coordinated by the Virginia State College Extension Program, the project involves local, district and state extension personnel, staff of the Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission, representatives of local governments and community residents.

The Citizens of West Point, a town of 2,500 at the mouth of the York River, view the project as "revitalization" for the town. The town has a thriving economy with virtually no unemployment. Concerns of local residents have been focused on the clustered appearance of the town, which has resulted both from commercial development on a rural arterial highway through town and from a decline in activity in the downtown business district.

The West Point Area Improvement Association (WPAIA) provides leadership for the town in working with project staff. The association and VPI & SU approved a memorandum of agreement which established a group of students to do a design study of the town's two business districts. The study included three phases: visual analysis; master plan; and design guidelines. The purpose of the study was to develop a possible street plan, building existacies and character perspectives. Total cost for the project to WPAIA was $1,985, which included student wages, expenses, and supplies.

The DSSC worked with the student team on the project. The DSSC, with the help of the study committee members, discussed ideas with the students who coupled these and other ideas with existing structures and data to develop conceptual improvement ideas for the town. Study efforts involved a continuous process of discussion, review and revision which allowed community members to interact with the design study team in order to develop a plan consistent with the ideas and interests of the town.

"The nature of the project involves the whole community -- citizens, council and business," the steering committee chairman said. "Its success depends on their support and community pride.

The completed study provides conceptual suggestions and illustrations for the specific guidelines for improvements in the town. Implementation, which is planned for several phases, requires estimated expenditures of $8500 over a three-year period.

Phase I will begin in 1979. It includes the development of a set of guidelines for improvements in the downtown business district of West Point. The association and VPI & SU approved a memorandum of agreement which established a group of students to develop the plan. The DSSC, with the help of the study committee members, discussed ideas with the students who coupled these and other ideas with existing structures and data to develop conceptual improvement ideas for the town.

The Virginia Tech extension agent believes the cooperative effort is really paying off. "Representatives of all areas of the West Point community are working together to improve the town's looks and strengthen its character," he said. And West Point's town manager added that the project was an "excellent effort which has shown people that government, business and citizens can cooperate to accomplish a lot with limited resources."

Technical assistance for implementation of the "revitalization" plans is being provided by the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service with Virginia State College and Virginia Tech cooperating, the Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission, a local architect, town officials, local business, and town residents. The coordinated involvement of the total community is intended to make West Point a more comfortable and attractive community in which to live, work and shop.

Throughout the improvement project, the WPAIA has utilized the community development process as a guide for effective action. Project selection and decision making have been made by citizen participants after thorough discussions of ideas and opinions involved. Community interest in the project has been sustained at a high level as a result of community pride and the feeling that residents of the town are able to improve the community through their own efforts. As one local leader put it, "The town now has an attitude of 'we can do it.'"

Continued planning and decision making by West Point citizens will insure project success for the whole community. Such is the essence of community development.
Farmers Home Active In Rural Development
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The Farmers Home Administration was created in the dark days of the depression by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt and the Congress's goal was to make loans to farm families so that, with this help, these families could stay on their land and stay off the city relief rolls. To qualify for a loan in those days, a farmer could have no more than one hired hand, two mules and two cows. The guidelines for qualifying for a loan have changed since then, but the same goal - keeping farm families on their farms - remains today. President Carter has given us many tools to accomplish this goal. With agriculture being the foundation of the economy in many rural areas, it is important that the Farmers Home Administration never forget the purpose upon which it was founded.

However, the Farmers Home Administration has grown and taken on new and important areas of responsibility. Along with our basic mission of assisting farmers, the Farmers Home is involved in housing - both single family houses and apartments so that low income and elderly citizens will have safe, decent, and energy efficient shelter. The Farmers Home Administration is involved in community programs, such as water and sewer facilities, libraries, hospitals, fire rescue services, city halls, and other community facilities that make small towns viable places to live. And the Farmers Home Administration is also into business and industry loans to provide assistance to industries which will provide jobs and/or necessary services in rural areas to combat the worst enemies of any people - unemployment and underemployment.

There are a great many programs and opportunities, but in the past they were dotted out in a shotgun-type approach, without much thought as to what the end result would be. In 1972, the Congress passed the Rural Development Act which directs the secretary of agriculture to play the lead role in coordinating and monitoring the Federal efforts that have - or should have - an impact on rural areas. For the first time since the passage of the act, that role is being taken seriously.

Any effort to strengthen rural America is a large undertaking:

- Rural America is 87 percent of the nation's land area.
- It contains 27 percent of the people - over 60 million persons.
- It is where all the nation's food and fiber for 215 million people are produced by just over 3 percent of the people.
- However, there are also many problems in rural America:
  - Rural America has over 50 percent of the nation's substandard housing.
  - It has over 40 percent of the nation's poverty line families.
  - Rural America lags behind the rest of the nation in health, education, and other necessary public and social facilities.

Our overall goals are to strengthen the economy, assure healthful and adequate water, provide decent shelter, establish basic community facilities, and aiding in bringing reasonable health and transportation services for all people in small towns, especially those who need it the most - the poorest, the most rural, the minorities, and the aged.

As President Lyndon Johnson said, "History records a long, hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and live where he chooses.... We lose that freedom when our children are obliged to live some place else if they want a job or if they want a good education.... Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities. The welfare of this nation demands it. And strange as it may seem, the cities will never solve their problems unless we solve the problems of the small towns and rural areas."

There is much work to be done and it must be done with a great deal of compassion.

To me, rural development is not:
- People in Washington sitting in small offices reading pipes and planning communities.
- It is not paving over our beautiful countryside.
- It is not large factories in every town with their smoke stacks polluting our air.
- It is not applying urban solutions to rural problems.

To me, rural development is improving the quality of life so people can live with dignity where they want to.

This will be accomplished by:

- Improving economic development.
- Increasing access to community services.
- Increasing the capacity of local communities to deal with their problems and solve them with the help of the Federal government, when necessary. This last point is very important because it goes to the root of community pride. This community pride exists in rural areas, and it must continue.

The Farmers Home Administration, along with other Federal and state agencies, will continue to work toward this type of development in rural America to fulfill President Carter's charge to the current government: "I want the government that I lead to be the kind of government that will simply let the greatness of the American people be realized... I grew up near a small town, a town where people depended on the land for a living. We shared the pleasures of a country life. We want our children to have opportunities even we did not enjoy, and we want to be sure that future generations can see a nation that is strong and free, decent and honest...

That is why, when I first came to Washington as President, I was determined that the Federal Government would take certain stances, would help rural development, would help to overcome the problems that we share and make sure that there is a full partnership between Washington and the rest of the country in meeting the needs of small town and rural America."
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4-H Development Fund Sets $1 Million Goal

Last year some Louisiana 4-H youths eligible to go to the Citizenship Short Course in Washington, D.C., didn’t go. They did not have the $300-350 for the educational trip.

Unfortunately, the citizenship trip was not the only 4-H function that had this problem. Nearly 80 educational trips for state winners have no businesses sponsoring them, or are only partially sponsored. Additionally, 4-H needs money to train volunteer leaders to work with 4-H clubs.

Steps are now being taken to change this picture. According to Dr. C. J. Naquin, state 4-H agent with the LSU Cooperative Extension Service, the John A. Cox 4-H Development Fund began last spring is raising $1 million to fund 4-H projects.

The funds will be held in endowment, with only the interest being used for projects. Use of the money will be determined by a board of trustees who have volunteered to direct expenditures. Contributions are being collected by a committee formed by the board and headed by Charles E. Roemer, state commissioner of administration.

Dave Perkins of Hamburg, chairman of the board, said, “The money will be spent strictly for 4-H youths and to train volunteer leaders. It will not go for salaries of professional personnel. Only a small percentage will be used for brochures, mailing expenses and certificates for contributors,” he added.

Naquin noted that over 100,000 Louisiana youths from rural and urban areas are involved in the educational projects of 4-H. The development fund, he says, could provide money for the educational trips that state winners in the projects receive. He indicated the fund could cover a third of the cost for the trip to Washington, and all of the expenses for other educational trips for state winners, such as those to New Orleans and Florida, and animal judging contests in Louisville, KY, Kansas City, MO, and Madison, WI.

Too, Naquin said that organizers hope the fund will provide money to expand the 4-H program. For example, Louisiana 4-H wishes to enlarge its role in the Partners of the American program, in which 4-H’ers assist Central American youth during the summer. There are also hopes of establishing a statewide 4-H adult leader conference to help volunteers working with 4-H clubs.

New Regional Development Commission Approved

The Department of Commerce approved plans for formation of a regional development commission to promote economic growth in Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee. Senator John C. Stennis (D-Ms.) said recently: “The new Mid-South Regional Commission will be made up of governors of the four states and a fifth member to be appointed by the President, Stennis said in a news release issued Jan. 12. The commission will be established under guidance of the Department of Commerce according to provisions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The commission will analyze economic problems in the region and develop an overall plan for enhancing growth.

During its first two years of operation, the commission will be financed entirely through Federal funds. Thereafter, state and Federal governments will split the administrative costs 50-50, with additional funds to be appropriated by the Congress for economic development projects.

Most of the first two years will be devoted to developing a comprehensive plan, providing technical assistance to state and local development agencies and sponsoring demonstration projects. Later the commission will take on a role similar to that of the Appalachian Regional Commission, promoting development in the four-state area through grants for specific projects designed to stimulate the states’ economies.

“This commission will provide an effective means for the four states involved along with the Federal government to work together for economic development,” Stennis said. “I am anxious for the Department of Commerce and the governors to proceed quickly as possible to form the commission.”

Problems Facing Appalachian Cities

Access to adequate community services is an expectation of all Americans. Census information and agency surveys have consistently shown services in Appalachian communities to be less available and/or of lower quality than for the nation as a whole. For example, health services are frequently nonexistent or inaccessible; water and sewer systems are inadequate; streets and roads are in need of repair, and inadequate garbage collection and disposal present health and pollution problems. Nevertheless, it is a goal of our communities to provide these basic services for all citizens.

There are 101 towns and cities in Kentucky Appalachia, nearly half (46 percent) of the population of the 49-county area reside. Increasingly, citizens are looking to officials of these towns for solutions to the provision of community services, thus requiring local officials to assess needs, set priorities and allocate resources. In order to determine what they view as problems and concerns of Appalachian cities, the officials of 79 incorporated places in Appalachian Kentucky were interviewed. This represents 78 percent of the towns and cities in the Appalachian Kentucky counties.

City officials who took part in the survey named problems of sewers and sanitation as their major concerns. Two-thirds of the officials surveyed said sewers were the top priority problem of their cities. Ranked second were highways, streets and bridges; followed by water systems, third; parks and recreation, fourth; and public safety, fifth. All of the top five problems were cited for first priority attention by a majority of city officials. The other concerns in the top 10 were flood control, garbage and sanitation, dumps, fire protection, and health and hospitals. Of the 28 problems asked about, a high priority was placed on the provision of basic community services. This is not surprising inasmuch as such services are either nonexistent or inadequate in many Appalachian cities and towns.

Appalachia Versus Non-Appalachia

When compared with Kentucky cities outside of Appalachia, the similarities and differences unique to the Appalachian region become evident. The top two problems, sewers and highways, are the same for both Appalachia and non-Appalachia. However, the provision of water ranks third in priority in Appalachian cities with 53 percent of the officials mentioning it as a top priority problem, while it ranks eighth for non-Appalachia. Flood control and dumps also rank higher as problems for Eastern Kentucky towns. Higher priority concerns in non-Appalachian cities is garbage and sanitation, fire protection, and planning and zoning.

The size of cities in the study varies from the smallest with 119 residents up to the largest with 27,456. However, in general, city problems are very similar for the different size cities. None of the top 10 problems in Appalachian cities differs significantly by city size. Differences that are identified are unique to the larger cities. They include such concerns as parking, juvenile delinquency, and planning and zoning.

Mining Versus Non-Mining

In an attempt to identify differences within Appalachian, the cities were classified according to whether mining makes an important contribution to the local economy (if a county produces at least 1 percent of Kentucky’s coal production it was classified as mining). Under this definition, 25 of the 79 Appalachian cities are considered “mining” communities. They are all located in 15 counties in the extreme southeastern portion of Kentucky Appalachia. The differences between mining and non-mining communities in Appalachia are striking. They differ in the types
highways, 47 percent higher; sewers and sanitation, 80 percent in mining versus 59 percent in non-mining; water systems, 72 percent versus 44 percent; and flood control, 60 percent compared with 33 percent. Other problems ranked substantially higher in mining communities were capital improvement projects and pollution. Problems higher on the priority list of non-mining communities (though not necessarily greater in magnitude) were public safety, budgeting, planning and zoning, and animal control.

What It All Means

Without question, the provision of community services—such as sewers, streets and roads, water, recreational facilities, and garbage collection and disposal—is the problem on the minds of officials of the towns and cities in Appalachia. Appalachian cities are striving to provide basic services for their residents. In general, concerns of cities in the Appalachian region don't differ that much from the non-Appalachian communities of Kentucky. Though there are differences in relative importance, eight of the top 10 priority problems are the same for both Appalachia and non-Appalachia. The two exceptions are flood control and solid waste disposal, which would be expected to rank high due to the unique geography of the region.

The major problems faced by Appalachian cities do not differ significantly by size of city. The same type problems prove to be uniformly important to all size cities, though the nature of the problems would be expected to differ. Services such as water systems and garbage collection are as important to a town with 500 residents as they are to one with 10,000.

The differences between problems of mining and non-mining towns are very revealing. Though the definition of mining is arbitrary and often changes, the differences to the presence, or absence, of coal production, a very unique set of problems was found to be identified with these cities. The problems related to the presence of coal mining, but in fact, they may be caused by other factors such as the unique geography, customs of the people, transportation problems, etc. Often these differences are ignored in our attempts to give identity to the region.

The first evident difference between the expressed problems of mining when compared with non-mining communities is the severity of the problems for mining towns. Consistently, a much larger proportion of the officials of mining communities ranked the problems as being of higher priority. In mining communities, seven problems were identified as being of top priority by at least half of the officials, whereas only two were listed by a majority of officials of non-mining communities. Relatively lower rankings by non-mining cities would suggest either that a city has not identified the concern as especially important or that an acceptable solution has been arrived at. Secondly, different type cities rarely do place different priorities on their problems. This finding would reinforce the need for carefully analyzing community situations before action programs are initiated. A single type program cannot be developed to satisfy the needs of Appalachian. There is no one set of needs for the region, but rather there exists a complex array of problems that are specific to the different type communities.

Publications Review


"This study was undertaken to identify the characteristics of the tobacco harvest work force, to determine the importance of harvest work to individuals and households, and to estimate the impact of impeding tobacco harvest mechanization on workers and their families." Copies are available from Department of Economics and Business, Box 3368, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, Raleigh, NC 27650.


"In the bulletin, literature reviewed focuses on changes in farm numbers, the incidence of low total incomes among small farmers, prospects for improving farm income, and factors influencing the future viability of small farms; several projects or technical assistance to small farmers are reviewed; the socio-economic characteristics, farm resources, management level, and current production of selected small farmers in Floyd and Brunswick Counties, Virginia are examined; potential production on these farms is estimated and factors affecting the quality of current to potential earnings are discussed; and implications are drawn concerning public policy vis a vis small farm technical assistance programs." Copies are available from Department of Agricultural Economics, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061.


"This guide seeks to address the problems of those rural citizens who have not shared in the favorable changes in rural development reflected in national rural development trends. This is a guide for learning about a number of resources, both financial and technical, for rural development." Copies are available from the National Rural Center, 1828 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

"The Small Farm in Transition." Ozarks 1, 2 (January 1979). Small farmers are losing ground— in every sense of the phrase. Most small farms today are economically viable only because of off-farm employment opportunities. While the future may be bleak for family farms as independent economic units, there is little doubt that the rural lifestyle will continue to appeal to many people. The Ozarks probably always will have small farms, though the nature of farming is undergoing rapid change. Because small farming continues to be the most appropriate form of agriculture in the Ozark region, and because broad public understanding and support are necessary for the survival of family farms, we have compiled this report on the situation—mostly in the words of the farmers themselves." Copies are available for $2 from the Ozark Institute, P. O. Box 549, Eureka Springs, Arkansas 72632.


"The first edition of A Selected Bibliography of Current Literature on Poverty was published by this Center in 1973. Since then several significant publications have been added to the literature. An effort has been made to incorporate them in this edition. An additional feature of this edition is a section on International Poverty." Copies are available from Dr. Josindar Dhillon, Center for Community Development and Research, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Tallahassee, FL 32307.