

The Origin of the Farmer Committee System

The farmer committee system, which today forms an important part of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, began in 1933. It was developed as an unique variation of the democratic process in response to a national emergency at a critical period of American history. Initially it was viewed as a temporary expedient with no permanent place in the American system of administration. ^{1/}

The agricultural depression contributed to the Great Depression of the late 1920's and early 1930's. As a result of deterioration in the agricultural sector of the economy, both at home and abroad, the depression in the other sectors of the economy was accelerated and intensified. This national crisis wrought a profound and far-reaching economic and political impact on American agriculture and American farmers:

As prices declined, farmers increased their production even more in an attempt to maintain their income. They succeeded only in lowering farm prices further. Farmers produced surpluses to sell at whatever prices were offered. . . . By 1932, cotton had dropped to about six cents a pound, hogs to four cents a pound, wheat to thirty-eight cents a bushel, and corn to thirty-two cents a bushel. Gross farm income dropped from nearly 18 billion dollars in 1919 to little more than 6 billion dollars in 1932. Net farm income also dropped—from 9 billion dollars in 1920 to 2.5 billion dollars in 1932. ^{2/}

The whole national economy was in a state of emergency and it was in no position to halt the decline in farm income, nor to correct it. Factories closed their doors, workers went into breadlines.

These circumstances, affecting the lives of all Americans, and striking hard against the welfare of farmers, produced a political upheaval at the polls in 1932. A new Administration came to Washington pledged to correct the decline in farm income as one aspect of the massive task of rescuing the nation from its plight. During the famous "one hundred days" after March 4, 1933, the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) was passed by the Congress providing production controls on specified commodities and authorizing payments to cooperating farmers. The Act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to establish for the more effective administration of these functions "State and local committees, or associations of producers and to permit cooperative associations of producers, when in his judgment, they are qualified to so do, to act as agents of their members and patrons in connection with the distribution of rental or benefit payments." ^{3/}

^{1/}However, Henry Wallace's writings of the 1930's viewed the committee system as a permanent contribution to public administration, and as something that would outlive the period of national emergency. M. L. Wilson, who originated the idea of farmer committees, also appeared to believe this.

^{2/}Murray Thompson, "The Search for Parity", Yearbook of Agriculture, 1962, p. 544.

^{3/}Agricultural Adjustment, May 1933 to February 1934: A Report of the Administrator, Appendix J, p. 365.

Temporary committees, either appointed or elected, handled the first stages of the original AAA programs. After these programs were in operation, cooperating producers in each township, or "community," elected committeemen, many of whom had been on the temporary committee. The chairmen of these committees in each county then met to elect from among themselves a county committee, composed of a chairman and two to four members.^{4/}

There were several reasons for the Secretary's decision to use the new authority. The specific commodity problems were both national and local. To apply the program at the individual farm involved determinations as to acreages planted and average crop yields. From these data would come individual farm allotments. As knowledgeable local people—farmers—were brought into this process, the Secretary believed that the program would be handled more equitably, more responsibly, more acceptably, and more in keeping with the democratic idea.

Thus, some 4,200 local production control associations came quickly into being; eventually they evolved into committees. There was an underlying singleness of purpose. Committeemen wanted to be of genuine assistance to farmers generally, to make useful contributions to improved agricultural welfare, and otherwise to participate in the effort to correct agricultural conditions. The Extension Service personnel played a key role in the early years of the new committee system. However, in the Midwest a somewhat different pattern of local administration by committee developed, and the Extension personnel had less influence than in the other parts of the country.

Initial Procedures

When a producer signed an adjustment contract he automatically became a member of the production-control association for that commodity in his county. He and other members of the association elected the local officers of the association from among themselves. Details of local administration of the program were in the hands of association committees, or community committees. Committeemen were paid for certain services. The cost of local administration was deducted from payments to producers. However, in the South up until 1936 committeemen were reimbursed for their services by the Extension Service from appropriations made available to it.

The community committee consisted of from three to five representatives of the signers of production-adjustment contracts in the community. It made the production-adjustment contracts available to farmers, assisted individual producers in preparing data required in the contract, helped farmers in obtaining substantiating evidence of production and acreage, obtained production data of non-contract signers, checked data offered by cooperating producers, made adjustments in those data, obtained execution of contracts, certified accuracy of statements in contracts, and checked and certified performance of contract. In later years, other phases of farm programs requiring action at the local level were assigned to the committee system. The procedures governing the committee system changed with time, experience and circumstance.

From these community committees came the executives of the county production-control associations, who were responsible for county-wide administration of the commodity program.

The chairman of each community committee in a county became a member of the board of directors of the county production-control association for that commodity. In

^{4/}Arthur T. Thompson, "Farmers as Committees," Yearbook of Agriculture, 1962, p. 559.

the deliberations of the board, each member was entitled to one vote. From its membership, the board elected a president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer. The president automatically became chairman of the county allotment committee. The board then elected from two to four of its members who, with the chairman, constituted the county allotment committee.

Attempts at partisan domination of the committees were forestalled by making it possible for committeemen to be removed by their own neighbors at annual election. Farm organizations gave full endorsement to the farmer committee system, and they generally supported the adjustment programs.

The supervision and guidance of the county and community committees was carried out through State committees. The early State committees usually were organized by the State Extension Director, and he served as the Executive Officer. As was the case with the county committees, there was regional variation in the organization and operation of the State committees. As the program developed, State committee members were appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and an attempt was made to have them be representative of the various farm interests in each State.

The Department staff in Washington computed from the official records the allotment for each State and each county, and thus fixed the amount of the commodity on which adjustment payments would be made. The computation for individual farmers was done by the local committee. It was the county committee's job to divide the fixed county allotment fairly among the producers in proportion to their past production.

The Washington office developed regulations and administrative rulings, often on the basis of practical and justifiable proposals made by the committees. Frequently, consultations between Washington administrative personnel and the committees took place in public meetings attended by county and community committeemen and farmers interested in the programs. The attendance at these public meetings was usually very good, and the exchange of views was beneficial to both Washington personnel and to the producers.

New Legislation

Two Acts of Congress were of historic importance in the development of the committee system: The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. 2/29/36

The former Act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize county and community committees of agricultural producers and the agricultural extension service or other approved agencies in carrying out the provisions of the pertinent sections of the Act.

Following passage of the Act on February 29, 1936, committee duplications which had survived the emergency organization were eliminated. A single elected farmer committee served all commodity groups involved in any one county.

This Act also provided for a system of Federal-State-local administration in the field of farm conservation work, based on grants-in-aid and State plans approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, similar to programs operated in the fields of highways, public health, and welfare. This system was never put into effect because subsequent legislation continued the existing system. At various times since 1933, there has been disagreement over the proper relationship of the farmer committees and the program they administered to other programs of the Department. But as the adjustment program evolved, it lost its emergency character, and administrative problems became more routine.

In the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, Congress, for the first time, required the use of elected farmer committees. It directed the Secretary to use local and State committees in handling of the agricultural conservation, acreage allotment and marketing quota programs. The Act required the Secretary to designate local administrative areas as units for administration of the authorized programs, and provided that no local area should include more than one county or parts of different counties. It prescribed such things as the general method of electing local and county committees, the number of committeemen to serve, and the composition and method of appointment of State farmer committees.

The pertinent passage from the Act is printed below:

In carrying out the provisions of this section... the Secretary is directed to utilize the services of local and State committees selected as hereinafter provided. The Secretary shall designate local administrative areas as units for administration of programs under this section. No such local area shall include more than one county or parts of different counties. Farmers within any such local administrative area, and participating or cooperating in programs administered within such area, shall elect annually from among their number a local committee of not more than three members for such area and shall also elect annually from among their number a delegate to a county convention for the election of a county committee. The delegates from the various local areas in the county shall, in a county convention, elect, annually, the county committee for the county which shall consist of three members who are farmers in the county. The local committee shall elect a secretary and may utilize the county agricultural extension agent for such purpose. The county committee shall select a secretary who may be the county agricultural extension agent. If such county agricultural extension agent shall not have been elected secretary of such committee, he shall be ex officio a member of the county committee. The county agricultural extension agent shall not have the power to vote. In any county in which there is only one local committee the local committee shall also be the county committee. In each State there shall be a State committee for the State composed of not less than three or more than five farmers who are legal residents of the State and who are appointed by the Secretary. The State director of the Agricultural Extension Service shall be ex officio a member of such State committee. The ex officio members of the county and State committees shall be in addition to the number of members of such committees hereinbefore specified. The Secretary shall make such regulations as are necessary relating to the selection and exercise of the functions of the respective committees, and to the administration, through such committees, of such programs.

Growth of Committee System

As the farmer committee system developed as a permanent institution, the pattern of organization became diversified along regional lines. For administrative purposes the 48 States were divided into five areas. Each area strove to develop a more uniform system of State and local administration of the diverse farm programs. A dual conception of the role of the committees developed around the so-called "southern system" and the "corn belt system."

In the South, the State Executive Officers and county administrative officers (called principal clerks) became key personnel in the system. As a rule, they ran "the show", while the State and county committees served largely part-time as boards of directors with limited "policy-making" and appellate authority. There was a tendency to use the committees with some imagination between 1948 and 1952, and a cooperative principal clerk-committee system was developed in the Southern States. The State Executive Officers had almost complete control over the selection of county principal clerks, and, in some States, did not permit them to serve in their home counties.

In the Midwest (the North Central area), however, the State and county committeemen played the key role in the system and served full-time in office capacities. As a rule, the county committee selected its own chief clerk and office staff to handle administrative detail.

The other areas of the country evolved committee systems resembling in some respects either the southern or midwestern model, but also with their own unique features of organization.

There were also important operational differences among different States; the system of communications was extremely diverse; internal audit functions were organized and performed by the States themselves under the supervision of regional offices; and national policy was implemented without too much uniformity. Control, supervision, direction, and coordination was effectuated, since 1936, from the Federal level through regional directors and their offices, reorganized subsequently into the Field Service Branch. Later on, the chief area officers were called Administrator's Fieldmen, and, since the early 1950's, Area Directors; they reported to a Deputy Administrator from a Washington, rather than a regional, headquarters.

However, partly as a result of budgetary limitations, and partly for other reasons, certain uniform tendencies evolved in all areas. The most important one was the shift in the role of the community committeemen. Whereas formerly they were the "heart and soul" of the farmer committee system, they came to play a less active role in farm programs administration, and in some States came very close to becoming a "paper" organization.

Another important uniform tendency was the use of farmer fieldmen as permanent liaison between the State and county offices. They became the key link in the whole system of administration of farm programs, and worked, in the 1940's, under the direction and supervision of the Chairman of the State Committee who served as the Chief Administrative Officer in the State office.

The types of programs administered by the farmer committees have varied considerably over the years. During World War II, and again during the Korean War, the emphasis was on increasing production to meet domestic and foreign needs. During World War II, the county committee chairmen were also chairmen of the Defense (later War) Boards, and the farmer committees played a key role in scrap drives on farms, assistance to the selective service system, rationing, etc. For a period in the 1940's there was emphasis on the conservation aspects of the program. The production adjustment and control aspects varied from time to time with the changes in legislation adopted by Congress. The interest of individual farmers and various farm groups in the farmer committees has also varied with the programs. There was a slacking off of farmers' interest in committees at the end of World War II, as the emphasis on increased production prevailed, and there was also a decrease in the enthusiasm and the number of men going out from regional and State offices to maintain liaison with the farmer committees.

The relationship between the farmer committees and the State and local administrators of other agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture also has varied. Between 1945 and 1951, an attempt was made to improve it by means of the USDA State and county

councils, which included representatives from the farmer committees. The councils were succeeded from 1951 to 1953 by Agricultural Mobilization committees, headed by the chairmen of the farmer committees.

As farm organizations developed major differences about the future course of agricultural policy, their endorsement of the committee system was affected. Some of the State and county committeemen were drawn into the political arena where they were subject to partisan attacks.

However, the farmer committee system remained an essential component of the American administrative system with a record singularly free from fraudulent and unethical practices.

1953-1960 Developments

In March 1953, a reorganization of the Department of Agriculture took place. Part of the Production and Marketing Administration (successor to the AAA) became the Commodity Stabilization Service. The community, county, and State committees became identified as the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation committees and their supervision was assigned to the Commodity Stabilization Service.

The appointed farmers on State committees were to be responsible for policy matters. Full-time work by State committeemen was halted. They were to be paid on a when-actually-employed basis, and limited in the number of days they could work during a year.

The Department's statement of policy for State committeemen required that each nomination for membership on the State committee be accompanied by a report on the acceptability of the nominee to heads of State farm organizations, Deans of Agriculture in the Land-Grant Colleges, Directors of Extension, State Commissioners of Agriculture, and other agricultural leaders in the State. The appointment by the Secretary of Agriculture was for a period of one year, and a rotation system was established whereby one or more State committeemen were replaced each year.

The State committee was to determine program and administrative policy, but the execution of such policies was to be carried out by its employees under the direction of a State Administrative Officer, employed by, but not a member of the committee.

A similar separation of duties was announced for county committees. The elected county committeemen were to work on an as-necessary part-time basis only. Each county committee was to hire an office manager responsible for day-to-day operations in the county. The farmer committees elected to administer the program were to concern themselves primarily with policy matters.

In 1954, election of county and community committeemen was changed. The Secretary announced that community election boards of farmers would be selected by county election boards, composed of the county agricultural extension agent as chairman, the heads of the Soil Conservation Service and Farmers Home Administration offices in the county, and the county head of each general farm organization operating in the county. Community election boards selected the slates of nominees for the community committees. County committeemen were elected at a convention of delegates from the communities in the county. County committeemen could not be officials of general farm organizations nor could they serve as employees in their own county offices.

The new system was to be uniformly applied in all areas. There was disagreement over whether these changes strengthened or weakened the farmer committee system. From one point of view, this was strengthening the committee conception evolved in the "southern

system" as the board of directors of the State and county operations. Committee members were relieved of administrative detail, so they could better concentrate on their role in "policy making." From another point of view, they were being relegated to merely advisory roles to county office managers and State Administrative Officers, with more standardized national administration rolling back regional differences in local control and administration of farm programs. According to this point of view, the deactivation of the elected farmer committees was in line with the assumed objective of eliminating farm programs from the national scene.

The attempt to limit county and community committeemen to no more than three one-year consecutive terms in office was particularly controversial; the limitation was removed by Congress. This attempt plus reported abuses by the Missouri State committee in dictating the selection of county personnel and the removal of county committeemen resulted in extensive congressional hearings in 1956 on several bills intended to change the rules regarding the committees.

Other revisions provided for removal of county and community committeemen and election board members only by a majority vote of the State committee. Provision was also made for the right of appeal by ousted persons.

In 1957, a comprehensive nationwide classification and pay plan for county ASC employees was developed and put in operation; a major reclassification of the positions in State offices took place; a county office manager trainee program was inaugurated with the objective of providing a pool of qualified applicants when vacancies occurred in county offices; a system of issuing instructions in handbooks was installed; and a national system of annual, comprehensive, audits and operation review procedures in every State and county office was inaugurated.

Later on, the county office employees were given additional fringe benefits, partly in response to their organization in State associations. Early in 1959, under the leadership of several county office managers, State associations formed the National Association of ASC County Office Employees.^{5/}

By 1960, the farmer committee system of farm programs administration was transformed into a nationwide manager-committee system. State and local administration was fully institutionalized around the State and county offices in which the full-time, salaried personnel was considerably upgraded.

In about a third of the States, "old hands" in the position of the Administrative Officer and farmer fieldmen were able to exercise considerable influence on the way the farmer committees were used as active agents on the county level of administration. They also had a great deal of influence in regional meetings and in the development of procedural policies in the Washington office. As a result, in New York, North Carolina, and a score of other States, the farmer committees were less affected by the revisions and transformations of the 1950's.

However, in those States where the key appointments of Administrative Officers and farmer fieldmen were filled by a partisan selection without any prior experience for the job, the quality of administration deteriorated, and led to embarrassing developments, especially in Texas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. The farmer committees suffered most in

^{5/}By 1962, the Association's membership included more than 75 percent of 15,500 full-time county office employees, and NASCOE was granted by the Secretary of Agriculture exclusive recognition to represent all full-time employees in county offices in negotiation with management on terms of employment and working conditions.

this deterioration. Their initial drive had become blunted, and in many cases completely lost. The feeling of urgency and enthusiasm on the part of farmer committeemen evaporated, and was replaced—especially on the community level—by inertia and lethargy.

1961 Changes

In line with the objectives set forth by the new Administration, the Secretary of Agriculture announced on March 23, 1961, important changes in the regulations governing farmer committees:

- (1) County and community election boards are eliminated, and authority to conduct elections now is vested in ASC county committees;
- (2) Officers of general farm organizations now become eligible to serve as county committeemen; and
- (3) The authority to assign duties to community committees is put in the hands of county committees instead of county office managers.^{6/}

The objective of these changes was to revitalize the county and local farmer committee system, and to change the spirit governing the administration of farm programs on the local level.

The Secretary pointed out in his statement that

managers in some counties have taken over prerogatives of the committees, with the result that committees have not fully assumed their responsibilities either because of lack of interest or because they were led to believe that the committee function was purely advisory.

We intend to actively encourage all committees to assume their full responsibilities and to make it abundantly clear that the committee has the responsibility and the county office manager carries out the day-to-day operations. County committees will be expected to determine policies and assume overall responsibility, and managers will be expected to carry out these policies and to supervise the day-to-day operations of the county offices.

We plan to abolish all arbitrary time limits on the service of committeemen, so that their talents may be fully utilized in getting understanding of our programs by farmers and the general public. At the same time, we do not expect to use them to perform purely clerical functions for which they are not particularly well suited by either training or experience. Active farmers who are representative farm leaders in their areas—the type who should represent farmers and the Department of Agriculture on ASC county committees—cannot be expected to spend full time working as committeemen, and we do not anticipate any such contingency.

It is our firm belief that the ASC farmer-committee is the most effective and economical method of operation if it operates as originally conceived under the enabling legislation. We intend to see that the committee system functions with full authority and responsibility in the days ahead.^{7/}

^{6/}Press Release, USDA 851-61.

^{7/}Ibid

Operations in the State offices were also somewhat realigned to emphasize the more active participation of the State farmer committeemen. The prescribed rotation system of State committeemen was abandoned.

The present organization, then, provides for overall direction of production adjustment, agricultural conservation, price support, and related programs in the county by the elected county committees, subject to the general direction and supervision of the State committee, appointed by the Secretary upon the recommendation of ASCS.^{8/} Under the direction of the county committee and subject to the regulations of the Department, the county office manager is responsible for day-to-day operations of the county office. As is the case in other organizations of this type, the relative influence of committee chairmen, committee members, and managers varies considerably from county to county. But it seems that in those counties where the farmer committees feel that they should serve, or are compelled to serve, principally in advisory capacity, they do not feel responsible for county ASC operations. As a result, such committees are not alert, and their effectiveness in the whole system of checks and balances is impaired.

In spite of the many modifications in the committee system, the 1961 experience indicates that the farmer committee method of administering farm programs is sound.

After the Congress enacted in March, 1961, the Emergency Feed Grain Act of 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture began immediately putting the new law into effect. It was already late. At the several meetings held around the country with farmers and U.S. Department of Agriculture field personnel, the point was repeatedly stressed that the new adjustment program could not become truly effective without the complete cooperation of the farmer committee system. By June 1, 1961, the initial objectives of the 1961 program had been accomplished through the combined efforts of tens of thousands of community committeemen and some 9,000 farmer county committeemen and their county employees in more than 3,000 counties, supervised by committeemen and staff of 50 State offices working under the general direction of the ASCS staff of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The farmer committeemen and the ASCS employees performed extremely well in obtaining participation. The general consensus was that the program could not have been accomplished without the elected farmer committees.

Conclusion

Thus, over nearly thirty years, the State and local administration of farm programs functioned to a large extent because of the existence of farmer committees, established to perform a wide variety of tasks authorized by law. The farmer committee system operated under six successive Secretaries of Agriculture, each subscribing to differing political philosophies and each advocating dissimilar approaches to farm problems.

The committee system at its inception was a product of the times. It was born during the Great Depression, and within a brief period of time after its birth, it became a vital tool for fostering our agriculture's economic well-being, psychological uplifting, and political stabilization. The committees' role has, however, been changed as the administration of farm programs became institutionalized. In spite of the modifications in farmer committees' standing, they survived both the changes in the national administration and the numerous personnel changes at the Washington, State, and local level. The committee system is still regarded as a key element of the field forces of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Over the years, farmers have been able to participate in farm programs administration, and reassure their neighbors about the objectives of adjustment programs. They

^{8/} The Director of the State Extension Service is ex-officio member of the State committee with voting power. The county agent is likewise an ex-officio member of the county committee but without the power to vote.

have been able to secure factual data of county-wide importance, and to communicate their ideas and attitudes regarding their part in agricultural adjustment programs to committees composed of their peers. The farmer committeemen have been able to handle a wide variety of tasks at the local levels under differing commodity programs in a satisfactory manner. In most cases, the normal political patterns of an area did not interfere with their responsibilities. The experience of farmer committeemen was of great importance in preparing them for public service in a variety of national, State, and local agencies of government. Several men of distinction in public affairs were the product of the farmer committee system.

The joint responsibility for the administration of agricultural adjustment programs designed to protect both farm income and the consumer price structure has resulted in a time-tested partnership of producers and the government. The farmer committees have not always been asked to assume major responsibility for the administration of programs authorized by law, and to serve as active agents of the Department of Agriculture. But they have never failed to respond whenever such a request for help had been made and communicated to them.

The problem for the future of the committee system lies in a critical evaluation of its strengths and weaknesses judged against the whole record of performance, and in the ability of leaders of agriculture at the national, State, and local levels to be even more responsive to the changes in farm population and to adjust to changing needs and conditions.

Between 1933 and 1961, farm population has dropped from 32,393,000 to 14,803,000.^{9/} During the same period the proportion of the total population that resided on farms decreased from 25.8% to 8.1%. The number of farms decreased from 6,740,750 in 1933 to 3,811,000 in 1961;^{10/} the decrease since 1950 was over one-third. The average size of farm has increased from slightly under 160 acres in 1933 to 307 acres in 1961. Figures are not available on the change in the number of family farms over this period, but one authority indicates that proportion of family-operated farms has not declined significantly.^{11/}

The trend toward fewer and larger farms has important implications for the whole committee system, especially on the State and county levels. The number of counties

^{9/} Estimates prepared by the Farm Population Branch, Economic and Statistical Analysis Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The change in definition of the farm population made in the 1960 Census reduced earlier estimates of farm population. The new definition specified persons living in rural territory on places of 10 or more acres from which sales of farm products amounted to \$50 or more in 1959 and on places of less than 10 acres from which sales of farm products amounted to \$250 or more in 1959.

^{10/} According to the Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

^{11/} John M. Brewster, "The Changing Pattern of American Agriculture," paper prepared for meeting of National Agricultural Advisory Committee, Washington, D.C., July 10-11, 1962.

with less than 1,000 farms increased substantially, and it is likely that more than 50% of all counties will be so classified in the near future. ^{12/}

A thoughtful re-examination of the farmer committees' structure and role, based on the perception of these developments, needs to consider the question of proper decentralization and the problem of responsibility in government. It needs to delineate the strengths and weaknesses of administrative decentralization and centralization, respectively: How much is gained by emphasizing local self-determination? What are the advantages and disadvantages of "straight-line" organization with appointed county committees? Would national farm programs ever be acceptable to farmers if they did not have the reassurance provided by elected committees of their peers? Would effective administration of farm programs be possible with concentration of authority in the hands of the bureaucracy?

To what extent does the present system open the door to subversion or nullification of the programs authorized by law by putting field operations in the hands of persons who are neither readily accessible nor directly responsible to the Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture? What changes would make it possible to take both local and national considerations into account in administering farm programs without making them inoperative or ineffectual at county levels, and without weakening responsibility in government?

A thoughtful re-examination of the joint responsibility for, and local participation in, administration of farm programs needs to consider the role, the duties, the selection and the tenure of farmer committees. It should consider meaningful adjustments and improvements conducive to a more perfect joint national-State-local administration of farm programs in the 1960's.

^{12/} The 1959 Census of Agriculture lists:
1,678 counties with more than 1,000 farms, and
1,401 counties with less than 1,000 farms.

Number of Farms in 1959							
	0	1-99	100-199	200-399	400-599	600-799	800-999 and up
No. of Counties:	3	84	110	299	284	330	291
							1,678