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Preface

This report attempts to capture the beginnings of agricultural economics at Cornell University and to follow the progress of the development of this field of study from its earliest years into the final decades of the twentieth century. It is a history from the perspective of one faculty member who actively participated in agricultural economics in the second half of the century. Unfortunately, the writing has largely been done without the help, insight, and comments of individuals who lived and participated in the early years of the department. Happily, there is available a rich set of sources within the files of the department, in Mann Library, and in the archives of the university’s Kroch Library, which have been used in preparing this statement. There are still gaps at points in this record and, inevitably, some errors, no doubt, have been made in what is written.

The intent is to provide some sense of what has happened in agricultural economics at Cornell as the field developed and the highlights of the accomplishments of its faculty and staff. Insofar as possible, the author has tried to follow what he understands about the style of the man for whom the building, Warren Hall, is named. No one in the department at the end of the twentieth century had the pleasure of meeting or knowing George F. Warren. He was one of the founders of our field of study and a major figure at Cornell and nationally until his death in 1938. Professor Frank A. Pearson, his colleague and coauthor of many publications, wrote a summary biography about Warren, published in Farm Economics in February 1957, which he aptly titled “The Fact-Finder.” This summary has attempted to follow the intent suggested by that title. Inevitably, the author’s impressions and judgments have influenced what is written. The effort has been to learn as much as possible about the early years and then choose excerpts of writing or tables and charts to show what was said and done.

In reading about the early years of the university and the college, one cannot help but be impressed by the accomplishments of the pioneers, especially Roberts, Bailey, and Warren. One can only get a feel for their accomplishments by reading some of what they wrote and what has been written about them. Roberts’s An Autobiography of a Farm Boy is a fine way to learn more about the man and his times. His life story from a boyhood in Seneca County, his apprenticeship as a carpenter, and his early life in Indiana as a teacher and in Iowa as a farmer provide a sense of his education-by-doing. Asked to manage the college farm in Ames, Iowa and then to teach when there was
no one else better prepared at that college was his start for a career in college education.

Bailey’s amazing career from childhood to his final years is nicely captured in Philip Dorf’s *Liberty Hyde Bailey, An Informal Biography*. Dorf, clearly an enthusiast for Bailey, details in his book the range of activities in Bailey’s early years and how they influenced his drive and success that took him to Harvard, back to the Michigan Agricultural College, and then to Cornell.

Warren was a Nebraska farm boy, one of the youngest of a family that survived a tough life on the prairie in the years after the Civil War. After a degree in science and mathematics at Nebraska, he was a successful school-teacher and principal in southeast Nebraska before coming east to study with Bailey.

All three of these leaders were products of the years following the Civil War. This was the age of the railroads, industrialization, and the opening of the West. Any agricultural “surplus” from the farm, after feeding one’s family, often had difficulty in finding a market. This was the era of the Granger movement, the Greenbackers, and the Populists. Many farmers were struggling to keep their farms and feed their families. Political activism was a part of life in most rural communities.

All three men felt a real commitment to the people and communities from which they had their beginnings. Bailey was a champion of the country life movement to which he provided essential leadership for a few years after he resigned as dean. He and Roberts were innovators in the ways they took knowledge from the campus to the people. Clearly, all three sought a better life for the people who made their living on farms and the small rural communities of America. It is their spirit and energy, and that of their colleagues, that gave momentum to work at Cornell’s College of Agriculture and made it such a special place at the turn of the twentieth century.

One of the key sources of information for this report is Gould Colman’s *Education and Agriculture: A History of the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University*. Colman’s book reviews the early efforts to start a college where agriculture would be part of the curriculum. His chronicle of 600 pages provides factual detail of the college’s early years, its people, the ways in which the college was financed, and those who provided its leadership. It covers the years from the 1850s through the 1950s. It is a true college history and follows its growth and development decade by decade.

A second important resource is Henry C. and Anne Dewees Taylor’s *The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840–1932*. Henry C. Taylor was an important part of this history and one of the leaders in the development of agricultural economics. His writing and comments, along with those of Frank Pearson, provide important insight into George F. Warren, including his contributions and his impact on the profession. Warren and Taylor came to the profession with different perspectives. Taylor was trained in economics, Warren in agriculture. But they worked well together for the
profession over the years covered by this book. The Taylors quote liber-
ally from bulletins and articles. One can get an informed impression of the
issues, problems, and final actions taken from the well-documented chapters
describing work in agricultural economics in the early years.

One of the more interesting, though time-consuming, efforts associated
with this effort was compiling a list of all the graduate degrees in agricultural
economics completed by students at Cornell. An initial list was prepared at
the time of the dedication of Warren Hall in 1932 and was part of the archives
of that great occasion. Pulling together the list for subsequent years resulted
in *Advanced Degrees Conferred at Cornell University during the Twentieth
Century with Major Fields in Agricultural Economics*, a research bulletin in
the department’s series. One gets a sense of the problems that were deemed
important over the years, something of the changes in methodology used in
research, and the changing backgrounds of the students seeking advanced
degrees. Especially for the years before World War II, many of the theses were
revised and published as experiment station bulletins. These were important
sources of information in capturing a sense of how the faculty and staff were
responding to the issues of the day in these early years.

Many judgments must be made in preparing a manuscript like this: what
to include and what to leave out. Further, there is the question of commentary
about some of the major events themselves; changes in the nature and char-
acter of department programs; and impressions about the department and its
work by other groups on this campus and at other universities. Inevitably,
some of this kind of commentary will be evident or can be inferred in what
is written. Certainly, the short statements about individual faculty reflect
the author’s observations and opinions. So do the introductory statements
for each chapter and the overview statements. But an unbiased evaluation of
impressions, especially those of others, both here and abroad, is not possible.
This report then is meant to be as accurate a statement of what has occurred
in agricultural economics at Cornell over the decades of this century insofar
as the author could learn from the records available and his own experiences.
My apologies for the important omissions that occurred but were uninten-
tional.
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The early roots for what would become the discipline of agricultural economics at Cornell were planted by the university’s founder, Ezra Cornell, and its first continuing professor of agriculture, Isaac Phillips Roberts.* Both were sons of the soil who learned by doing. They understood the discipline of hard work. They were self-made men who succeeded by trial and error, combined with self-discipline and persistence. Both cared for the lot of farmers and rural people, and saw education as central to the transformation of rural America. They understood that farming was a business and wanted something better for future generations than what had been available in their own early years. Their pioneering efforts set the pattern for the new College of Agriculture as it developed and the academic disciplines that evolved in the early years of the twentieth century.

ISAAC P. ROBERTS

A brief review of Roberts’s background and preparation for his future position as professor of agriculture and national leader in his field provides insight into the complexities of the early years of developing an educational program of stature and lasting importance. Born in 1833, Roberts grew up on a small farm in the town of Varick, New York, not far from the west shore of Cayuga Lake. He was educated in the district schools of Varick and the Seneca Falls Academy. To earn money to go to high school at the academy, Roberts apprenticed as a carpenter during his summers, a trade that served him well throughout the rest of his life.

After graduating from Seneca Falls Academy, he spent most of his summers working as a carpenter and his winters as a teacher in a nearby district school. At the age of 21 he left home, following the carpenter who had taught him his trade, to LaPorte, Indiana, in the newly settled West where there was work aplenty but little of civilization. In the winters he again taught school and in the summers worked as a carpenter. He met his wife here, a daughter of a

*Lewis Spaulding was appointed assistant professor of agriculture and director of the college farm in 1869; his ill health led to the appointment of Allen Benham of Dryden, New York, as director of the farm in 1870; Henry McCandless was brought from Ireland as professor of agriculture in 1871, but he resigned shortly after his first year. Isaac Roberts, successful in operating the college farm and program at Iowa State University, was sought for advice. His suggestions were so well received that he was interviewed and hired in 1873 and led the Department of Agriculture for the next 30 years (Colman 1963, 51–55).
local farmer, and bought a farm of 48 acres, continuing his life as a part-time farmer, teacher, and carpenter.

Discouraged with his lack of progress, he sold the farm in 1862 and moved with his family to Mount Pleasant, Iowa, in a covered wagon. He impressed his new neighbors with his hard work and thrift on a farm he rented. The high prices received for crops during the Civil War years allowed him to buy some land. His skills in handling livestock led a neighbor, O. H. Buchanan, to ask him to manage a large flock of sheep on shares, from which both profited and which allowed Roberts to pay off his debts. In 1869, Buchanan, now a trustee of the Iowa Agricultural College, asked Roberts to become superintendent of the college farm and secretary of the Board of Trustees. Roberts accepted and moved with his family to Ames. When Dr. Townsend, the lecturer in agriculture, left for a position at Ohio State University, the college president asked Roberts to fill in “for a time” because of his experience as a schoolteacher.

As Roberts reports in his Autobiography of a Farm Boy, “I began to tell the students what I knew about farming. It didn’t take me long to run short of material and then I began to consult the library. I might as well have looked for cranberries in the Rocky Mountains as for material for teaching agriculture in that library. Thus, fortunately, I was driven to take the class to the field and farm, there to study plants, animals, and tillage at first hand. So again I was shunted onto the right track by sheer necessity . . . and so I fell into the habit of taking the students to view good and poor farms; to see fine herds and scrub herds in the country roundabout, even though they sometimes had to travel on freight cars. I suppose I was the first teacher of agriculture to make use, in a large way, of the fields and the stables of the countryside as laboratories” (Roberts 1916, 160–61).

In 1872, internal trouble among some of the faculty and the trustees led William Anthony, professor of physics, to look elsewhere for a position and
move to the new Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. Roberts, tired of the controversy, handed in his resignation, planning to return to his farm at Mount Pleasant. Professor Anthony wrote in 1873 asking Roberts if he would prepare a proposal for the organization of the Cornell farm, which he could submit to President White. The proposal was so well received that Vice President Russell came to Ames and offered Roberts the position of superintendent of the university farm and the title of assistant professor of agriculture (Roberts 1916, 103).

In February 1874, Roberts returned to the state of his birth to a fledgling institution and another mismanaged, disorganized university farm. With only three senior students in agriculture working an hour each day, he spent most of his effort and time turning around the farm and making it pay its way and serve as a field laboratory.

Two major events helped Roberts see a brighter future than the number of students or the state of the farm and its budget could suggest. First, both he and George C. Caldwell were promoted to professors of agriculture and agricultural chemistry, respectively. Second, President Welch of the Iowa Agricultural College came to Cornell, bringing with him the news that the college’s faculty and Board of Trustees had awarded Roberts the degree of master of agriculture on the basis of his years of practical study and experience there. Moreover, as Roberts wrote in his autobiography, “The President of Cornell University, Andrew D. White, took the greatest interest in my work from the beginning; and as I became better acquainted with Cornell and...
with his plans, I think I must have acquired the ‘Cornell spirit,’ for by the end of the first year, I was loath to give up my place” (Roberts 1916, 113).

Roberts’s early work at Cornell University suggests his own interest and influence on what would later be called “farm management.” He started by taking an inventory of the property belonging to the farm and filing it with the university treasurer, the first inventory ever taken by any department at the university. The next year, orders went out to every department to file such lists with values affixed. He also introduced a system of farm accounts so that the loss and gain of not only the whole undertaking, but also of each subdivision, might be ascertained—an idea brought from his experience in Iowa (Roberts 1916, 113). Roberts ran simple field experiments and learned from both his successes and failures. He turned to successful farmers in Seneca County to gain their insights into getting higher yields and controlling pests and diseases. He was a keen observer and recorded what he learned in college bulletins first paid for by Jennie McGraw Fiske.

In his Autobiography of a Farm Boy, Roberts made some early observations that he believed were crucial in the success of the college: “. . . in the seventies it was generally believed that an agricultural college could not be successfully grafted on to a university and the evidence seemed to prove it; but when I looked at all sides of the question, I was convinced that a college of agriculture could never take a dignified place in the world of higher education unless its entrance requirements and its courses of study were equal in length and in severity—though not necessarily the same in kind—to those prevailing in the Colleges of Science and the Arts. . . . All these things I began to realize.
dimly while I was trying to determine the direction which the agricultural
courses should take in order to lay a foundation for the College at Cornell
which should not be inferior in any respect—when suitably maintained—to
any other in the university” (Roberts 1916, 142).

Roberts published his first farmers’ bulletin summarizing the results of
his studies on the university farm in 1879. With the passage of the Hatch Act
in 1887, federal funding became available to establish an experiment station
in every state. The federally sponsored station for New York was located in
Ithaca, and Roberts was appointed its director as well as dean of the college.
Annual reports were required as part of the legislation and the first bulletins
of the college became part of this continuing record. This new source of fund-
ing made it possible for Cornell to appoint a new professor of horticulture,
and Liberty Hyde Bailey was persuaded to leave the Michigan Agricultural
College for Ithaca in 1888. A major building block in Cornell’s future devel-
opment was put in place by this action. The two worked well together, and
the small, distinguished faculty assembled by Roberts and President Adams
in the 1880s received national recognition (Colman 1963, 89–101).

Roberts set a high standard for students and faculty in his work ethic and
productivity. He was a voluminous writer on agricultural subjects. As associ-
ate editor of the *Country Gentleman*, Roberts provided 1,400 short articles,
often in answer to questions from readers. His books included *The Fertility of
the Land*, *The Farmstead*, *The Horse*, and *The Farmer’s Business Handbook*,
which were published by the Macmillan Company and included in the Rural
Science Series of which Bailey was editor. All of this writing came from a man

Nature Study School in front of Sage Hall [about 1889]. Professor Roberts is third from the left
in the front row holding his hat. Professors Comstock and Bailey are in the second row; Bailey
is holding his hat with a crease down the middle.
with no formal education beyond the Seneca Falls Academy, but with a driving will to learn by doing and to serve the welfare of farmers and rural people to the best of his ability.

The preface to *The Farmer’s Business Handbook* tells much about his views and his ability to communicate: “It is said that the farmer should be a scientific man. I like to think of him, also, as a business man. In fact, unless he is a good business man, he is not a good farmer. He must not only grow crops, but he must also buy and sell, and must be a man among men.”

Roberts served as professor of agriculture at Cornell for 30 years. He molded the college and helped to assemble its first faculty of leading agricultural scientists. With Bailey, he traveled the state answering farmers’ questions, presenting the results of work done at the college and looking for ways to improve rural life. His imprint on the college and its future was writ large. Bailey, then dean, wrote a short statement to introduce Roberts’s *Autobiography*: “For thirty years Professor Roberts and his associates stood for agriculture, always for agriculture—not for natural science under the name of agriculture, not for some pleasant combination of studies that would satisfy the law. In an eastern university, with the great tide of emigration sweeping past him to the West, with decreasing values, with old fields, with hindering traditions, he stood—stood like a prophet. It is to this courage, this steadfastness in the determination to hold the field for agriculture, that grows larger in my estimation as the years go by.”

**LIBERTY HYDE BAILEY**

Any effort to understand the beginnings of agricultural economics at Cornell University must look at the influence of Liberty Hyde Bailey during his early years as a professor and then as dean of the college following Roberts. His formative years, like those of Roberts, had much to do with shaping his philosophy, his work ethic, and his expectations for the development of agriculture and the sciences associated with it.

Born in 1858, Bailey was named after his father, a Vermonter who moved west to Michigan in 1841. When Liberty was five, he lost his mother to diphtheria and his second brother to scarlet fever. His father, a Puritan, left Liberty free to roam the woods and fields and develop his innate curiosity for nature and how it worked. In due course, his father remarried, to the displeasure of Liberty’s older brother, who left home at 16. As a consequence, Liberty grew up much like an only child.

Bailey’s father was taciturn, disciplined, and thrifty. As he grew older, Liberty worked side by side with his father in the fields and forest, and the son quickly absorbed what his father had learned from experience. Bailey’s father had set out an orchard when he came to Michigan, and these apple trees attracted Liberty’s great interest. His father taught him the art of grafting, and soon the two had topworked the orchard to the best varieties. By the
time Liberty was 14, his services were widely sought in neighboring orchards [Dorf 1956, 27].

The years following the Civil War were difficult for farmers. These were the days of the Populists, the Greenbackers, and the Granger movement. Because the Grange did not limit its aims simply to obtaining higher prices for crops, but also focused on better roads, local improvements, broader education, women’s suffrage, and the dignity of rural life, Bailey became a member and had a lifelong respect for the organization.

At 19, Bailey set off for Michigan Agricultural College, the first agricultural college in America, founded in 1855. Bailey’s mentor there was William Beal, professor of botany and horticulture, and a former doctoral student of Asa Gray and Louis Agassiz at Harvard. Bailey’s aptitude for science and the field study of plants was quickly recognized [Dorf 1956, 36–42].

Because of illness, Bailey was 24 when he graduated from the Michigan Agricultural College in 1882. He became a reporter for the Morning Monitor in Springfield, Illinois, covering the activities of the capitol and state legislature. Although offered the position of city editor, he quickly accepted the offer as assistant to Asa Gray at Harvard, with time for graduate study. In two years, his studies with Gray were completed and he returned as assistant professor of horticulture at the Michigan Agricultural College. Less than three years later, he was invited to give a series of lectures on horticulture at Cornell. Shortly afterwards, President Adams called on Bailey in East Lansing and persuaded him to come to Cornell with a promise of a study trip to Europe and new laboratory equipment. The future dynamic partnership of Roberts and Bailey was thus initiated by President Adams, probably the Cornell president.
most committed to making the College of Agriculture the strong and vital educational force that it became (Colman 1963, 89–112).

Bailey arrived at Cornell in 1889 to find instruction and research limited to a few classrooms in Morrill Hall and the buildings from Ezra Cornell’s old farm east of campus. The basic sciences relating to agriculture—chemistry, botany, and entomology—were led by established figures: Caldwell, Prentiss, and Comstock. Bailey, full of enthusiasm, went to work teaching, experimenting, and writing. And write he did—for magazines, newspapers, journals, and book publishers. Bailey understood the language of farmers and rural people. Dorf, in his biography of Bailey, writes, “His information was based on personal experience, careful experimentation, keen observation, and wide reading; his philosophy was derived from not only deep reflection, but from an instinctive and emotional reaction to the forces of nature; his style
was crisp, colorful, direct—as clear as an able lawyer’s brief and yet emotionally worthy of rank with the best of Burroughs, Muir, and Emerson. He kept his feet on the ground but, at times, he raised his eyes to the stars” (Dorf 1956, 75–76).

Bailey’s books came in a steady stream. By the end of his first year at Cornell came the Horticulturist’s Rule Book, followed shortly by three more. Macmillan became his publisher in 1895; in the next five years, he sent them 11 manuscripts. Quoting Dorf, “In Bailey, Macmillan had found a gold mine. His books sold. Most of them went through edition after edition” (Dorf 1956, 78).

It was Bailey who saw the need and conceived the idea of the Rural Science Series, a set of books for schools and rural people. By 1914, there were 32 titles in the series from 22 authors from across the country, all edited by Bailey. Bailey’s Principles of Agriculture was then in its twentieth edition. While Bailey’s international reputation as a great botanist and horticulturist is rightly acclaimed, the Rural Science Series also reflects his impressive contributions to the needs of rural people at the turn of the century. He saw their great need for better information in an understandable form and set about filling it.

When Roberts retired as dean in 1903, Bailey was quickly appointed to replace him. Bailey was concerned about the role of the university and its responsibilities in teaching practical agriculture. Having one professor of agriculture, along with the related sciences, was not enough. Applications of science in dairying, woodland management, field crops, and livestock breeding were needed. In a key speech, “Agricultural Education and Its Place in the University Curriculum,” he sounded an indirect but clear call for the state of New York to have a role in financing agricultural education: “The effort all along has been to force the farmer into the accepted university or academic methods. He has refused to accept them. . . . Now I hope the university will be taken to the farmer, will be adapted to his needs. . . . Agricultural education is therefore the coming education. . . . The State must foster it. Some institution must come to the fore free from bigotry and convention and inspired with patriotic hope. . . . Let that institution be Cornell” (Dorf 1956, 102–3).

In 1903, a Committee for the Promotion of Agriculture was formally organized by the officers of the leading farm organizations and agricultural periodicals in New York, with Bailey as one of its members and H. E. Cook, president of the New York State Dairymen’s Association, as chairman. They worked long and hard in Albany for state funds for the college. Despite strong opposition from the other colleges and universities in the state, and rallying behind the strong support from Senator Nixon in the legislature and President Schurman at Cornell, the governor signed legislation establishing the New York State College of Agriculture in April 1904. New funding, buildings, and faculty followed, a great tribute to the farmers and their organizations in the state, and to Roberts and Bailey as their leaders (Colman 1963, 157–70).
Governor Charles Evans Hughes came to Cornell in April 1907 to dedicate the new buildings for agriculture—later to be named Roberts, East Roberts, and Stone—on what was to become known as the “Ag Quadrangle.” Bailey gave the principal address of the day and his comments reflect his strong vision and commitment to farm and rural people: “This College of Agriculture was not established to magnify Cornell University. It belongs to the people of the State . . . the farmers of the State have secured it. . . . Their influence has placed it here” (Dorf 1956, 134). Out of this legacy grew a strong, widely recognized college and faculty with fine programs in teaching, research, and public service.

**ROBERTS, BAILEY, AND AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS**

In the nineteenth century, Roberts and Bailey were leaders among the deans of agricultural colleges across the country. They saw farming as a business and sought to identify profitable agricultural practices to make farm operations pay. In *The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States*, H. C. Taylor and A. D. Taylor observe, “In the closing decade of the nineteenth century solid foundations were being laid for the rapid development of agricultural economic thought in the early years of the twentieth century. The foundation builders included I. P. Roberts and L. H. Bailey at Cornell, R. T. Ely at Wisconsin, T. F. Hunt at Ohio, W. M. Hays at Minnesota and, somewhat earlier, J. M. Gregory at Illinois and J. R. Dodge of the U.S. Department
of Agriculture” (Taylor and Taylor 1952, 54). These leaders in agricultural colleges included lectures on the history and development of agriculture, rural economy, farm accounting, and farm management as part of their curriculum, along with those on topics of technical agriculture.

Both Roberts and Bailey regularly took their students to farms to observe practices that had been successful and those that had not. The relationships they established with farmers and the insights gained from their work with them provided an important part of their lectures.

One of the graduation requirements for all agricultural students was a course in political economy taught in the Department of Political Science. In 1897, George N. Lauman, on graduation from the College of Agriculture, was hired as an assistant in horticulture. He was made an instructor in 1901 and listed to teach four courses: History of Agriculture, Farm Buildings, Economics of Agriculture, and Readings in Technical Agriculture. In 1903–1904, Lauman received the title Instructor in Rural Economy and became secretary of the College of Agriculture. A formal commitment to instruction in what would become “agricultural economics” had begun.
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THE AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION of the 1890s led to substantial political activity by farmers and rural people. A combination of low farm prices and rising costs for anything they had to buy led farmers and their leaders to protest the monopoly power of trusts like Standard Oil and International Harvester. Calls for studies of costs of production and ways to improve production practices came to the colleges of agriculture. Some initial studies of costs of production for individual crops were completed in Texas (cotton) and Nebraska (wheat) in 1893 (Taylor and Taylor 1952, 391). Henry H. Wing, professor of dairy husbandry at Cornell, published Cost of Milk Production, Variation in Individual Cows in May 1893, which related milk production to feed costs for cows in the university herd. In subsequent years, Wing also published bulletins on the feed costs of producing eggs.

An Office of Farm Management was established within the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) with W. J. Spillman as its chief in 1902. A cooperative cost-of-production study between the Bureau of Statistics, the USDA, and the University of Minnesota was started in 1902, collecting account records from individual farmers. It was out of this kind of environment and the limited data available to answer compelling questions that the Committee for the Promotion of Agriculture was organized in New York State in 1903. This environment provided the popular support for state funding of new buildings and faculty positions for the College of Agriculture in the first decade of the century.
One of the first key appointments made by Bailey when he became dean in 1903 was to bring Thomas F. Hunt to Cornell from Ohio State, where he had been serving as dean of agriculture. Hunt was appointed professor of agronomy and manager of university farms and, in fact, served as second in command for the college with responsibility over expenditures for agronomy, animal husbandry, dairy industry, and the university farm (Colman 1963, 151, 171). In many respects, Hunt became a replacement for Roberts who had retired. His two courses—Field Crops and Farm Management—became required courses for all students. The course in farm management involved field trips to farms and served to integrate technical agriculture with the business side of farming. Hunt was a forceful personality and widely respected by students and faculty alike.

Thomas Forsythe Hunt, professor of agronomy; first teacher of farm management at Cornell, 1903–1907.
Hunt was one of the important leaders in agriculture in the United States in the first two decades of the century. Born in 1862 and a graduate of the University of Illinois, he remained there as an assistant for seven years. He started his career as professor of agriculture at the Pennsylvania State University in 1891, but was attracted to Ohio State in 1893 as professor of agriculture. It was there that he completed his widely used text, *The Cereals of America*, and taught courses in rural economics and the history of agriculture. From 1895 onward, Hunt was an active and influential member of the Committee on Methods of Teaching Agriculture of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations [Taylor and Taylor 1952, 60–71]. While dean at Ohio State he continued to teach and gave his first course of lectures in farm management.

Hunt’s years at Cornell were only four in number, but important. He brought with him not only his great skills as a teacher, but also developed Farm Management as a basic course for all students in the college. The Department of Agronomy, as organized in 1904, included teaching and research in soils, farm crops, plant breeding, farm management, and farm mechanics. Each of these areas of study became separate academic departments within the next 10 years [Taylor and Taylor 1952, 356].

One of Hunt’s innovations in his course on farm management at Cornell was to require that each student obtain and summarize information for a specific farm business, including its assets and liabilities, its sources of income and expenditures, as well as calculating its labor income. This report also required preparing a plan for managing the business, including an expected rotation of crops and their yields, changes in the inventory of livestock and machinery, and expected sources of income and expenses for the coming year. His definition of labor income has remained in use for almost a century.

While at Cornell, Hunt wrote *How to Choose a Farm*, published in 1906 as part of Bailey’s Rural Science Series. The first part of the book was devoted to soils, farm appraisal, climate, and farm economics. The second half provided an interesting review of opportunities in farming in the several regions of the United States, as well as Canada, Central America, and South America. It was also Hunt who initiated the farm survey work in Tompkins County that George Warren carried forward, modified, and perfected when Hunt left in 1907 to become dean of agriculture at Penn State.

Henry C. and Anne Dewees Taylor dedicated their book, *The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840–1932*, to “Thomas Forsythe Hunt who opened the door for agricultural economics in the land grant colleges.” Hunt taught at Illinois, Ohio State, Cornell, Penn State, and the University of California, Berkeley. He was dean at three of these colleges and a major figure in the American Farm Management Association and the American Farm Economics Association when each was organized. One of his first efforts when he became dean in California was to offer Warren, Wilson, and Whetzel from Cornell substantial increases in salary to move west. All were persuaded to stay in Ithaca during a period when leading figures in the
agricultural disciplines were in great demand. Hunt retired as dean at the University of California, Berkeley in 1923, a widely respected national leader in the development of higher education in agriculture.

RURAL ECONOMY AND GEORGE N. LAUMAN

Four-year students in agriculture at Cornell were required to complete a course in political economy in their second or third year from the 1890s onward. The application of these ideas to the problems of agriculture in one or more courses, however, began with the designation of George Lauman, assistant in horticulture, to teach the economics of agriculture in 1901–1902, with Bailey’s encouragement. Born in western Pennsylvania in 1874, Lauman completed his degree in agriculture in 1897, with a lifelong interest in political economy. During his initial years as Bailey’s assistant and then as an instructor, he gathered materials for The Cyclopedia of American Agriculture.
and The Cyclopedia of American Horticulture. He was known as a careful and tireless worker.

With Thomas Hunt’s arrival in 1904, courses on the history of agriculture, farm management, and rural economy became regular parts of students’ academic programs. Lauman worked closely with Hunt and was promoted to assistant professor of rural economy in 1905–1906. When Hunt left to become dean at Penn State, Lauman became the instructor for the courses, History of Agriculture and Rural Economy; he also added a new course, Rural Sociology, to his teaching responsibilities. As secretary to the faculty, he worked closely with Bailey on college administration associated with the course roster and teaching.

Dean Bailey’s commitment to a continuing program in rural economy is reflected in Lauman’s appointment as a full professor in 1909 and the designation of Rural Economy as a separate academic department, with Lauman as its sole member. This was not unusual. Bailey was able to create 23 different departments, often with one professor and one assistant, by the time he resigned as dean. This arrangement provided substantial freedom to senior faculty to pursue their own research and teaching interests, but created a few administrative problems for succeeding college leaders.

Lauman established strong personal relationships with a number of faculty teaching history and political economy, and was accorded membership in the faculty of their departments in the College of Arts and Sciences in 1912. He was recommended by these colleagues as a member of the graduate faculty and served as a member of a number of graduate student committees in that college. He was an active member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, regularly attending its meetings, and was made
one of its Fellows. He was a lifelong member of the American Economic Association.

FARM MANAGEMENT AND GEORGE F. WARREN

George F. Warren came east from Nebraska in 1902 to do graduate work in horticulture with Bailey after teaching mathematics and serving as a school administrator for five years after completing his undergraduate degree (Pearson and Myers 1957, 5475–78). Warren first completed a B.S.A. in agriculture at Cornell and then set about working on his M.S. under Bailey’s direction. Roberts, in his last year as director of the experiment station, had set aside funds for an orchard study in Wayne County: “[1] to correlate geologic and soil characters with orchard conditions; [2] to compare successes and failures, and ascertain underlying causes; [3] to investigate methods of orchard management and determine the influence of each; and [4] finally, and in short, to collect and tabulate such a mass of data upon practical apple-growing, as will place many moot questions beyond the range of peradventure and furnish indisputable evidence for the assistance of those who are horticultural leaders and teachers” (Warren 1905, 231).

This project provided funding for Warren for both his M.S. and Ph.D. Warren concluded the experiment station bulletin summarizing his work: “Tillage, fertilization, pruning, and spraying are the chief factors that enter into the good care of an orchard. . . . Last of all, let me urge the advisability of keeping an account with the orchard and with the other important crops. See

George F. Warren, early years on the faculty.
which crops really pay. If the apple orchard proves to be the most profitable crop, then give it first attention” (Warren 1905, 360–61).

After completing his doctorate, Warren was appointed assistant horticulturist at the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station. When Thomas F. Hunt left Cornell in 1907 to become dean at Penn State, Bailey quickly appointed Warren assistant professor of agronomy and head of the new Department of Farm Crops. On his return to Ithaca, Warren picked up much of the teaching and research started by Hunt, including the survey work on farms in Tompkins County. Warren’s enthusiasm and teaching skills immediately attracted students. By 1908, 10 of the 43 graduate students in the college were working with him, a number on the Tompkins County survey (Colman 1963, 224). One of these students, M. C. Burritt, was set to work summarizing the records obtained by Hunt’s former students for his course in farm management from farms spread across 41 counties in the state.

### Table VI.—Comparing Various Factors on the Most Successful and the Least Successful of 86 Farms—1907.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average 86</th>
<th>Least Successful 45</th>
<th>Most Successful 41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average area</strong>:</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tillable area</strong>:</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total capital</strong>:</td>
<td>$10,386</td>
<td>$9,471</td>
<td>$11,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment per acre</strong>:</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong>:</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>3,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong>:</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net income per farm</strong>:</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net income per acre</strong>:</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>16.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net income per tillable acre</strong>:</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>19.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer’s labor income</strong>:</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent. on investment</strong>:</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISTRIBUTION OF CAPITAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average 86</th>
<th>Least Successful 45</th>
<th>Most Successful 41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real estate</strong>:</td>
<td>$7,997</td>
<td>$7,308</td>
<td>$8,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Machinery and tools</strong>:</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horses</strong>:</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other live stock</strong>:</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seed and feed</strong>:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong>:</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISTRIBUTION OF EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average 86</th>
<th>Least Successful 45</th>
<th>Most Successful 41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seed and feed</strong>:</td>
<td>$357</td>
<td>$359</td>
<td>$378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fertilizers</strong>:</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Machinery and repairs</strong>:</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and fences</strong>:</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Live stock</strong>:</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total labor except owner’s</strong>:</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor paid for in cash</strong>:</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer’s estimate of value of his own labor</strong>:</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

first farm management bulletin at Cornell, *The Incomes of 178 New York Farms*, was issued in 1909 with Burritt as author. The effects of capital, labor, type of enterprise, and size of business on labor income were examined. Warren, in an introduction, counseled readers, “In considering the averages, we must not lose sight of the fact that a considerable number of the men lost money or made a very small profit” (Burritt 1909, 16).

The Tompkins County Agricultural Survey, initiated by Hunt in 1906 and then revised and completed by Warren in 1908, obtained a full record of economic activity on 769 farms in four townships between April 1, 1907, and April 1, 1908. The summary report of this study, Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 295, published in March 1911, made a major contribution to farm management research and survey methodology and did much to establish Warren as a national leader in his field. Warren’s bulletin of nearly 200 pages was replete with pictures, tables, and charts. Essentially a small book “ sent free of charge to persons residing in New York State who request . . . ,” it was wide ranging in the topics considered in a direct, readable style. It centered on why some farms made more money than others and discussed labor income in relation to such factors as size of business and the use of labor, capital, and cropland. But there was much more. There were sections on successful practices followed in producing each of the major crops and livestock enterprises. Also included were discussions on systems of farming, forms of tenure, women as farmers, abandoned farms, and the education of farmers. The pages were filled with practical advice as well as economic analysis.

The final six pages of the bulletin provided “Summary of Recommendations.” A few quotes give one a sense of Warren’s skills as a writer and analyst: “A farm home or country estate may be a success when it gives pleasure to the owner. But a farm cannot be said to be a business success unless it pays all farm expenses, pays interest on the capital invested, and pays well for the farm work done by the farmer and his family. . . . Cows are the most profitable kind of livestock in the county, but the average cow does not pay. . . . Practically all the profitable farms raise crops for sale. . . . It pays to raise corn
silage for cows, oats for horses, and wheat for chickens. But hay, potatoes, cabbages, and apples usually pay so much better than raising grain for cow feed that it is better to sell them and buy mill products for cows. . . . If a farm boy has no capital but wishes to be a farmer, the first thing to do is to get an education. . . . The same amount of money invested in the better soil types pays better than if invested in poor soil” (Warren and Livermore 1911, 563–68).

The lead paragraph in Warren and Livermore’s bulletin begins: “Every farm is an experiment station and every farmer the director thereof. If we can collect and properly correlate the results of all the more or less accurate experiences and experiments, we shall have a body of most valuable agricultural knowledge.” The first sentence is a paraphrasing of Bailey’s often expressed ideas. Survey work at Cornell reflected the philosophy of this paragraph in succeeding studies completed by Warren and his colleagues. Farmers and agricultural businesses shared their experiences because individual records were treated as confidential, and because the results of the studies were shared promptly in a readable and understandable form.

Farm management surveys succeeded because Hunt and Warren were prepared to learn by doing, and because of what they had learned earlier in studying farm businesses and working with farmers. In their first efforts, both Warren and Hunt tried to collect too much information. One of the lasting benefits of the Tompkins County study was the development of the Labor Income Survey Form, which became widely used throughout the United States as a unit of the basic methodology for collecting farm management data. Taylor and Taylor, in their history of agricultural economics,
devoted a chapter to “Agricultural Surveys” (Taylor and Taylor 1952, 326–87). They commented, “Cornell University took the lead in the United States in developing a new form of the survey method of gathering data relating to agriculture. Liberty Hyde Bailey drew T. F. Hunt and George F. Warren into the survey work. . . . Warren manifested real genius in testing out and developing the farm management survey in the statistical form which soon came to be generally accepted in the United States as a pattern for agricultural fact gathering in the study of farm management.”

There was so much interest in the survey work at Cornell that Warren prepared a separate bulletin summarizing what he and his colleagues had learned over time. Agricultural Surveys outlines in 24 pages the steps followed in this research process. The paragraph headings provide perspective on the contents and their practical nature: “First find out the facts,” “Some facts can be determined only by studying farms,” “Survey methods often the cheapest,” “Order for making surveys,” “Definite object necessary,” “Too much should not be attempted,” “Every record should be completely filled,” and “Sort by cause, not by effect.”

In the academic year 1909–1910, Warren was promoted to professor of farm management and farm crops. The title of the department became Farm Crops and Farm Management. A new instructor, K. C. Livermore, one of the leaders for the Tompkins County survey, was listed on the faculty of the department. In 1911–1912, Warren’s title was changed to simply professor of farm management. A new separate Department of Farm Management was created with Warren, Livermore, and Arthur L. Thompson as its three faculty members. Thus, in a span of less than 10 years, two new academic departments—Rural Economy and Farm Management—had been recognized as the college grew and expanded.

The first decade of the twentieth century was a time of momentous change for the college. In the academic year 1899–1900, 12 students were granted the degree of bachelor of science in agriculture and three obtained master’s of science in agriculture. Agriculture’s four-year program had 43 full-time students; 45 special students were enrolled in courses in technical agriculture; and 83 students took part in a special winter short-course program. The college had some space in Morrill Hall, the Roberts Barn, and a dairy building, which eventually became a wing of Goldwyn Smith Hall.

In substantial contrast, by 1910–1911, enrollment had grown rapidly to 589 students in the four-year program, 172 special students, and 477 students attending the winter courses. Eighty students were registered for graduate degrees. Classes were being held in the three new buildings—that were dedicated in 1907. Additional new buildings, subsequently named for Comstock, Caldwell, Wing, Rice, and Fernow, were under construction or funded as a result of a carefully organized campaign in 1909–1910 to expand work in entomology, soils, agronomy, poultry, animal husbandry, and home economics. A new auditorium in which
to hold classes and public meetings on campus, including Farmers’ Week, which had been started in 1908, was being planned. It was completed in 1913 and in 1914 was named for Bailey, who had successfully led the way for the college’s expansion in his 10 years as dean. Building on Roberts’s legacy of goodwill and service, the farmers and farm organizations of the state, with Bailey as their leader, had provided a solid foundation for the agricultural education, science, and service which the New York State College of Agriculture was to provide throughout the twentieth century.
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The first decade of the twentieth century was a time of rapid growth for the New York State College of Agriculture and one of relative prosperity for farmers. As the new decade started in 1910, supplies of agricultural products were more nearly in balance with demand and the national economy was growing steadily. Expectations were high on the Cornell campus as faculty and students looked forward to expanding programs in each of the academic departments that Liberty Hyde Bailey had created and encouraged.

With Farm Crops, Soils, and Plant Breeding now established as separate departments, Warren, Livermore, and Thompson concentrated their efforts on farm management research and teaching. Arthur Thompson was appointed an instructor in 1911 after completing his master’s thesis, “Cost Accounts on Five New York Farms.” In the Department of Rural Economy, Lauman concentrated on teaching his courses, Rural Economics, History of Agriculture, and Rural Sociology. In the Department of Farm Management, the courses were Farm Management, Regions and Systems of Farming, Advanced Farm Management, Cost Accounting, and a seminar. Farm Accounting and Farm Management were taught in the winter program.

Cost Accounting and Cost of Production Studies

The first cost accounting research project in the United States had been established in Minnesota in 1902 in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). G. F. Warren followed its progress with great interest and established a similar project in New York. Cost accounts required a double-entry system with detailed labor records to account for the use of employee time and horse use by enterprise and field, as well as cash outlays and income. Supervision and assistance with cooperating farmers were important components of these projects. One of the activities of new graduate students in farm management was to visit cooperating farms, check records, and answer questions. Closing cost account records at the end of the year and verifying charges for labor use and costs by enterprise were fundamental to obtaining both accurate and useful information in these projects.
Concerns of farmers about costs of production, both in New York and nationally at the turn of the century, and the efforts of faculty across the country to obtain solid information about costs for key commodities are reflected in the thesis projects completed by graduate students at Cornell and elsewhere (Taylor and Taylor 1952, 388–446). Seven of the first master’s and Ph.D. theses completed in farm management between 1911 and 1915 dealt with labor use by enterprise and costs of production. Carl Ladd, later to become dean of the college, completed his doctoral dissertation in 1915 entitled “Cost Accounts on Some New York Farms for 1912 and 1913.” His work with 18 farmers established the standard methodology followed in this cooperative research program at Cornell, which continued until 1983, interrupted only for a few years during each World War. In 1914, Ladd also prepared USDA Farmers’ Bulletin 572, A System of Farm Accounting, describing the cost accounting system and the details of its methodology.

For its cost accounting project, the college provided cooperating farmers basic instruction in keeping the records and the necessary account books. A representative regularly visited farms during the year to answer questions, inspect the accounts, aid in taking inventories, and help in closing accounts at the end of the year. All overhead costs, such as depreciation, interest, and taxes, were allocated to each of the enterprises, along with the labor used, machinery costs, and direct costs, such as purchased feed, seed, and fertilizer. The records for each farm were then summarized in the department annually, enterprise records completed, factors worked, and the results returned to each
cooperator with comments and suggestions. Individual records were treated as confidential.

Farmer interest in this program was strong from the beginning. The information gained was considered valuable enough that farmers applied to participate. This project became the primary source of data on enterprise costs for individual crops and such basic information as the costs of operating tractors and machinery, and knowledge of the tremendous variability in these costs from farm to farm. While the cooperating farmers, who kept these detailed records, could hardly be thought of as “typical” or randomly selected, their collective experiences provided credible information about costs of production in a manner heretofore unavailable, especially the variability around the basic averages obtained.

In 1915, A. L. Thompson published the results of his doctoral study, “Costs of Producing Milk on 174 Farms in Delaware County, New York,” as Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 364. This was the first cost of production study completed in the new department in which the basic data were obtained using the survey method on farms for which milk was the primary product sold. The study covered two production years, from the summer of 1911 through the summer of 1913. The results indicated that costs exceeded returns on most farms; that is, family labor and capital did not receive market rates of return. Thompson summarized, “In
order to show a profit, either feed or labor must be charged below its value, or manure must be credited at too high a rate." The key recommendations to dairymen were to cull out the poor producers, make better use of improved pastures, and improve dairy breeding programs. Only the higher-producing cows were making a profit.

The fundamental objective of these early studies of cost of production was to increase basic knowledge about the structure of costs on farms and their allocation to individual enterprises. Providing farmers and farm leaders with more information about costs and the reasons for their great variability, and what might be done to improve enterprise profitability, was central to this work. These early publications on costs of production by enterprise and the results of the Tompkins County Farm Management Survey brought substantial attention to the new Department of Farm Management’s staff and students and, in turn, strong public support for continuing and increasing this kind of field-based research.

In 1914, Warren responded to a somewhat different set of public issues with his bulletin, *Crop Yields and Prices, and Our Future Food Supply*. In his introductory paragraph, he explained, “The questions, whether our soil is exhausted and how we are to be fed in the future, are constantly being discussed in newspapers and magazines. The wildest sorts of statements are being made. Statistics are so persistently misquoted and misused that wrong impressions or absolute untruths are often accepted. . . . In the midst of all
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**Fig. 21.**—Comparative crop yields in States east of the Mississippi River. Yields of 1866 considered as 100 per cent.

the excited discussion, it is well to stop long enough to examine available facts and find out where we stand.”

In the next sections of the bulletin, Warren assembled the available data on crop yields and wholesale prices from across the United States for the years 1866 through 1912 from wherever they were recorded and published. He then discussed the reasons why farm prices had been so low in the years following the Civil War, particularly in the 1890s, and the reasons why prices had risen during the previous 10 years. In a similar manner, he examined trends and variability in crop yields and the slow, but uneven, progress over time in production. The emphasis was to provide well-documented economic information in a central place that the informed public could then use to draw its own conclusions. Warren’s undergraduate training in mathematics and his basic interest in statistics served him well as a “fact-finder” and economic reporter.

One other cost study completed at the end of the decade is of particular interest. In 1918, New York had 2,982 farm tractors, about one tractor for every 62 farms. A new faculty member, W. I. Myers, was assigned to study the potential role of tractors on New York farms in relation to horses, the primary source of farm power. Myers’s bulletin, An Economic Study of Farm Tractors in New York, collected detailed cost data in southern Cayuga County and the fruit areas of Monroe and Orleans Counties. Some of his conclusions were responses to questions farmers were asking: “At heavy work, such as plowing and disking, a tractor accomplished as much work on the average in a day as seven to nine horses. At harrowing, a tractor accomplished as much as six horses; at binding corn or grain, as much as four to five horses; at mowing as much as three horses.” The bulletin included costs of operating different sizes of tractors as well as the impact of rates of use on costs per hour or per day.

THE AMERICAN FARM MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

The American Farm Management Association (AFMA) was organized on July 27, 1910, at Iowa State College by a group of professors at colleges of agriculture across the country who were engaged in teaching and doing research in farm management. The AFMA grew out of a meeting of the Graduate School of Agriculture, a four-week summer course conducted by the American Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations. The 1908 session of the Graduate School had been held at Cornell and economic issues were recognized on the program, with sessions led by George Lauman, Henry C. Taylor, and George F. Warren. In 1910, a four-week course on the economic and social aspects of agriculture was offered at the Graduate School for the first time by professors from four different colleges, each making presentations for one of the weeks (Taylor and Taylor 1952, 83–84).

During the closing days of the Graduate School, those present and participating in this course on the economic and social aspects of agriculture concluded that they should organize into a professional association, which
they named the American Farm Management Association. They clearly wished to establish the field of farm management as separate from agronomy, animal husbandry, and the other agricultural sciences. Naturally there was substantial discussion of what was included in the field and what was not, and how rural economy and economics were related to or incorporated into farm management. The new association established as its objective “to promote the investigation and teaching of farm management.” A Committee on Scope and Cleavage was established consisting of W. J. Spillman (Office of Farm Management, USDA), D. H. Otis (Wisconsin), and Harry Hayward (Delaware). Their final report created substantial discussion and some disagreement among members of the new association, but was published to read:

The field of Farm Management is:
1. The organization of the farm, in which we deal with such questions as types of farming, equipment, labor, etc.
2. Farm operation, in which we deal with the various types of farming as they are conducted in the various regions where they occur.

Farm management deals with the rural problem from the individual or private point of view. It differs from agricultural economics or rural economy or rural sociology in that these subjects view the rural problem from the national or public point of view. (American Farm Management Association)

The first officers elected were: President, W. J. Spillman, Office of Farm Management, USDA; Vice President, D. H. Otis, Wisconsin; and Secretary-Treasurer, G. F. Warren, Cornell.

The second annual meeting of the new AFMA was held in Columbus, Ohio, in November 1911. Farm management was being taught as a basic course in 30 of the 33 colleges represented. Most of the teachers were members of a department of agronomy or its equivalent. As of January 1912, there were 72 members of AFMA from 38 states and the USDA. A journal of proceedings for the new organization was published and distributed to all its members.

Bailey. In the preface, he provided a definition, which over the years was widely quoted and accepted: “Farm Management is the study of the business principles in farming. It may be defined as the science of the organization and management of a farm enterprise for the purpose of securing the greatest continuous profit. Successful farming requires good judgment in choosing a farm and in deciding on a type of farming. It demands clear business organization and management for the efficient use of capital, labor, horses, and machinery. It requires good judgment in buying and selling” (Warren 1913, Preface).

H. C. Taylor commented, “In this definition, Warren clearly took the economic point of view in harmony with the Hunt report to the American Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations in 1911” (Taylor and Taylor 1952, 96). Warren brought together in a book of 590 pages much of what he had learned from the Tompkins County survey and the work of his students, the results of the census of agriculture in 1910, and the published reports of his colleagues in farm management across the country. His book was widely adopted and used. By 1918, it was in its ninth printing and the standard reference in the field. The language was straightforward, and the liberal use of pictures and charts to illustrate key points made it an easily accessible book. It strongly influenced his colleagues and the field of farm management as it developed.

Warren was elected president of the AFMA in 1913. A proceedings issue of 130 pages for the annual meeting was distributed, including Warren’s Presidential Address. Much of his address dealt with the survey method and
what he had learned: “Perhaps the first object of a survey is to find out normal conditions. After this information is obtained, it is possible to study the more successful and less successful with intelligence. The strikingly unusual has too often been accepted as a model. . . . Some facts can only be determined by studying farms. There are many kinds of agricultural information that can only be obtained by survey methods, because the facts exist on the farms and nowhere else. The cost of producing a crop may be determined for a college farm, but this tells very little about the cost on regular farms.”

Interest in farm management grew rapidly across the country at all of the colleges of agriculture. In June 1918, the membership in AFMA had grown to 348, with all 48 states represented and some members from foreign countries. Increasingly, the farm-oriented leadership of AFMA recognized the interrelationships of their interests and that of faculty in colleges of agriculture with a background in political economy, who met annually as part of the American Economic Association (AEA). Some members of AFMA were members of both groups. In December 1917, the AFMA adopted an historic resolution: “In view of the fact that the American Farm Management Association, since its organization, has dealt with problems in the field of economics as related to agricultural production, the committee [on resolutions] recommends that the word ‘management’ be changed to the word ‘economics’ so as to read, American Farm Economics Association [AFEA].”

After considerable discussion and concern by those wanting to keep the current name and narrower interest, H. C. Taylor wrote a motion that was passed. It provided that a committee consisting of three members of AFMA meet with a similar number from the group meeting regularly with AEA and report at the next annual meeting. In January 1919, the members of AFMA adopted the resolution that had been presented by Peck, Warren, and Cox a year earlier. Thus, within a decade, the new association, AFEA, came into being and the blending of rural economy and farm management into a more comprehensive discipline was accomplished.

In many respects, the active leaders in bringing together the professors of farm management and those trained primarily in political economy were H. C. Taylor at Wisconsin and George Warren at Cornell. They were the authors of the most widely used textbooks across the country: Farm Management (Warren) and Agricultural Economics (Taylor), both published by Macmillan. They often disagreed on specific points, but respected each other’s opinions and worked effectively together to build and strengthen the newly created AFEA.

The Journal of Farm Economics was launched in June 1919 with an issue of 40 pages, publishing a number of the papers and reports presented at the meeting where the new name and association were approved. Warren’s paper, “Some After-The-War Problems in Agriculture,” spoke to a range of public and private concerns:
The fundamental problem in agriculture is to make and keep conditions of farm life such that a fair proportion of the intelligent and able citizens of the nation will continue to live on farms.

The strongest safeguard that the nation can have is an independent, forward-looking, and self-respecting farm population.

In the past generation, the conditions of living in cities have been greatly improved. It is evident, therefore, that unless corresponding improvements are made in farm conditions, the intelligent portion of the farm population will be more strongly drawn to the cities than ever before. Let us see what these improvements are. Some of the more important changes may be classed under the headings of education, health, recreation.

Free education in every subject from the primary grades through the university is the only sound basis for democratic citizenship.

Public agencies such as the agricultural colleges and Department of Agriculture should study the problems of farm economics as they have in the past studied the problems of production. Such studies will require good judgment and tact, but the tact should not go to the extent of failing to tell the truth.

The preceding sentences and quotations from Warren’s presentation speak to his sense of the substantial problems that were to come in converting from a wartime economy to a return to peace and the rebuilding of Europe. He saw the great need to improve the quality of life on farms and in rural America if able young people were to continue to live and work in rural areas. His strong call for improvements in education, health care, and recreation reflected his own commitment to the aims of the “country life” movement of which Bailey was such a champion during the years before the war and those following. This speech and journal article, and most of those which followed in the next two decades, marked a clear shift away from his central interest and research on farm management problems to those of agricultural policy, prices, and index numbers of the economy.

**COOPERATIVE EXTENSION AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

From the early years of the college, Roberts and Bailey worked effectively using demonstrations and meetings across the state to bring the results of their research and studies to farmers and their families. Their writings and
speeches were much appreciated. Their commitment to improving the welfare of farmers and rural communities was readily understood by new faculty when they joined the college. This commitment and the demonstration work on key farms had much to do with subsequent funding by the state for the work of the college.

“Extension” work had begun in 1894 with passage of the Nixon Act, providing for experimental work on fruit farms in Chautauqua County directed by Bailey. A school of horticulture was held in Fredonia in December 1894 and another in 1895 in Jamestown. In 1896, a state appropriation for extension work in horticulture in 22 counties was provided. A new program with nature study leaflets organized by Bailey and Anna Comstock followed. John Spencer organized Junior Naturalist Clubs and, by June 1899, almost 25,000 teachers were receiving nature study leaflets written by Comstock and the faculty. Funding for these leaflets and for experiment station bulletins that reported the results of research came from the state and a variety of private sources. All were directed to outreach, extending the work of the faculty and staff of the college.

In 1907, a Department of Extension was established by Dean Bailey with Charles H. Tuck as its director. Its functions were to coordinate the extension activities of the other departments and publicize the work of the college. In November 1908, the college ran its first “Farm Special” over the Erie Railroad. This initiative came from the railroad, which was anxious to
improve agriculture along its lines. Such educational trains were already popular in the Midwest. The following spring, a similar train was sponsored by the New York Central. During the academic year 1909–1910, Cornell ran five such educational trains over four rail lines reaching an estimated 30,000 people. The extension department organized exhibits at county fairs as well as the State Fair at Syracuse, a major undertaking. News releases to the agricultural community were coordinated using extension’s resources (Colman 1963, 206–10).

The first Farmers’ Week at the college was held in 1908. It was a success with an estimated 800 in attendance, and the following year, annual meetings of farm organizations and conferences were coordinated with these programs and meetings at the college during the last week in February. During 1909–1910, about 300,000 requests for information were received, of which about 40,000 were answered by faculty writing personal letters in response (Colman 1963, 211).

The first “farm bureau” agent in New York State in 1911 was John Barron, an alumnus of the college. He was sponsored by the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce and the DL&W Railroad, in cooperation with USDA’s Office of Farm Management. In February 1912, a state law was drafted permitting county boards of supervisors to support farm bureaus with county funds. By May that year, special county agents were appointed in Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Cortland, Genesee, Jefferson, Orange, and Oswego Counties (Colman 1963, 240–42).

Federal funding for what is now called Cooperative Extension came with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914. Funds were appropriated for each state, including an annual basic grant with additional funds based on rural population, to be matched by the state. In New York, a memorandum of understanding was signed with the USDA by the college to administer the program in cooperation with the counties and the state. A separate college administrator, the director of cooperative extension, was required by law to operate the program. Extension positions in academic departments were created to work with county “demonstration agents” to carry out these educational programs with farm families (Colman 1963, 264–68). In 1915, Gad P. Scoville was appointed in the Department of Farm Management to work full-time in extension with these funds. His first assignment was to work
with farm records programs organized by the new farm bureau agents in 16 counties.

**Faculty and Students in Farm Management and Rural Economy**

When Farm Management became a separate department in 1911–1912, it consisted of one professor and two instructors. Teaching was done in Morse Hall; there were 14 graduate students and an associated research program including farm surveys, cost accounts, and farm record summaries. Rural economy centered around the teaching of Professor Lauman, with eight courses listed for him in the *University Announcement*.

In 1913, Carl Ladd was appointed an instructor in farm management while working on his doctorate, bringing the faculty roster to four. George Lauman spent half of the year on a sabbatic leave in Europe studying land tenure and cooperatives in Germany. None of his courses were offered in his absence. By 1914, K. C. Livermore had been promoted to professor and A. L. Thompson was an assistant professor. D. S. Fox joined Carl Ladd as an instructor. This group of five taught 2,408 hours of instruction to four-year students, as well as 303 hours to winter students. Farm Management’s faculty roster grew to six in 1915 with the appointment of Scoville as an assistant professor to take leadership for extension programs concerning farm records and their summaries across the state. Cost accounts were now being kept on 74 farms. In Rural Economy, Harold D. Phillips was hired as an instructor to teach a new course in marketing and prices.

The extension and research programs in Farm Management continued to grow rapidly and the faculty was again increased to seven in 1916 by a new instructor, E. G. Misner, who was working on his doctoral thesis on dairying in Broome County. Undergraduate teaching needs had stabilized; the extension farm records effort reported 2,554 records reviewed and 1,424 returned with summaries and comments. By 1918, the Farm Management faculty had grown to 11, with Warren and Livermore as professors, Thompson and Scoville as assistant professors, and E. G. Misner, W. I. Myers, L. E. Harvey, C. V. Noble, C. P. Clark, R. L. Gillett, and L. J. Norton as instructors. D. S. Fox had left for a position at Penn State. Carl Ladd was now the director at the New York State School of Agriculture at Delhi.

The faculty and staff were in great demand in the war years as New York State and the federal government sought assistance in carrying out a special farm census in 1917–1918, in staffing the New York State Food Commission, and in providing data on the costs of producing key commodities such as milk and wheat. Teaching in Rural Economy was carried out by Lauman and Phillips. A new study on cooperatives was completed by Phillips.

At the end of the decade in 1919, the faculty in Farm Management was reduced to 10 members as Arthur Thompson resigned his appointment and
moved to Maryland, where he developed a successful business, Thompson’s Dairies. E. G. Misner was made an assistant professor, and Ernest C. Young became an instructor replacing L. E. Harvey. James E. Boyle was brought from North Dakota as a new faculty member in Rural Economy, increasing their ranks to three.

On September 20, 1919, on recommendation of the dean of the college, the former Departments of Farm Management and Rural Economy were combined into the new Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management by action of the University Board of Trustees. Professor Lauman was not pleased with the integration of the two departments, but he accepted the reality that most of the teaching, extension, and research in agricultural economics was being done by the faculty in the former Department of Farm Management.

It was in this decade that the weekly department seminar program had its beginnings. Initially, Warren ran a course named “Seminar,” in which graduate students and seniors gathered every week to discuss current research projects and problems of interest. Visitors to the department were expected to make presentations. As graduate student numbers increased, all were expected to attend and make a presentation or progress report on their work toward a thesis. Attendance was mandatory and students signed in each week. All the faculty were also expected to make contributions. Without a central building where students and faculty worked together, the department seminar was an important mechanism that fostered communication and built loyalty to the department.

**OVERVIEW OF THE DECADE**

When Bailey resigned as dean in 1913, the College of Agriculture had enjoyed 10 years of rapid and often unbridled growth under this charismatic leader, who had encouraged entrepreneurship by individual faculty, often creating new departments to allow them additional freedom in developing programs. The new dean, Beverly T. Galloway, moving from his post as assistant secretary of agriculture in Washington, D.C., sought to reduce the number of departments and curb some of this entrepreneurship. The faculty and staff resisted his initiatives. By 1916, Galloway resigned and Albert R. Mann—professor, secretary of the college, and Bailey’s close associate—was chosen as dean (Colman 1963, 223–24). Mann’s personal style and honesty in all his dealings with the faculty allowed him to accomplish many of the necessary changes that Galloway had sought to put in place. The new Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management, with Warren as head, was one of Mann’s many successful initiatives in bringing units together during his 14 years as dean.

In 1919, the newly created department had 31 graduate students. A majority of the theses completed during the decade, 1910–1919, were con-
cerned with costs of production for important commodities such as milk, potatoes, and wheat, or the structure of agriculture in different New York counties or regions of the country. A combination of census data and farm management surveys was used in completing many of these studies. But a new set of initiatives and topics for research was in process at the end of the war: Clarence V. Noble completed a doctoral thesis, “The Cost of Living in a Small Factory Town;” Guy Peterson wrote his master’s thesis, “Land Tenure and Farm Leases in the United States;” and Paul Horn’s master’s thesis, “Some of the Factors Influencing the Price Spreads between Retail Cuts of Meat,” pursued a new area of study. These theses are suggestive of the public issues being raised at that time and Warren’s encouragement to both students and faculty to pursue them.

**Warren Recognized as a National Leader**

George F. Warren rose to prominence as a national leader in farm management and a champion of farmers and their organizations between 1910 and the end of World War I. A number of notable achievements contributed to
this recognition. Warren's first book was *Elements of Agriculture*, published by Macmillan in 1909. It was designed to fill a need across the country for teaching agriculture in secondary schools. He prepared a teacher's manual to go with it as well. The book was reprinted many times and sold over 400,000 copies (Pearson and Myers 1957, 5480–81). In New York State, his bulletin summarizing the Tompkins County survey was free and widely distributed and discussed; nationally, his book *Farm Management* was the basic text for most farm management courses.

During the fall of 1917, dairymen in New York State and in areas near other large cities across the country conducted successful milk strikes, forcing dealers to raise prices and creating anguished consumer protests. The data collected on costs of production at Cornell provided an accepted database for establishing a formula for instituting milk prices, which producers, dealers, and consumer interests finally recognized. This process, called "the Warren Formula" by
the urban press in New York and Chicago, provided additional, unsought publicity.

Warren’s willingness to speak out about the folly of a commission in Washington setting ceilings for the prices farmers could receive for wheat and grains earned the support and admiration of the farmers of the Midwest and his native Great Plains. In March 1919, Warren’s views were summarized in his article “Some Purposes of Price Fixing and Its Results” in the American Economic Review. He wrote, “The popular demand for price fixing comes very largely from a desire to avoid the necessity of economy. The ordinary consumer believes that if prices are fixed he can have more of the product, not realizing that, whatever the price, we can only eat as much as there is, and that a reduced price reduces the production of the product that was already short” (Warren 1919, 234).

In the academic world, Warren, first as secretary-treasurer and then president of the AFMA, saw both the need for and the opportunity of bringing together the faculty and professionals across the country working on the economic problems of farmers and rural people. The successful efforts to bring farm management and rural economy together into one professional organization at the end of the decade is a tribute to the leadership and farsightedness of Warren, Taylor, and their like-minded colleagues.
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New Specializations and the Agricultural Depression

1920–1929

In the years immediately following World War I, farm prices continued strong and land prices rose as returning soldiers sought land to farm. But just as inflation came with the war years, deflation with its many problems also followed with surprising speed. Prices fell rapidly for most storable commodities across the country. People who had gone into debt during the war years were suddenly faced with difficulty in meeting interest payments, to say nothing of the principal on mortgages. The agricultural depression, which began in the early 1920s and persisted throughout the decade, was then joined in 1929, following the stock market crash, by the wider economic depression in which all of society was involved.

Prices and Index Numbers

At the urgent request of Henry Canfield Wallace, the secretary of agriculture, G. F. Warren was asked to prepare a study of farm prices in the United States (Pearson and Myers 1957, 5494–95). The results of his work, Prices of Farm Products in the United States, was issued in August 1921. The bulletin gathered together monthly data on farm product prices, some of which went back to the early years of the nineteenth century. Warren then developed index numbers of farm product prices using 1909–1914 as a base period. Series were developed for each of the major commodities and commodity groups. He used the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Index of Wholesale Prices as a measure of the general price level for purposes of comparison.

Warren’s comments and analyses were directed to explaining why prices had fluctuated as they had: “Violent changes in the price level result in violent changes in industry. If the price of a particular product is not favorable, its production is checked, but the price does not fully respond to the reduced effort until the product that is already in the process of production and merchandising is nearly exhausted. Prices then rise and new production begins, but the new efforts at production have only a limited effect on prices until the new
goods have passed through the process of production and merchandising” (Warren 1921, 7).

An important section of the bulletin was directed to understanding the purchasing power of farm products and the relevance of this concept in studying changes in prices over time: “In June 1921, the price of corn was 92 percent of its prewar average. Since the general price level was 151 percent of the prewar average, the relation of corn to the general price level was 61 percent. If a bushel of corn was sold in 1921, at the average price paid to farmers, and the money used to buy commodities of all kinds at the wholesale prices of 1921, the quantity purchased would have been 61 percent of the average amount that could have been purchased as a five-year average before the war. Manifestly, the sellers of corn could not buy the usual quantities of other things” (Warren 1921, 19).

Warren concluded, “ Practically nothing that the farmer sells can be exchanged for the usual quantity of other things [in 1921]. It is physically impossible for farmers to absorb the products of factories. Farm prices have dropped much more than wholesale or retail prices of farm products. The low purchasing power of farm products has made it impossible for farmers to buy the normal amount of things and has been a contributing cause of unemployment” (Warren 1921, 25). In reading Warren’s comments, it is important to remember that in the 1920s, farmers and their families were then a major part of the national economy.

Most of the bulletin was used to present BLS wholesale prices as well as farm product prices for 31 different commodities and associated index numbers on a 1909–1914 base. Special emphasis was given to the rises and falls
in prices for these commodities during the Civil War period in comparison to the results for World War I. Emphasis on the purchasing power of farm products, when expressed in terms of the BLS Wholesale Price Index, was central to these final sections. During the years of World War I, farm product prices rose more rapidly than the Wholesale Price Index and then fell much more rapidly in late 1919.

Warren’s interests and concerns were now firmly centered on the prices that farmers received for their products and the prices they paid for what they bought, and finding ways to explain their fluctuations and interrelationships in an understandable manner. One of the young faculty members at the University of Illinois, Frank Pearson, came back to Cornell as an instructor in 1920 to study with Warren. After completing his doctoral thesis, “Agricultural Prices,” Pearson was appointed an assistant professor in 1922 and then began what was to become a long and close association with Warren in nearly all of Warren’s subsequent research, as well as the books and bulletins which flowed from their work.

Farm Economics

One of the important new initiatives of the 1920s for the Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management was the launching of Farm Economics in 1923, an extension publication provided free of charge to residents of New York State. The first issue of six pages presented four different sets of index numbers for the general price level, using the base period 1910–1914. Warren and Pearson gave comments about each of the following sets: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Dun’s, Bradstreet’s, and Harvard’s. They concluded that the BLS effort was the most comprehensive. They also explained the contents of each and why there were differences over the years 1913–1922. They then presented five sets of index numbers that they had constructed on business conditions for the same period, including such diverse indicators as 20 industrial stocks and U.S. production of pig iron. One other table, titled “Farm and City Prices of Farm Products, 1910–1914 = 100,” was discussed briefly, showing how index numbers for New York compared with those for the United States.

The first issue of Farm Economics was distributed as a short mimeograph. The second was issued one month later and included the same four sets of index numbers on the cover page as in the first issue, with one additional month of data. This pattern of using the cover page to present current index numbers of conditions in the economy was to follow for all future issues until its publication ceased in September 1958. The fifth issue in 1923 consisted of 12 pages and included a statement on “The Agricultural Situation” as well as a number of short reports on “New York Farm Prices,” “Ways of Making Adjustment in New York,” and “Outlook for Dairying in New York.” The November issue in 1923 was printed, reflecting the enthusiastic response from the public and college support for this new project. There were now
seven different sets of index numbers on the front cover. A series of short articles considered business conditions and the outlook for individual commodities.

During 1924 and 1925, it became the practice for graduate students and faculty to prepare short, signed articles reporting the results of their work in each issue. Warren—or Warren and Pearson, in most cases—provided a statement on business conditions or interpreted recent changes in prices or commodity markets in each issue. In this manner, the work of the faculty and staff was reported each month, as well as an economic commentary on the outlook for agriculture. For example, in June 1925, Warren and Pearson concluded their commentary, "In many parts of the Middle West, the hay crop promises to be poor, other crops have also been damaged by the dry weather. For several years, considerable areas of hay in New York have been left uncut. If the crop damage is severe enough, these areas may be worth cutting. It will pay to watch the weather and crop reports with unusual care."

Farm Economics was delivered each month to the homes, schools, government offices, and businesses across the state, wherever it was requested. In this manner, farmers and agricultural businessmen were regularly supplied with prices, economic data from a variety of sources, and the insights and commentary of Warren and his colleagues in the department. It was an effective and relatively inexpensive way to report the results of research, and it provided Warren a good way to teach and comment to the many people who had come to listen to his presentations over the years in his classes at Cornell and the sessions at Farmers' Week, or annual meetings of farm organizations. Farm Economics became one of the important ways in which the Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management met the public and passed on current economic information, particularly between the two World Wars and the days before television and multimedia communication.
SUPPLY AND PRICE

One of the consuming interests of Warren and Pearson was the ways in which demand and supply for individual commodities and their substitutes were related. Perhaps the most important piece of research they published during the decade was *Interrelationships of Supply and Price* [Warren and Pearson 1928]. They carefully examined the statistical work done on both demand and supply by H. L. Moore, Henry Working, Henry Schultz, Mordecai Ezekiel, and others in a substantial appendix, as well as presented their own methodology and that of other workers in the field. In all, 221 original equations and their subsequent revisions were presented for supply-price relationships for a number of standard farm commodities using data from different locations in the United States and around the world. Comparisons were also made to supply-price relationships for lead, salt, rock phosphate, pig iron, zinc, and two aggregates of U.S. manufactures and mining.

The authors opened their bulletin:

The increasing spread between farm and retail prices and the increasing violence in the fluctuation of farm prices were a serious problem even before the World War. With deflation, the maladjustment between farm and retail prices has been the most serious single factor in causing the agricultural depression. The statement is commonly made that supply and demand govern prices. Even if such a generalization were always true, it would be of little value, because it does not state what effect any given supply will have on prices, nor does it state how demand affects prices. . . . This bulletin is an attempt to express mathematically some of the relationships of supply to price, relationships of price to supply, relationships of farm and retail prices, and the effect of supply on the relationships.

Of course, every added bushel reduces the price. How much reduction takes place depends on the particular product sold and the point at which the price is taken. A large supply reduces the farm price by a much greater percentage than it reduces the consumers’ price. The only price that affects consumption is the price that the consumer pays. The only price that affects production is the price the producer receives. Wholesale prices do not govern consumption nor do they govern production. For agricultural products, supply is much more variable than is demand [Warren and Pearson 1928, 5].

The first major section of the bulletin was devoted to a series of studies of the relationship between farm prices of potatoes and production or supply expressed in a variety of ways. Seventeen figures examine relationships over different time periods and in different locations. Price was deflated, nominal,
and expressed in terms of purchasing power. Relationships between retail, wholesale, and farm prices were also carefully considered. Similar analyses then followed for hay, apples, peaches, pears, cabbage, corn, oats, barley, wheat, grains as a group, hogs, beef cattle, and various aggregates. When one remembers what kinds of computing equipment were available in the 1920s and how much of this work was done with little more than adding machines and early comptometers, one recognizes the massive amount of scholarly work and effort that this bulletin represents.

The authors’ concluding statement in the summary of the bulletin reflects an important message they hoped more people would come to understand: “Farmers respond to prices as vigorously as does industry, but they are dealing with biological facts. When prices of pig iron were 20 percent above normal, production was increased 12 percent in the same year. When round steak sold for 20 percent above the normal price, the receipts of steers in Chicago were increased 32 percent eight years later” (Warren and Pearson 1928, 144).

Increasingly, index numbers were calculated and used in presenting economic data by faculty and staff in the department. Most commonly,
1910–1914 became the base period against which current production and prices were presented and analyzed. A good example of these efforts is the doctoral thesis of Harry S. Gabriel, subsequently reported in a 1925 bulletin, *Index Numbers of Freight Rates and Their Relation to Agricultural Prices and Production*. Freight rates were a contentious issue to producers, especially...
those who lived the greatest distance from market. Index numbers provided a way to look at these numbers, from point of origin to destination, in a consistent and more understandable manner. The impact of freight rates on both production and prices could more easily be discerned when such information was made available.

MARKETING AND COOPERATIVES

Just as farm management studies had tended to dominate research and extension activities for department faculty and graduate students in the years before World War I, work on marketing was a major center of activity in the 1920s. There were 19 Ph.D.s and 19 master’s degrees granted during the decade on topics concerned with marketing issues and market structure. Students and faculty set about learning the costs of packing fruit in cooperative packing houses and how hay was marketed and priced in the United States. Milk marketing was examined and compared in Chicago and New York; operations in milk plants were studied to find possible cost savings and

efficiencies. Similar kinds of studies were completed for retail feed stores and public produce markets. Efforts were made to understand how both local and central markets worked and what made up the differences between wholesale and farm product prices for both fresh market and storable commodities. Faculty members were learning along with their students.

The results from the research in marketing were quickly incorporated into teaching and extension programs. The monthly issues of *Farm Economics* provided an excellent way to share brief summaries of what had been learned about operating costs and possible efficiencies in feed stores, milk plants, and packing sheds. A steady stream of work on milk marketing was given priority, both because the dairy industry was the most important source of farm income in the state and because of the public interest in the pricing of the fluid product in the marketplace. The titles of two Ph.D. theses in 1927 and 1928 suggest the nature and direction of this research: "The Relation of the

**A Preliminary Survey of Milk Marketing in New York**

| TABLE 5. Utilization of Milk at Various Types of Country Milk Plants in New York Counties Tributary to the New York Market, 1922-1923* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kind of plant | Per cent of total | Per cent of milk used for each product | | | | Total |
| | supply handled | Milk | Cream | Condensed, evaporated, and powdered milk | Cheese | Butter | Other uses |
| Shopping stations | 55 | 60 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 100 |
| Condenseries | 15 | 6 | 27 | 62 | 23 | 43 | 100 |
| Cheese and butter factories | 17 | 3 | 27 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 100 |
| Ice cream and candy factories | 2 | 27 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 43 | 100 |
| Average | 95 | 43 | 20 | 13 | 13 | 8 | 100 |
| Local plants | 7 | 3 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 100 |

*Computed from reports made to the New York State Department of Farms and Markets by plants receiving milk or cream from farmers.
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**Figure 22. Seasonal Variation in Receipts of Milk and in Sales of All Milk in the New York Metropolitan Area**

Monthly receipts and weekly sales are expressed as percentages of the average for the year. The weekly-sales curve shows the seasonal trend in demand more accurately than does the curve for monthly receipts.

Base-Surplus Marketing Plan to Milk Production and Shipping Station Costs in the Philadelphia Milk Shed” and “An Economic Study of the Cost of Handling Fluid Milk and Cream in Country Plants.” Professors William I. Myers and Leland Spencer directed these two studies and took leadership for work with industry leaders and teaching in this area.

In an analogous manner, marketing work concerned with fresh fruits and vegetables became a primary interest of M. P. Rasmussen, who joined the faculty in 1923 after completing his Ph.D. thesis, “An Economic Study of the Marketing of New York State Potatoes.” Efforts to form cooperatives to handle such functions as assembly, packing, and grading were too often well-intentioned but underfunded, and then broken when buyers made direct agreements with the largest growers in the new organization. Cooperatives were much talked about in this decade, but only those with strong leadership, commitment of member capital, and a good understanding of their functions survived.

Perhaps the most notable success was the formation of the Grange League Federation Exchange (GLF) in 1920 as a purchasing cooperative by the New York State Grange, the Dairymen’s League, and the New York State Farm Bureau. This new cooperative succeeded in part because of the three strong,
well-regarded organizations who sponsored it and provided its name. But much of its success rested in requiring that farmer members of the new cooperative put up the small amounts of capital required if they were to use its services.

A former extension agent and state leader of agents, H. E. Babcock, was hired by Warren to work with cooperatives at this time. He saw the possibilities and potential gains for farmers of the state from the successful operation of this new venture and worked to get it capitalized correctly and organized as a strong business. He served on its board of directors for its first two years and then resigned from the faculty to become its manager. Babcock’s enthusiasm, vision, and business acumen had much to do with the great early success of this purchasing cooperative. He became a widely respected business leader in the state and served on the board of trustees of Cornell University, first as representative from the New York State Grange in the 1930s, and then finally as its chairman from 1940–1947. Colman comments, “During the time he served as trustee, Babcock was perhaps the most important figure in New York agriculture” (Colman 1963, 436–37).

**Local Government and the State**

During the 1920s, local governments as well as individual farmers faced problems in meeting their obligations to their constituents when citizens could not pay their taxes, and this was the primary source of revenue for local governments. The state of New York recognized the problem and began to provide state aid to schools in relation to tax collections. M. Slade Kendrick’s bulletin, *An Index Number of Farm Taxes in New York, and Its Relation to Various Other Economic Factors*, in 1926 provided information on real and personal property taxes as assessed on farms from 1887 to 1925 in 33 selected townships, one per county, in the state.

In 1928, a second bulletin by Kendrick, *The Collection of General-Property Taxes on Farm Property in the United States with Emphasis on New York*, provided further background and information about financing government in other states. Kendrick concluded, “In many states, general-property taxes on farm property could be collected more cheaply. The evidence indicates that a general adoption of the system of county-treasurer collection of taxes, with the treasurer on a salary basis, would lower costs [some of them greatly] in
most of the 28 states which do not have this system of collection. . . . In New York, with large amounts of taxes collected under a system where small administrative units of collection are combined with a fee basis of reward, the savings which could be realized by county-treasurer collection of taxes, with the treasurer on a salary basis, are large.”

Another Ph.D. thesis and subsequent bulletin by J. L. Tennant, The Relationship between Roads and Agriculture in New York, contained information concerning the relationships of roads and their condition to farms located along them and their economic viability. Tallies of the travel on 110 roads were obtained during the summer and fall of 1926 and the summer of 1927, including state highways, county and town roads, and dirt roads. The study concluded, “In many cases the improvement of a dirt road makes possible a more profitable type of farming, such as the selling of market milk instead of butter and cheese, the growing of larger acreages of cash crops, or the use of more lime and fertilizer. A hard-surfaced road increases the value of farm land about 20 percent. . . . If the improvement of dirt roads costing $10,000 per mile were paid for on the basis of use, the farmers would need to pay only $1,100 per mile of road. This they could readily afford to do where the land is valued at $50 per acre or more. On the basis of use, the other
population groups would pay the remaining $8,900. . . . Farm travel is a small part of total traffic, even on dirt roads” [Tennant 1929, 50–51].

Kendrick also reported on a national study of county boards of supervisors and their costs of operation in 1929. Careful study was made in Illinois, Michigan, and New York as examples of “large” boards, and in Ohio, Indiana, Utah, and Colorado as examples of “small” boards where members were on a salary basis. Considerable variability was found. Some of the findings included, “The cost per session in states with large boards increases with increases in the number of supervisors. . . . The cost per session in states with small county boards does not increase with increases in the levy of county taxes. . . . The usual cost per session for counties in states with small boards is low. . . . The number of sessions held annually by small boards is much greater than the number held by large boards. . . . Are small county boards to be preferred to large boards? . . . The average quality of the members of a small board is probably higher than the average quality of the members of a large board. . . . The responsibility to the voters is much more evident in the small board than in the large board. . . . The small board functions with much more freedom than the large board” (Kendrick 1929, 39–41).

Irving Call completed a Ph.D. thesis under the direction of Myers and Warren examining the relationship between farm taxes and the incomes of farmers in New York for the period 1912 through 1922. Central to this study was the recognition that many farmers after the war lacked the income to pay their taxes, even though they recognized the need for and the uses of these revenues. Comparisons with the situation in New York counties with other states were made. In the published bulletin the author noted, “During the decade ending with 1922, the assessed valuation of property in New York more than doubled and property taxes more than tripled. Increases were much greater in some counties than others. Greater prosperity among city people has prevented the tax increases from being as severe a burden on them as on farmers. . . . Property taxation can be improved, but it cannot be made
equitable under the present conditions. To decrease the inequality, state property taxes should be abolished. A larger share of the taxes should be based on incomes and the proceeds used as increased state aid to communities for the maintenance of schools and roads" (Call 1929, 47–49).

This set of studies and the emphasis placed upon them was somewhat unique for departments of agricultural economics in the 1920s. Warren, as department head with the full support of the dean of the College of Agriculture, set about trying to learn and then to inform the people of the state about the great needs of rural people during the agricultural depression and the actions that might be taken to reduce their problems. Many farms were being sold because farmers could not pay their taxes. The solid body of information collected by Kendrick and others was made available to legislators, and over time it also reached the ears of successive governors: Al Smith in 1925–1929, and Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1929–1933. These initiatives led state officials to look to the department and the college for advice, as well as for individuals to work on legislation and then later to administer new programs.

Kendrick's bulletin, *The Collection of Taxes by the State of New York and the Division of These Revenues with Units of Local Government*, was a major historical document reporting how state aid had been allocated to local governments over time, together with a set of recommendations to resolve continuing needs. Some statements from the bulletin follow:

A state may aid units of local government in at least three ways: (1) Grants-in-aid may be made directly to such units. The purposes for which these grants are to be spent may be broad and general, or may be narrowly specified. (2) The state may assume functions performed by local units, and thereby relieve them of the financial obligations entailed by the performance of these functions. (3) The
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The proceeds of certain taxes collected under a general state law may be returned as a whole or in part to local units. Examples of all these methods of granting aid are found in the financial system of New York State. This state grants large sums annually to local units for aid in maintaining local schools and highways. It has assumed a number of functions formerly performed by local units; among these the care of the insane may be mentioned. Also it divides with local units the proceeds of both the personal and the corporation income taxes, the mortgage tax, the gasoline tax, and a number of other taxes" (Kendrick 1930, 1–3).

The personal income tax law in New York was passed in 1919. This act recognized, from the first, the principle of division of receipts with local government. . . . The share of each county was determined by the ratio of the assessed valuation of real property within its boundaries to the total assessed valuation of real property in the State (Kendrick 1930, 6–7).

The general recommendations are that units of local government should receive larger revenues from state-collected sources, that
these revenues should, in general, be granted to the larger units rather than the smaller; and that these funds should be used as sanctions to enforce a proper keeping of the financial accounts of units of local government” (Kendrick 1930, 53).

Because of the studies and work done by faculty and graduate students in the department, and the interest that it generated nationally, Warren was invited to speak about these efforts at the American Farm Economics Association meetings in 1929. His presentation, “A State Program of Agricultural Development,” was printed in the *Journal of Farm Economics* in July 1930. Key quotes follow:

I believe that agriculture and general welfare would be much better served if most of the effort were expended in getting fundamental legislation, that is, legislation that would be needed if there were no depression rather than in efforts to get emergency legislation. Legislation is generally too slow to meet emergencies. But when emergencies arise, it is a good time to put basic needed legislation on the books.

New York State has had a very fortunate combination of circumstances. During recent years it has had the benefit of studies by a number of commissions such as the Commission on Taxation and Retrenchment, the Industrial Survey Commission, the Committee of Twenty-One on Rural Schools, the Reforestation Commission, which still continues, and a number of others. The research work of the College of Agriculture has also been of value in finding basic facts. The farm organizations such as the Grange, Horticultural Society, Farm Bureau, and Home Bureau have worked with the large business cooperatives, the GLF, and the Dairymen's League, so that farm problems are thoroughly discussed, and when a conclusion is reached, it represents agriculture. Formerly, there were not sufficient facilities for discussion, nor for expression. Anyone who was born on a farm was assumed to speak for agriculture. That is no longer the case.

It is fortunate that at this particular time, the state has a governor who is interested in, and has a knowledge of, both urban and farm affairs, and at the same time it has a legislature that is interested in state development. Before he took office, the governor appointed an advisory commission on agriculture. The chairman of this is a publisher of a farm paper. Its membership includes representatives of farm organizations, master farmers, members of the legislature, heads of some of the state departments, representatives of the
Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. Practically all of its many recommendations have been endorsed by the governor and enacted into law.

Some of the more important problems about which legislation is needed at this time are: schools, roads, electric power, health, and land utilization. . . . No such progress can be made without the cooperation of many agencies. The governor is, of course, the pivotal point in it. . . . Since I am talking to agricultural economists, I naturally overemphasize their part in the work. I should perhaps express my opinion of the place of these workers in state planning. I believe their primary function is as reliable fact-finders. When a commission or other state agency is considering any problem affecting rural development, it should be able to turn to the Agricultural Colleges for basic data that will be accepted by all parties as scientific and accurate.

The preceding quotations from Warren’s journal article provide some indication of his own growing role as an advisor to state government and his commitment to work with legislators and state agencies to seek ways to solve rural problems. The studies conducted by faculty and graduate students provided basic, reliable information about recognized problems and offered recommendations about possible solutions. The decision makers, who could take action, were the state agencies and departments, the governor, and the legislature in Albany. Warren saw the College of Agriculture as one of the key players, together with the farm organizations and the commissions, in establishing the environment and understanding needed to move forward with new legislation and formulas for distributing state funds to local governments to assist with improving schools, roads, and local institutions.

**LAND USE AND LAND ECONOMICS**

Bulletin 295, *An Agricultural Survey*, written by Warren and Livermore in 1911, included a section on abandoned farms. The title itself reflected on what was already recognized as an issue, but then became recognized as a growing problem for both individual landowners and township governments in the 1920s. The situation in 1907–1908 is characterized in the bulletin: “The southern half of Tompkins County is in the region of so-called abandoned farms. There are no abandoned farms in the sense of abandonment of title. There are very few farms that are not partly farmed. In this region, many fields were unwisely cleared that should have been kept in permanent forests. Some fields that are not adapted to machine farming are left to grow up to weeds and later to trees. Many other fields are being farmed that should be abandoned” (Warren and Livermore 1911, 556). By the early 1920s, not only
were fields left abandoned, but entire farms as well. Hill townships were faced with sharply reduced revenue, as landowners could not pay their taxes.

In 1923, the executive committee of the Chenango County Farm Bureau passed a resolution requesting the college to make a survey of one of its townships where land was being abandoned rapidly. In response, William Allen, a Ph.D. student, did a preliminary study in Pharsalia in the summer of 1923. Then in 1924, he collected information on land use on all parcels of land of 10 acres or more in two townships in Chautauqua and Chenango counties. The townships were chosen because large areas in each were considered marginal for continued use in farming. Substantial areas in Pharsalia, Chenango County, had already been abandoned when the study was undertaken.

Pharsalia, the central area studied, was first settled in 1797 and had 482 residents in 1810; from 1825 through 1875, there were more than 1,000 residents counted in successive censuses. By 1923, the population had declined to 553. Detailed records were obtained on sources of income, indebtedness, farm operations, and off-farm activities for all residents. The status of existing forest lands on farms and the quality and potential of remaining trees were assessed. The authors proposed that two contiguous areas of the town might well be removed from farming and become forested areas as a state demonstration project, with the state buying the land from current owners. A brief discussion of the impact of such a project on schools, taxes, and the remaining citizens and villages was provided. Most of the bulletin revolved around the basic data obtained and the status of the current residents and the use of their landholdings.

A second Ph.D. student, Lawrence Vaughn, completed his thesis, “Abandoned Farm Areas in Southern New York,” in 1929. This thesis summarized comprehensive surveys of abandoned land areas in 40 different locations across the state. As a result of these studies, it was suggested that it would be desirable for the state to buy and reforest the abandoned land.
areas: “In order that such land shall be kept from agricultural production and still not remain wholly idle and unproductive, forestry has been suggested as the logical remedy. Fortunately, much of the land not adapted to farming is excellently adapted to growing trees” [Vaughn 1929, 257–58]. The legislature created a commission to investigate the possibilities of reforestation in 1928, with particular reference to ascertaining the location, value, and area of lands in the state that were unsuitable for agriculture, but that might be used for reforestation. The commission was also directed to determine the best means of promoting and financing reforestation within the state.

As a result of the work of this commission and the surveys already completed, two pieces of new legislation were passed under sponsorship of the commission in 1929. The State Reforestation Law authorized the State Conservation Department to acquire for the state, by gift or purchase, reforestation areas consisting of not less than 500 acres of contiguous land. The County Reforestation Law authorized the board of supervisors in any
county to acquire lands for reforestation and to establish and maintain forest plantations on lands already owned by the county. Finally, the commission recognized the need for a continuing program for reforestation. A constitutional amendment was adopted in 1931 providing for the acquisition and reforesting of a million or more acres of land within a period of 15 years at a cost of not more than $20 million. An important part of the database and rationale for this legislation came from the efforts of faculty with extension and research appointments in the department and their students.

EXTENSION INITIATIVES

In many respects, the research program of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management had a strong, direct extension orientation. Graduate students worked on learning more about some of the real problems of the state, collected data bearing on the issues, and then suggested what might be done to assist in solving them. *Farm Economics* became an excellent outlet for progress reports on major projects and a way to report what had been learned, as well as serving as a source of economic outlook and data on the state’s farm economy. Faculty were regular contributors to the Extension Service News, a statewide service providing articles for the individual county extension service publications. Other important outlets for short and timely articles were the magazines targeted to rural people and farmers: *The Rural New Yorker, The American Agriculturist,* and the *Dairymen’s League News.*

The 1920s was a period in American history when many cooperatives were being formed across the country with the hope that farmers could retain more of the value of the products they produced by “reducing the profits of middlemen.” Happily, some of the cooperatives succeeded to the benefit of farmers and their communities. Many failed—too often undercapitalized, poorly managed, and unable to find markets for their products. Department faculty members were actively involved in the successful organization of the GLF and its survival in its early years. Interactions with the officers and directors of the Dairymen’s League were regular and often complicated. Carl Ladd, as director of extension, was an activist in trying to assist farmers’ organizations to operate in a businesslike manner. Faculty assisted in setting up accounts and business plans, and explaining basic cooperative principles. Success or failure finally rested on local boards of directors and their management.
From the early days of the University, students from other countries were welcomed into all fields of studies, including agriculture. For the three-year period, 1907–1910, foreign students made up 9 percent of those in the four-year degree programs in agriculture (Colman 1963, 214). The first graduate degree obtained by an international student, an M.S., was granted in 1916–1917 to Kurt von Schenk for his thesis, “The Significance of von Thunen’s Law in Rural Economy,” with George Lauman as his chairman. Charles Gagne was granted an M.S. for his study, “Cooperation in French Agriculture,” in 1920, and Rui Feng completed his M.S., “The Breeding and Culture of the Silk Worm, Bombyx Mori,” in 1922. Four Chinese students completed Ph.D.s in 1923–1924, and, in most subsequent years, there were students from one or more countries in Europe, Asia, South Africa, and Latin America in residence working on a graduate degree in agricultural economics. Some worked on New York or American problems and data. Others pursued the analysis of data and issues from their own countries.

An early relationship was established by the College of Agriculture at Cornell and the University of Nanking and its College of Agriculture and Forestry at Purple Mountain in China. The dean of the college in China, John H. Reisner, was a Cornell graduate (M.S.) and agricultural missionary. J. Lossing Buck, a Cornell graduate in agriculture in 1914, went to China as a missionary in 1916. After three years of field experience, Buck was asked by Dean Reisner to develop a department of agricultural economics and extension in that college. A program of course work and the collection of farm records data were started in 1921 with two Chinese associates. Two more young Chinese joined the staff in 1923–1924 when funds became available to support the college and its efforts to improve farming and reduce the likelihood of famine because of
crop failures. In 1925, Chi C. Chang, who had recently completed his M.S. at Cornell, joined the staff to teach statistics and agricultural economics.

The Cornell-Nanking Cooperative Project in Plant Breeding was established in 1925 with special funding in China, whereby one Cornell professor came to Nanking during his sabbatic year to help train students and faculty in the most advanced methods of crop improvement. Harry Love, one of the most able at Cornell, was the first to arrive and quickly established eight improvement stations to develop new strains and varieties of crops adapted to local conditions. These eight stations provided a local base for carrying out farm survey work for Buck and his students.

The success of the cooperative program in plant breeding led to a less formal program with the Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management at Cornell. For the period 1931–1938, funding was obtained to bring six different faculty members for one year or more to Nanking to teach and assist with the farm records and the land utilization study that Buck had initiated. A number of Chinese students came to Cornell for graduate work as an outgrowth of this program. The American ambassador to China in the 1920s was Jacob Gould Schurman, recently retired as president of Cornell University. He was a key figure in gaining some of the original funding and support for the cooperative projects. During this same period, Buck returned to Cornell to complete his Ph.D. in 1933, “Chinese Farm Economy: A Study of 2,866 Farms in 17 Localities and 7 Provinces in China.” The Cornell links with China remained strong after World War II and were then largely associated with Taiwan, where many Nanking faculty had moved (Buck 1973).

Among the international students completing doctorates during the 1920s were two of perhaps particular interest. One was Vladimir P. Timoshenko, who wrote “Wheat Prices and the World Wheat Market” under the direction of Pearson, Warren, and Reed. Timoshenko, born in 1885, escaped Russia at the time of the revolution and found his way to the United States. He was author of Ukraine and Russia: A Survey of Their Economic Relations in Russian in 1919, which was subsequently translated into English in the 1930s. Timoshenko’s thesis, modestly revised, was published as a book in 1928. He joined the faculty of the Food Research Institute at Stanford University and was a leading figure on that faculty for the rest of his life. His books included World Agriculture and the Depression (1933), World Wheat Production: Its Regional Fluctuations and Interregional Correlations (1944), and The World’s Sugar: Process and Policy (1957) with Boris Swerling.

In 1928, Keith A. Murray completed his doctorate, “Some Aspects of the Supply and Prices of Meat in Great Britain,” under the direction of Boyle, Warren, and Davenport. Murray returned to Britain and served that country in many ways, both in the Ministry of Agriculture and as rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. He helped to establish the Institute of Agricultural Economics at Oxford and served as chairman of the nation’s University Grants Committee, making allocations of funding to all institutions for higher education in Britain at the close of his career.
One of the key figures on the faculty in the 1920s was Carl E. Ladd. After completing his Ph.D. in 1915, he first served as director of the two-year School of Agriculture at Delhi, then went to the State Education Department in Albany to organize its programs for high schools in vocational agriculture (1917–1919). After a year as director of the two-year school at Alfred, he returned to Cornell as extension professor of farm management in 1920. His skills in working with people and his abilities as an administrator were quickly recognized. He established vital communication links with all of the county extension workers and built support for a strong program in farm records and economic education. He was a strong advocate of the department’s new publication, *Farm Economics*, and helped extension staff and teachers of vocational agriculture to extend the information it provided to wider audiences across the state.

Ladd found time to write a textbook, *Dairy Farming Projects*, to serve the needs of high school students and dairy farmers. The lead sentence of the book reflects something of his basic philosophy and background in farm management: “You should have constantly in mind that management of a dairy farm is neither scientific or practical unless the farm business makes a profit.” The book contains 27 chapters with a wide range of titles, such as “Selecting the Cows,” “Milking and Bedding the Cow,” “Producing Clean Milk,” and “Financing the Dairy Farm Business.” His references reflected the scholarship of the time, a combination of experiment station bulletins and standard textbooks in agronomy, animal husbandry, and farm management. The book was replete with pictures, charts, diagrams, and a suggested set of questions in each section to help both students and their teachers to make use of the material.
In 1924, just nine years after completing his doctorate, Ladd was appointed director of extension for the college by Dean Mann. In this new post, he gave priority to building bridges between the extension education programs provided by the Home Bureaus and Farm Bureaus. He was recognized as a successful mediator. Colman describes him as “a master at securing a compromise of conflicting positions” (Colman 1963, 384). In many respects, the success of the college in its relationships with the State of New York and leading agricultural organizations was due to the steady hand of Ladd, working in concert with Dean Mann and faculty leaders like George Warren.

Dean Mann and Ladd had somewhat different philosophies about what was most important. Colman comments, “Ladd justified research directed toward the solution of immediate agricultural problems as a matter of fundamental conviction; Mann viewed it as necessary adjustment to the external pressures placed upon the college. For him, the vital factor was having outstanding men on the faculty” (Colman 1963, 388). They made a strong team at a time when resources were relatively scarce and an agricultural depression put heavy pressure on faculty to seek solutions to the real problems of farmers and rural communities.

A second leader within the department was William I. Myers. He grew up near Elmira, New York, and worked on his grandfather’s farm in his early years. He completed his B.S. in agriculture at Cornell in 1914; was an assistant while completing his M.S.; worked on a survey funded by the USDA; and then completed his Ph.D. in 1918 with a thesis entitled “An Economic Study of Farm Layout.” He was made an instructor before he finished his degree and became an assistant professor when Livermore left in 1920 to operate a farm in western New York. Myers initially took over responsibility for the cost accounting project and taught the undergraduate course in farm management.
Warren sought a new professorship in farm finance and when it became available in the middle of the 1920s, he turned to Myers to develop a research and extension program in this field. Myers developed a reputation as the department’s outstanding teacher. When Babcock left the department to become the manager of the GLF, Myers taught his course in cooperative marketing for a number of years. He and Babcock were lifelong friends and confidants. Their strong personal relationship would later make possible many things, when Myers was dean of the college and Babcock served as chairman of the board of trustees for Cornell University.

As the new professor of farm finance, Myers led an effort to establish county farm conference boards to bring farmers and bankers together to talk about credit problems. The need for credit grew as farmers bought more and more of their feed, fertilizer, and seed, and introduced tractors and more mechanization. The first farmer-banker conference was held in Ithaca in 1924. A credit statement was developed cooperatively by the department, the Federal Reserve Bank, and the New York State Bankers’ Association. Out of these early meetings grew the Bankers’ School of Agriculture and strong cooperation with cooperative farm credit associations serving farmers. Myers was respected by both farmers and their creditors in a time of substantial economic difficulty. Communication was kept open; ways to refinance loans were discussed and negotiated; and an educational program evolved.

When Warren was called away from the campus, Myers became the acting department head and second in command. There was substantial interaction among Myers, Ladd, and Warren; often the three met and talked over Sunday breakfasts, discussing department and college issues, and planning
how to meet needs and set priorities (Colman 1963, 394–95). Myers took a sabbatical leave in 1926 and studied the teaching of farm management and accounting systems in Britain, Holland, Scandinavia, and Germany, as well as the cooperative farm credit systems established in these countries. This experience and the contacts made were an important addition to his growth as an influential figure in agriculture.

As faculty positions in the department became available, from the rank of instructor to professor, they were typically filled by former graduate students or those soon to complete their Ph.D.s. Warren did not appear to search widely outside Cornell when a position was vacant, but sought to keep the best of the department’s recent graduates. Many of these men were attracted to other institutions. Ernest Young was an instructor and faculty member for four years, but left for Purdue in 1923, where he became dean of the graduate school. Lawrence J. Norton’s name appeared on the faculty list from 1917–1923, before he moved to the University of Illinois and his distinguished career there as professor of marketing.

Key faculty who completed Ph.D.s in the 1920s and joined the department for most of their academic careers were Leland Spencer, who took leadership for work in milk marketing; M. P. Rasmussen in fruit and vegetable marketing; Frank A. Pearson in prices; V. B. Hart in extension farm management and credit; M. Slade Kendrick in local government; and Whiton Powell in business management. Partial funding for faculty positions and the new work in marketing and prices came from the Purnell Act passed by Congress in 1925.
Graduate student numbers grew rapidly and space for both students and faculty was often at a premium. In 1924–1925, 12 students completed doctoral dissertations and 10 completed a master of science.

At the end of the decade, the work of the department was housed in four separate locations. Farm Management was located in the old Judging Pavilion, converted in 1915 for temporary use after being condemned by the state architect as unsafe. Marketing was located in the old poultry feed house, with the rest of the students and staff in the basement of Bailey Hall and some space in Fernow Hall. The pressure for one building to house work in the social sciences grew, and in 1930, with Warren’s work and that of his faculty on the governor’s Agricultural Advisory Commission so widely recognized, the necessary appropriation for a new building was finally made. On April 24, 1930, Governor Roosevelt signed agricultural bills that included the provision for a building for the Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management at Cornell University. As he signed the bill, the governor said, “This bill is a personal tribute to Dr. Warren,” and handed him the pen with which it was signed (Pearson and Myers 1957, 5506).

Warren was the central figure around which work in agricultural economics revolved at Cornell. Graduate students came from distant lands as well as from all parts of the country to study with him and the faculty he had assembled. The discipline was developing rapidly at many other colleges of
agriculture as well. The discipline of economics was now an important part of
graduate education in agricultural economics, and most students at Cornell
had at least one economist on their graduate committees. Davenport or Reed
from the economics faculty served most frequently.

Graduate study in agricultural economics was developing rapidly at the
major land grant universities, especially Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa State,
Illinois, and the University of California, Berkeley. The major figures of the
profession included Taylor and Hibbard at Wisconsin, Black and Boss at
Minnesota, Carver at Harvard, Nourse at Iowa State, Case at Illinois, and
Falconer at Ohio State.
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The Role of Government in Agriculture and the Great Depression

1930–1939

While farmers in the United States had already experienced a decade of falling prices for cropland and reduced purchasing power for the products they sold, the rest of the economy faced substantial economic problems as the new decade began. The stock market crash in 1929 heralded the uncertainty and insecurity that were to characterize much of the next 10 years. Fluctuating prices, uncertain employment, and difficult times for both rural and urban people were now widespread. Concerns about survival in times of stress were basic as the plights of individuals on bread lines and without the basic necessities of life became a reality throughout the country. This was a decade when the role of government and its influences on the functioning of the nation’s economy became a central interest of the public, and many different initiatives were tried to solve fundamental economic problems. Faculty and students in the department, like nearly everyone else, were caught up in the process in many different ways.

Prices and Index Numbers

In terms of its scholarship and lasting value, one of the more important research endeavors of the department in the 1930s was summarized in *Wholesale Prices in the United States, 1797 to 1932* by G. F. Warren and F. A. Pearson,
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During most of the last 140 years, instability of the general price level has been the most important problem of agriculture and industry. The periods of rising prices have been periods of prosperity, and periods of falling prices have been periods of distress.

and *Wholesale Prices at New York City, 1720 to 1800* by Warren, Pearson, and Herman Stoker. This two-part research report of 222 pages was the culmination of years of painstaking work by a group of dedicated clerks and students under the direction of Warren and Pearson.

As the authors noted in their introduction,

Up to the present time no monthly index numbers of wholesale prices covering the past century have been prepared, although a number of persons have prepared index numbers for a part of the period. It is the aim of this study to present comprehensive index numbers to correspond with the present index numbers (quarterly basis) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The collection of the data was made possible by a grant from the International Committee on Price History. . . . Prices for 116 commodities were used for 1797, and for 138 commodities for 1889.

Index numbers are given for the 10 groups of commodities used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics: farm products, foods, hides and leather, textiles, fuel and lighting, metals and metal products, building materials, drugs and chemicals, house furnishings, and miscellaneous. A separate group for spirits was computed also. From these groups, two all-commodity index numbers were prepared. One gives each group the same weights for the entire period. The other varies the group weights previous to 1890.

Commodities that were little used a century ago were generally very high in price. Any index numbers that give these commodities as high a weight as is given now exaggerate the height of prices in the earlier period. The index here presented gives a reduced weight to textiles, fuel and lighting, metals, and chemicals in the earlier years, and an increased weight to farm products, foods, hides and leather, and spirits as described on page 163. This index number of wholesale prices, which, it is believed, best represents the general level of prices in the United States from 1797 to 1932 is given in Figure 1 and Table 1.

The first table in the memoir presents monthly index numbers calculated on a 1910–1914 base from 1720 forward whenever enough data were available for the month or year to construct an acceptable index number. From 1749 onward, there were monthly index numbers for each month of each year except for 1782–1784, 1788, and 1792. Important collaborators on this project were statisticians at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Professor A. H. Hansen, University of Minnesota; and Ethelbert Stewart of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The Public Library of New York City and the New York Historical Society made available their extensive materials on prices. Daily newspapers were particularly important sources of prices in the early years before governments were keeping such records.
An important part of the memoir was given over to a review of past work done on preparing index numbers of wholesale prices and comparing the methodologies used along with the results and reasons for differences found. Details on the process of choosing the “appropriate average price” for a commodity for a specific month and the tests followed to look at alternative methodologies were presented, along with all the index numbers for each of the major commodities included in the series. Comparisons with index numbers of wholesale prices in France and England were made at the beginning of the report. Later, a careful review of the other index numbers of wholesale prices for the United States, prepared by such influential scholars as Wesley Mitchell, Alvin Hansen, and Arthur Cole, was made in the final sections. This valuable scholarship was well recognized nationally, and the final revisions of the monthly index numbers published by the BLS adopted much of Warren and Pearson’s work in this memoir as the accepted national methodology and index numbers for the years before 1890.

A second major piece of related research by Warren and Pearson was also published as a memoir in November 1932, The Physical Volume of Production in the United States (Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Memoir 144). While the process of obtaining a solid series of price data for the years before the Civil War was difficult for the large number of commodities desired, production data for each was substantially more complicated. Nevertheless, if weights were going to be used in combining the index numbers for commodities over time, then quantities of production were necessary for each of the years, or periods of time, so that the index numbers

reflected how people actually were spending their money and the role of the price level in this process.

Carl Snyder at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York had prepared an index of the world physical volume of production from 1865–1931 and shared his basic data and ideas in building a series back to 1839 for any of the component series, such as coal and other minerals. Census data were available for agricultural production, every 10 years from 1839 onward to the Civil War, when annual series for the major crops and livestock products were established.

An important part of the publication recognized the complexities of introducing new and important commodities into the index as they came into use. Good examples of such commodities were petroleum and natural gas, electricity, minerals such as silver and gold, pig iron, and all the forest products, such as paper and pulp. Equations to estimate rates of growth in production from fragmentary data were calculated. The estimates made by W. M. Persons and Snyder were systematically compared with their own efforts. The bibliography in the bulletin reflects a substantial effort to examine published research in Europe as well as the English-speaking world. One of the most important sets of citations, eight in number, was to Edmund Ezra Day, later to become president of Cornell University from 1939 to 1951. This memoir was a major first effort to be followed later by Warren and Pearson's more extended work on business cycles.
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Figure 2. New York Farm Prices with Variable Group Weights, Compared with Wholesale Prices of Farm Products in the United States, 1841 to 1935

(1910-1914 = 100)

Since 1841, the movement of farm prices in New York has paralleled very closely the movement of wholesale prices of farm products in the United States.

One other major effort on prices was completed by S. E. Ronk as his doctoral thesis and then published as Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 643, *Prices of Farm Products in New York State, 1841 to 1935*. The methodology and graphics follow the procedures established by Warren and Pearson in their memoir. Monthly prices are provided from 1841 forward on all of the major crops and livestock products, including, among others, hay, corn, wheat, milk, potatoes, and apples. All index numbers are on a 1910–1914 base.

The changes in receipts of eggs, as determined by price and time, are shown by means of a “surface” (figure 26). Every point on this surface is the result of the joint effect of deviations of Monday's price from normal, and of the number of days after Monday, on receipts for the various days of the week. The effect of deviations of Monday's price was not marked until two days afterward. As the time from Monday increased, deviations of Monday's price resulted in larger deviations of the receipts. In general, small deviations of the price on Monday had relatively more effect on later receipts of eggs than did large deviations.


Another doctoral thesis, published as a bulletin, *Interrelationships of Daily Egg Prices and Supply in the New York Market* by Karl Vogt, studied supply-price relationships in a terminal market in greater detail. Special interest was given to storage holdings and their relationships to prices and rates of movement into the market.
LAND UTILIZATION STUDIES AND LAND ECONOMICS

Between the agricultural censuses of 1920 and 1930, land in farms in New York State dropped from 20.6 to 18.0 million acres, farm numbers fell from 193,200 to 159,800, and cropland fell from 13.2 to 10.5 million acres. Most farmers were struggling. Those on poor soils and living on dirt roads relatively far from markets had either given up or found other work to supplement their incomes. In this environment, studies of abandoned farmland were continued and new efforts were launched to identify those conditions that allowed commercial farming to succeed and those that made success unlikely.

In August 1929, Governor Roosevelt’s Agricultural Advisory Commission recommended that a general study be made of the agricultural resources of the state and appropriated funds to carry out the study. In 1930, faculty members began a study of land utilization in the state, including a more intensive study of land utilization in Tompkins County, the location where the original farm management studies had been done, and where the faculty and staff started with substantial knowledge of soils, markets, and farming conditions. A land-classification map of Tompkins County was published in which all land in the county was designated as belonging to one of five classes. Land Class I was established as primarily adapted to forestry and recreational uses; Land Class II was “better suited to forestry and recreational uses than farming, but considerable farming is done; . . . land in classes III, IV, and V is agricultural land classified according to intensity of use” (Lewis 1934, 17–18).

A summary publication by A. B. Lewis, *Methods Used in an Economic Study of Land Utilization in Tompkins County, New York, and in Other Similar Studies in New York*, was issued in 1934. The three principal types of information used in establishing classifications for land were: (1) the condition of existing buildings, (2) the current uses of land, and (3) the character and types of soils available, considering slope, elevation, and climate. Lewis wrote, “The primary purpose of an economic classification of land is to assist those who are interested in the land to use it for those purposes for which it
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At the time the United States Geological Survey maps were made, there were 14,400 houses in land class I and 26,800 in land class II (table 28). In 1934, about one-half of those in land class I and one-fourth of those in land class II were either gone or falling. An additional 8 percent in each of these two land classes were vacant. Only about 18 percent of the houses standing in land class I, about 35 years ago, and 45 percent of those in land class II, were classified as occupied farm homes.

is best adapted. The classification in effect outlines the areas that are adapted to different uses, and labels those areas so that everyone may know, within limits, the profitable uses to which each area may be put” (Lewis 1934, 11).

During the 1930s, similar land utilization studies were completed in important agricultural counties of the state, and generalized land classification maps were issued for each county with supporting data in experiment station bulletins. During the fall of 1934, a preliminary study was made in cooperation with the State Planning Council and the National Resources Board of those areas in the state where there were thought to be any areas of 1,000 acres of land better suited for forest and recreational uses than for agriculture. These areas were identified on a master map as primarily Land Classes I and II.

The county land utilization studies required a substantial amount of manpower to locate and visit all the farms and tracts of land, identify them on maps, and then make decisions on the generalized boundaries for the final classifications. This program offered summer work and experience for many students who were more than happy to have a paying job as well as to learn by doing.

The key figures in this early land classification work were Warren and Myers from the senior faculty and Forrest F. Hill and A. B. Lewis, who completed their Ph.D.s in 1930 and 1933, respectively. Hill came from Saskatchewan to study farm finance with Myers shortly after the new faculty position in finance for Myers had been created in the 1920s. Hill’s Ph.D. thesis, “A Statistical Study of the Problem of Making Long-term Mortgage Loans on Farm Property in New York State,” provided him with a graphic overview of the difficulties many farmers and credit institutions were having in trying to survive over an extended period of agricultural depression. The quality of the land resource and its location relative to roads and markets were clearly important in determining whether or not loans were repaid.

Lewis completed his Ph.D. thesis using materials from the initial land class study made in Tompkins County in 1930. Lewis acknowledges Warren and Hill as directors of his study and the memoir on methodology. Shortly after completing his thesis and the memoir, Lewis took a position at the University of Nanking with J. Lossing Buck from 1933–1936.

Leadership for continuing the county land utilization studies and generalized maps fell to Hill, who quickly was recognized as one of the key younger faculty and leaders in the department. The strong interrelationships between credit performance and the quality of the basic land resources were clear to Hill and Myers. These county studies and the land class maps were seen as an excellent way to help both bankers and potential owners of farmland understand the resources they were considering. Out of these beginnings, a continuing program in what was first called land economics—and in the last decades of the century, natural resource economics—developed.
THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS AND THE ELMHIRSTS

The beginnings of what became the International Association of Agricultural Economists (IAAE) is intertwined in many ways with Leonard and Dorothy Whitney Straight Elmhirst and the agricultural economics faculty at Cornell. Leonard Elmhirst arrived in Ithaca in the fall of 1919 seeking a degree in agriculture, already holding an M.A. in history from Cambridge University. He had spent some time in India in 1915 before being called up to serve in World War I. Due to an injury, he was “invalided” to work at the Agricultural Training Institute in Allahabad, India, from 1917–1918 alongside an agricultural missionary. As a result of this experience, he concluded he should learn more about agriculture and return to India to help the Indian people learn more about farming as a business and science (Elmhirst 1975, 1–2). After a further year of military service, he made his way to Ithaca in search of more knowledge as well as a degree in agriculture.
Elmhirst obtained his B.S. in agriculture at Cornell in 1921 and formed many friendships with students and faculty. He was elected president of the Cosmopolitan Club, where he lived for the two years it took to gain his additional degree. The Cosmopolitan Club, an international living unit, had a substantial debt, and Elmhirst agreed to go to New York to see the widow of Major Willard Straight, a Cornell alumnus who had died in Paris from pneumonia at the end of the war, to seek assistance for the club. Straight had left a provision in his will to use his resources “... for making Cornell a more human place.” Elmhirst convinced Mrs. Straight, then in her early thirties, to visit Cornell, see the club, and decide if this would be a good way to assist students and the University. She became not only the benefactor of the Cosmopolitan Club, but also provided the funds to build Willard Straight Hall, Cornell University’s first student union, as a fitting memorial to her late husband. She later married Elmhirst in 1925 (Elmhirst 1975, 119–121).

Elmhirst returned to India in the early 1920s to serve as secretary to Rabindranath Tagore, the poet, Indian nationalist, and founder of the Indian Institute of Rural Reconstruction. Elmhirst worked with the students and helped them go to the villages and work in much the same fashion as the extension agents he had seen at work in upstate New York. Willard Straight Hall was opened in 1925 after the Elmhirsts had moved to England, where they purchased a fourteenth-century estate, Dartington Hall, in Devon, which they rebuilt into a livable home. They developed a community around it that sought to extend the concepts and practice of progressive education, scientific agriculture, rural industry, and the arts.

As a student at Cornell, Elmhirst felt he benefited greatly from his classes in farm management and agricultural economics. From his experience in India and his associations with students at the Cosmopolitan Club, he thought there would be great benefit if agricultural economists from around the world could come to know each other and exchange ideas. He invited Carl E. Ladd to spend his sabbatic leave in Britain, based at Dartington Hall, in 1928–1929. Ladd visited many of the colleges in the United Kingdom,
teaching agriculture and economics. Together with Elmhirst, Ladd planned a meeting sponsored by the Elmhirsts at Dartington in the summer of 1929, to which 50 agricultural economists from 11 countries were invited. Those attending found this experience to be very beneficial. As a result, a second conference was planned to be held at Cornell University in 1930, with a third to be held in Europe in two or three years (Raeburn and Jones 1990, 19–34).

The second conference was held at Willard Straight Hall in August 1930 with representatives from 30 different countries and 5 Canadian provinces; 309 persons attended, with 234 from the United States. Those present adopted a constitution for the International Conference of Agricultural Economists (ICAE), and it was agreed that a Proceedings should be published following each meeting. Grants obtained from the Carnegie Endowment and the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation by the host group...
at Cornell provided for much of the funding for the travel of Europeans and others traveling to the United States, as well as for the *Proceedings* that was published from the 84 presentations and summaries of member discussion groups. Elmhirst was elected as the first president, Warren and Max Sering (Germany) as vice presidents, and Jock Currie as secretary-treasurer of the new association. Forrest F. Hill served as secretary for the conference, assembled the papers and reports of discussions, and edited the published *Proceedings*.

After the conference, those present from overseas sought to memorialize the occasion. Blocks of wood representing the countries of participants attending were sent to Dartington Hall, where a seminar table was fashioned in their rural industry center. It was completed and sent to Cornell to be placed in the fourth-floor seminar room in Warren Hall at the time of the dedication of the new building in 1932 (Raeburn and Jones 1990, 1–30).
Members and visitors attending the Third International Conference of Agricultural Economists, Bad Eilsen, Germany, 1934. Warren is in the center of the front row with his legs crossed.

Post-conference tour, 1934: G. W. Hedlund, center back row. Note storm trooper to guide the tour!
Despite the worldwide economic depression, a third conference was held at Bad Eilsen, Germany, in late August 1934, with 171 in attendance from 19 countries—97 were from Germany. The officers from 1930 were reelected and the Proceedings were published in both German and English. Max Rolles, fluent in both languages, kept communications flowing; J. P. Maxton, Oxford, served as editor of the Proceedings.

A fourth conference was held at St. Andrews, Scotland, in early September 1936. There were 219 participants present, of whom nearly half had attended a previous conference and 127 had traveled from abroad. Warren and Ladd were again both in attendance and presented major papers. A fifth conference was held at MacDonald College, Quebec, in late August 1938, despite the imminence of war in Europe. There were 510 members present from 23 countries and a sixth conference was planned for Hungary in 1941.

The concept of these international conferences owes much to the Elmhirsts, both for their financial support and their creative efforts to make the first and succeeding conferences truly international in character. Elmhirst attributes the idea of holding the first conference to Carl Ladd, who then sold it to his colleagues at Cornell and elsewhere in the United States, as well as those he visited in the United Kingdom. Warren’s enthusiastic support, along with that of Henry C. Taylor, brought the leadership of agricultural economics in the United States to the second meeting. Elmhirst himself kept the concept alive between conference periods by his travels around the world, building a program and providing travel money in places where it was necessary.

**MONETARY POLICY AND THE GOLD STANDARD**

The aftermath of World War I left many countries trying to pay reparations and debts with weakened currencies. Periods of monetary chaos and hyperinflation resulted. The gold standard was widely advocated as the basis for a sound currency, and gold or a currency backed by gold was seen as the way to pay for international debts, especially by bankers and many leading economists. Increasingly, Warren and Pearson concentrated their energies on studying prices and studying alternatives to gold as a basis for backing a national currency.

Warren presented the lead paper at the third conference in Germany (1934) in the section devoted to “International Policies Relating to Agriculture.” His paper reflected much of what he had written and advocated on the topic since the start of the Great Depression. It included seven figures and eight tables of data showing price relationships during the years after World War I, and especially what had happened in individual countries since 1929. A few quotations from his paper provide a sense of his approach and points of view: “I desire to present science—not to speak for, criticize, or recommend political action. I hope to be as objective as a chemist. The gold-using world has had 20 years of monetary chaos and, I think, will continue to have monetary chaos for a
number of years. . . . The writer believes that the price chaos has been due to fluctuations in the demand for gold which resulted from monetary chaos. . . . In 1931, England and most of the other countries of the world left the gold standard when prices were only a little below pre-war, and, by raising the price of gold, either raised prices or stopped the decline. . . . It is sometimes said that England did not get a rise in prices by leaving the gold standard. That is true, but she stopped the collapse" (Warren 1934, 289–95).

In the concluding section of the paper, Warren suggested his own views about the actions he thought should be taken, especially in the United States: “At the present time, the price of gold must be more than doubled in order to restore the pre-depression price level in any country. Those countries that have doubled the price of gold have progressed much farther towards recovery than those countries which have raised it by a lesser amount. . . . I believe that there is enough knowledge about prices so that an improved measure of value is possible, but, even if the gold standard is to be re-established, a definite commitment to any final price for gold, before its value has reached some approximation to stability, is dangerous” (Warren 1934, 308–9).
One can also gain a clear sense of Warren’s position on monetary policy from a speech he made to the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Nashville, Tennessee, in December 1934. Titled “The Monetary Situation,” it examined the current situation in the United States and the rest of the world. Warren argued strongly to move away from the “one commodity, gold standard” for the U.S. dollar:

If only one commodity—gold—is to be used, some kind of machinery is essential so that the price of gold may respond to changes in its value. We now have a temporary law that permits the President to make changes within limits, but have no permanent monetary plan. This law expires in two years.

It is not necessary to use a commodity money. A managed currency has been successfully operated at many times. England has been off the gold standard in 38 of the past 138 years. She is running such a currency now. On each of these occasions gold currency was not functioning well. If she can run a managed currency fairly successfully in periods of monetary chaos, she ought to be able to run it easily in times that are more nearly normal. The experiment that England is now running is of very great value to the world, and I hope that it will not be interfered with by other nations whose monetary operations are less successful and would like to have England follow their less successful plans” (Warren 1934, 8).

Warren and Pearson were authors of three books published by John Wiley & Sons in 1933, 1935, and 1937 that reflected their central interests and research during the 1930s. The first of these books was Prices, which came
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**Figure 7.** Index Numbers of Wholesale Prices of All Commodities in England, 1782-1938.

on the market shortly after Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR) moved from Albany into the White House. The second, *Gold and Prices*, was introduced by the authors in the preface in the following manner: “Much of the material in this volume is taken from *Prices*, but so many new chapters have been added and such extensive revisions have been made, that it is deemed advisable to give it a new name so that the two books can be distinguished.” It also reflects the prominence given to gold in the minds of the authors in considering the monetary situation and its impact on the Great Depression, especially farmers and rural people. The third book, *World Prices and the Building Industry*, included a careful study of 40 basic commodities in 13 countries between 1910 and 1937. The second half of the book concerned itself with a study of the building industry in each of these countries as a way of measuring changes in economic activity and the business cycle.

**WARREN AS PRESIDENTIAL ADVISOR**

Warren had established a strong and warm relationship with FDR while the latter served as governor of the state of New York. There was mutual respect and appreciation of each other’s abilities and talents. Warren particularly appreciated FDR’s concerns for agriculture and the well-being of the state’s rural people. The governor’s Agricultural Advisory Commission brought the two men together even before FDR took office as governor in 1929. Warren also spent several days at Warm Springs, Georgia, in the late fall of 1930, conferring with Roosevelt and Henry Morgenthau, Jr., on the state’s agricultural policy and the decline in commodity prices. He was an invited guest at Hyde Park to advise both on the management of the farm and to talk about monetary policy and the price level (Pearson, Myers, and Gans 1957, 5506–7). Earlier, FDR had offered Warren a well-paid position on the state’s Public Service Commission, which he declined, wanting to maintain his freedom to speak and write as an independent voice and to continue his work at Cornell University.

The Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities appointed a committee of five to report on the agricultural depression and make recommendations for policy actions. The members were Warren, H. R. Tolley (University of California, Berkeley), M. L. Wilson (Montana), Dean T. P. Cooper (Kentucky), and Dean H. W. Mumford (Illinois). Three of the committee, including Warren, believed strongly that monetary policy should be identified as the most effective way to improve commodity prices; two believed that production had to be reduced or controlled to bring about change. Agreement on a final report was not possible, a reflection of the conflicting views and strong positions taken by individuals and organizations throughout the country (Pearson, Myers, and Gans 1957, 5510–11). In the process, the issues received wide publicity and Warren became identified nationally as one who believed that going off the gold standard and moving to a managed currency had merit.
In the early 1930s, Warren was in great demand as a public speaker. He was particularly popular with state Farm Bureau organizations and the state and national Grange. He spoke to groups in Cincinnati, Columbus, Minneapolis, Des Moines, Madison, and Salt Lake City, as well as in most cities in New York State. Almost everywhere, he talked about the causes of the Depression and proposed remedies for it. In January 1932, he returned to his native Nebraska to read a paper at the university on “Adjusting Agriculture to Present and Prospective Prices.” His arguments to move off the gold standard with a managed currency, or alternatively, to raise the value of gold in the U.S. dollar, were welcomed by rural audiences but abhorred by bankers in the major cities and the industrial establishment. During 1932, Warren addressed audiences at 54 different locations with more than 14,000 in total attendance. On two different occasions he spoke over nationwide radio hookups (Pearson, Myers, and Gans 1957, 5509). Country banks had closed in many communities. The cry for some kind of change in policy was loud and clear across rural America.

Immediately after his election as president, FDR sought and received advice from a large number of individuals, commissions, and committees so that he could move forward immediately to take some positive actions to boost the economy. Warren was one of the many called to Washington.
During the presidential campaign, Hoover was generally known as the “sound money” candidate and FDR as the “soft money” man. The arguments made by Warren, and others of like mind, were given credence by Roosevelt in some of his speeches, but no clear commitments had been made about the actions he would take. Abandoning the commitment of the federal government “to redeem its paper money at the rate of 23.22 grains of fine gold to the dollar” was seen as a statement of national bankruptcy by Hoover, his advisors, and those who held bonds and letters of credit. For the great majority of people who could not meet their debt payments or who were already facing bankruptcy, this was not so unthinkable.

FDR had no shortage of eager advisors with widely conflicting ideas. The need for some kind of direct action was clear. He called Congress into an extraordinary session on March 6, 1933. As his first proclamation, he declared a bank holiday and suspended gold payments, starting on March 6 and lasting through March 13. Warren, Rex Tugwell, Henry Morgenthau, and Henry A. Wallace were the key advisors who worked with FDR on this major decision and the associated steps toward reflation. But suspension of the gold standard, by itself, was not enough. On April 20, FDR permitted transactions in foreign exchange under government supervision to begin, and the price of gold rose 50 percent in the next 90 days. Commodity prices and the stock market rose by 76 and 66 percent, respectively. Revaluation of the dollar was in process.

During March and April 1933, Warren spent considerable time in Washington. He advised the Committee for the Nation, which included bankers, industrialists, and farm organization leaders, as well as the president’s office. In April, Senator Thomas from Oklahoma sponsored legislation giving the president power to inflate the currency, reduce the gold content of the dollar, or adopt bimetallism. The affirmative vote in the Senate was 64 to 21, and in the House 307 to 86, reflecting the broad support across the country for the actions taken by Roosevelt in his first two months in office. FDR signed the bill on May 12, 1933, and finally used the authority on January 30, 1934, when the price of gold was fixed at $35 per ounce, up from $20.67, where it had been before March 1933 (Pearson, Myers, and Gans 1957, 5605–28).

Warren continued his trips to Washington in the summer and fall of 1933. He was opposed to the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA), the plowing under of cotton, and the slaughter of little pigs. So were many others; Secretary of Agriculture Wallace’s programs to reduce farm production and raise prices were not well received, even in his native Iowa. But Warren kept his own counsel and limited his public statements on this issue. His role with the president, and with FDR’s other advisors, was on monetary policy and commodity prices.

Roosevelt clearly understood that to achieve success with the New Deal required economic recovery. Warren worked with Roosevelt on the content of a number of his fireside chats, especially when he moved to have the Reconstruction Finance Corporation buy newly minted gold in the United
States at prices to be determined by the secretary of the treasury and the president. Warren held his positions firmly, many times in direct opposition to other key advisors. This was also true on the Cornell campus, with Paul O’Leary and Harold Reed in the Department of Economics leading the faculty opponents to the revaluation of the dollar. The final decision to fix the price of gold at $35 per ounce again in January 1934 was but one of FDR's political compromises. Warren continued to believe that the price of gold should not be fixed but determined by market forces, and that the nation should operate with a managed currency. The desire in Congress and in industry to reestablish a known base for the dollar, both here and abroad, was too strong finally for FDR to ignore.

In 1934, Warren saw much less of FDR and was called to Washington primarily as an advisor to Morgenthau, one of Roosevelt’s closest friends and secretary of the treasury. This was also a period when Warren was working on the revisions of his earlier book, *Prices*, which he published in 1935 as *Gold and Prices*, with Pearson as his coauthor. Warren went to Europe in 1934 to participate in the International Conference of Agricultural Economists and lunched with the president on his return; most of the conversation concerned FDR's new efforts on public works. In succeeding years, Warren maintained regular communication with Morgenthau, but his direct role as presidential advisor was largely confined to sustained periods in 1933–1934 (Pearson, Myers, and Gans 1957, 5598–676). In the period when Warren was continuously in the public eye, he continued to see himself as an advisor, not as a spokesman. Pearson comments, “He never spoke to the press, wrote no articles, refused to air his views” (Pearson, Myers, and Gans 1957, 5675). Warren was both loyal to those whom he advised and silent about his personal opinions.

**A NEW BUILDING**

With a state appropriation in April 1930, the completion of a building to house the dispersed staff and students of the Department of Agricultural Economics from its four different locations on the campus was now possible. It was to be the campus location for the rural social sciences, and spaces were set aside in the building to house Rural Sociology. With commodity prices falling and construction workers anxious for work, it was an ideal time to build and furnish a building for faculty research and classes. George Lauman and E. G. Misner were given responsibility, on behalf of the faculty, for meeting regularly with the architects and those in charge of the project.
to ensure that good use was made of the appropriation. Modifications were made along the way to produce what Dean Ladd said in his 1933 annual report of the college was “. . . in many ways, the most satisfactory building that has ever been constructed at the College. It is efficiently arranged, well-constructed, and furnished with suitable facilities in every way; and the construction was completed promptly.”

The cornerstone for the new building was laid on May 23, 1932, with appropriate ceremony and remarks by President Livingston Farrand and Provost Albert R. Mann (former dean of the College of Agriculture), as well as Dwight Sanderson, head of Rural Sociology, and George Warren, head of Agricultural Economics. Warren, in his opening remarks on this great occasion, said, “The erection of this building comes as a result of the application of scientific methods of research to these fields in which this step was long overdue. The basis of most scientific work is measurement. Lord Kelvin says, ‘When you can measure what you are speaking about and express it in numbers, you know something about it, but when you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind.’” This quotation from Kelvin was clearly one of Warren’s favorites and appeared rather regularly in his speeches and writings.

The newly completed Warren Hall in the mid-1930s.
Warren's speech was titled “Development of Work in Farm Management, Marketing, Rural Economy, and Prices and Statistics.” He evidently saw these components of agricultural economics as the major areas of work, both at Cornell and nationally in 1932. His concluding remarks from his four-page speech retain some interest many decades later. “Not many years hence, economics will be equipped (for research) in every large university, and when as much money is spent on economic research as is spent on medical research, we will look back on conditions like the present, as we now look back on the typhoid epidemic, which ravaged the university in 1903—as a leftover from the Dark Ages. The state recognized the importance of scientific work in these fields and is providing this building as an investment. I hope that, as the years go by, the contributions through discovery of new truth and through teaching and public service may be as great per square foot of floor space in the new building as they have been in the old one.”
Participating in the ceremonies were the graduate students of the department that included representatives from Albania, Bulgaria, China (2), Canada (7), Denmark, England (2), Germany, Poland, and South Africa. Besides these 18 students from outside the U.S., another 25 students came from New York State and 66 others from 28 states, all registered in M.S. or Ph.D. programs. Out of this group of 109 students, 40 were minoring with one or more faculty in Agricultural Economics, with their majors in such fields as rural social organization, education, economics of the household, nutrition, or an applied field of agriculture. A formal picture of the department taken in 1932, in front of the old farm management building, identifies 40 individuals, all of whom were either faculty members or graduate assistants.
The new building provided the faculty, staff, and students with many wonderful advantages. A new library was located at the eastern end of the building in the basement with two full-time librarians and space for students to work and study. (This space is now used for graduate student offices, the Alfalfa Room for light meals, and storage.) At the other end of the building were the computing rooms and the IBM equipment, which allowed tabulation and calculation using punch-card equipment. These rooms, and the new generations of calculating equipment which followed, were used by faculty and students not only in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, but also by social scientists in Home Economics and Industrial and Labor Relations over many years. (Some of this space is still used for CALS computing labs and for the information technologies staff.) All the new classrooms were well appointed with blackboards, maps, and chart materials. It quickly became one of the most heavily used classroom buildings on the campus and remains in that status more than 70 years later.

One of the greatest values of the new building was the center it provided for the students, faculty, and staff. There was already a strong “esprit de corps” within the department. They now had a building and workplace in which they could take great pride, as well. The department head was a national figure and too often away from the campus from the point of view of students and staff. Bill Myers was generally looked to as the “acting chief.” The new seminar room provided a fine place for campus meetings and social events. The central lecture hall was in demand for college meetings and public events, as well as for classes. The new building for the rural social sciences soon became the informal student center on the upper campus, which in many ways it remained at the end of the century.

Faculty Work Overseas

Under the direction of Dean John Reisner, J. Lossing Buck worked in the field of agricultural economics on the Cornell-Nanking Cooperative Project, first as an agricultural missionary from 1915–1920, and then more directly as one of the faculty. Buck sent his students in agricultural economics to take farm management surveys in their home communities as a basis for obtaining information about the agricultural economy and to provide local materials as a basis for teaching. By 1925, he had data from 2,866 farms in 17 localities across China and published what he had obtained to that date as a new book, *The Chinese Farm Economy*.

The success of the Cornell-Nanking plant breeding program under Dr. Love, and the growth and development of agricultural economics at the college in Nanking, led to a grant of funds to expand the work Buck had started and to carry out further study of land utilization in China, using the survey procedures from his earlier study, but on a more comprehensive scale. As part of the funding for this ambitious project, provision was made to bring faculty
from Cornell to Nanking to work with the Chinese students and faculty, carrying out the project under Buck’s direction.

Buck completed his M.S. in 1925 and his Ph.D. in 1933 at Cornell, which made the organization of this project feasible. Dr. A. B. Lewis, who had worked on land classification studies in New York and had been a fellow graduate student with Buck, spent three years in Nanking on this project. S. W. Warren, G. W. Hedlund, W. M. Curtiss, and J. R. Raeburn each spent a year with the project, helping students and staff handle the large amounts of data that had been collected and assisting in teaching classes. Dr. Walter W. Wilcox from Cornell’s Department of Economics lectured on population statistics. A Ph.D. student, Ogden T. King, spent a year collecting data for his own thesis and helping with the project. This was the first of what would become a number of overseas projects for faculty and students in agricultural economics during the remainder of the century.

**Farm Finance, the Farm Credit System, and W. I. Myers**

The agricultural depression of the 1920s forced many farmers to give up their land or seek other forms of employment to survive. The Great Depression, from 1929 onward, pushed banks and credit institutions into the same economic dilemmas faced by their creditors. Banks failed along with farms and other businesses as the downward economic spiral caught up many honest and well-meaning people in its pervasive rush. W. I. “Bill” Myers, the young, new professor of farm finance, had bought a small farm on contract for $9,750 in 1920 north of the campus, expecting to pay for it from the income to be generated from his poultry enterprise. In 1924, Myers borrowed $8,000 from the Federal Land Bank to pay off his note to the former owner and took a mortgage on the farm on which he only had to pay interest indefinitely. Unlike most farmers, he had a regular, second source of income from which to meet interest payments if there was a lean year (Slaybaugh 1996, 68–69). The farm provided Myers an excellent set of practical experiences for his lectures in farm management, for which he had the reputation as one of the most able and popular teachers in the college. He was highly organized and genuinely liked his students. He was much sought after as a speaker by his former students, wrote for farm periodicals, and gave talks on the radio. Because of his friendship with his former colleague, H. E. Babcock, now general manager of the Grange League Federation (GLF), he became an informal advisor and then finally its assistant secretary in 1930, as well as president of the board of directors of its Farm Service Agencies arm. Myers always argued aggressively that cooperatives could only succeed if they were operated for profit, like any other business. It was Myers who wrote the operating rules for the local service stores. Whatever his official capacity, Myers regularly reviewed the cooperative’s finances (Slaybaugh 1996, 88–90). Farmers’ needs for credit to operate their farms in the postwar years grew more rapidly than the capacities of local banks or other financial institutions
to serve their needs. Earlier, Congress had passed the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916, which created 12 regional land banks, set up as cooperatives in conjunction with local farm loan associations, and 12 regional joint-stock land banks to lend to private businesses. The concept was that the more credit-worthy farmers would borrow from the joint-stock banks; poorer risks would turn to the local farm loan associations. This cooperative system was not organized by farmers to meet their needs, but essentially was handed down to them by a well-intentioned Congress and the federal government. When the credit crises came in the 1920s and early 1930s, the land banks were squeezed like their borrowers. They needed to pay their bondholders interest on the capital they had borrowed from them, and they had no cash to do it. The system was undercapitalized and unprepared to meet its challenges (Slaybaugh 1996, 101–7).

During FDR’s presidential campaign in 1932, Henry Morgenthau, as FDR’s closest advisor, turned to Myers for advice and counsel about the farm credit system and what needed to be done to shore it up to the benefit of all involved. As a political conservative, one might wonder why Myers worked closely with Morgenthau and Roosevelt. But as a public employee of the State College of Agriculture, Myers saw his first responsibility to be to the citizens of the state, as did Warren and the rest of the faculty. Moreover, much had been accomplished in working with Governor Roosevelt from 1928 onwards, and mutual respect and trust had been built accordingly. Besides, the national needs for rural America in 1932 and 1933 were so large that one could not help but try to assist when asked.

Myers obtained leave from Cornell and moved to Washington in November 1932, working as a technical advisor and deputy to Morgenthau. Myers’s principal assignment was to prepare new legislation to revitalize and reorganize the farm credit system, consulting with the best minds within the system and the banking community for ideas, and to build support for needed changes among the farm organizations and Congress. Two pieces of legislation resulted: the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (Slaybaugh 1996, 110–13). Initially, Myers served as Morgenthau’s assistant on the Federal Farm Board until the new Farm Credit Administration (FCA) was established, which then included provision for production credit banks along with the land banks, and a new Central Bank for Cooperatives to replace the now defunct Federal Farm Board. Myers and Morgenthau worked as a team, with Morgenthau as the governor of the FCA and Myers as its chief operations officer (deputy governor). The major officials of this new credit institution were chosen by Myers without political pressure from FDR’s office because Morgenthau served as the necessary buffer at the political level in Roosevelt’s inner circle.

Most of his first year at the FCA was spent by Myers in rebuilding a credit-worthy system nationally and in working to demonstrate to all that those with existing farm credit loans and those seeking to borrow could expect that the new funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would be used
wisely and would eventually be repaid. In November 1933, when Morgenthau was called to become the secretary of treasury, Myers became governor of the FCA.

Myers’s challenges as governor of the system were to continue to build and support this new cooperative credit system as it had been reorganized and, simultaneously, to learn how to do more of what was politically necessary to head this substantial federal agency. Astutely, Myers appointed as his first deputy governor W. Forbes Morgan, a former New York banker and party treasurer of FDR’s campaign. Morgan solved political patronage problems, allowing Myers to continue to hire the most qualified people for key management positions. In 1934, the workload of the system grew tremendously, processing 500,000 loans worth $1.25 billion, which was the peak year of business and when other agricultural lenders began returning to the market.

Myers was widely recognized as an excellent manager, both within and outside the FCA, and he took great satisfaction from the successes achieved in his critical first years in Washington. He had the support of Morgenthau and FDR throughout his tenure as governor of the FCA, which allowed him to maintain the independence of the agency and survive the inevitable criticisms of its conservative business orientation that came especially in the last year of Roosevelt’s first term as president (Slaybaugh 1996, 148–51).

Myers returned to Cornell in 1937, both because he felt that the FCA was now functioning smoothly, though under increased political pressure, and because he would lose his Cornell pension and appointment if he stayed away from Cornell for more than five years. He had had an excellent experience as manager of a very large government agency, responsible for making loans accumulating in the billions, and working with a loyal and dedicated staff, while establishing a fine reputation in Washington and throughout the country. He learned how to interact effectively with a wide range of people, including politicians from the South as well as the West and the Plains. He had become a seasoned administrator without losing his sense of his origins and the public he had set out to serve. But Myers returned to Cornell a different person. He was now a national personality, a respected leader in farm finance, and one at ease in administration. He had been tested under fire, served the public well, and was ready for new challenges.

While Myers served in Washington, responsibilities for research and teaching in farm finance first fell to Forrest F. “Frosty” Hill. He had quickly taken leadership for the land classification work when appointed to the faculty in 1930, and finance was directly related to his own professional interests. His
Ph.D. thesis under Myers had centered on the problems of making long-term mortgages in New York State. When Morgan left the FCA as deputy governor to raise money to pay off some of the party’s debts, Myers quickly sought and obtained the expert assistance of Frosty Hill in the critical year of 1934. It was a time when many new employees were being integrated into the system and the volume of loans was at an all-time high. Hill took the challenges of Washington in stride. He and Myers had great personal rapport and understood each other’s ways of doing business. Hill was an easy communicator, organizer, and strategist as deputy governor. He knew when to encourage and when to require strict adherence to the rules. The welding together of this large number of new employees into a functioning credit system, maintaining solid standards across the country, owes much to the dynamic, supportive leadership of these two able young men.

When Myers decided to return to Cornell at the end of Roosevelt’s first term as president, he naturally recommended that Hill continue on in Washington and be appointed governor of the FCA. With the support of New York’s Jim Farley and Senator Robert Wagner, Roosevelt agreed to this nonpolitical appointment. Myers and Hill both desired that the FCA would continue to operate as an independent agency, serving the credit needs of commercial farmers. The secretary of agriculture, Henry A. Wallace, had other ideas. He sought to bring together as many of the “independent” agencies serving agriculture as possible under his general management as part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). The political implications of such a move seemed clear. Exercising some control over how farmers received credit and who served on the boards of the banks in the 12 districts was of political interest to Wallace and of concern to Myers and Hill (Slaybaugh 1996, 190–91).

In 1938, Wallace sought to move Hill out of the FCA to a position at the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at a similar salary and rank so that he could move one of his own men into the governor’s position. Hill refused the arrangement and stayed on, hoping that farm organizations might build sufficient opposition to thwart Wallace’s moves, but to no avail. In due course, the FCA was incorporated into the USDA framework, but Hill held his ground within the agency, ensuring its relative independence in hiring key staff and establishing basic credit policy. Hill returned to Cornell in 1940 to his position as professor of farm finance. The agency he left had grown and matured into a well-recognized credit institution with a solid portfolio of loans amounting to more than $5 billion.

**EXTENSION AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

With limited resources available for travel and substantial calls from county extension agents for assistance with programs, written materials, radio, and telephone calls often were the vehicle of necessity in carrying forward extension programs. Extension bulletins and the department’s mimeo-
graphed publications were widely distributed and used both by faculty and county agents. G. F. Warren’s speeches were reproduced and heavily quoted in the *American Agriculturist*, *Rural New Yorker*, and the *Dairymen’s League News*.

Interdepartmental cooperation was an important part of extension work. A major effort was made to solve problems in potato production and marketing, with Rasmussen playing a key role in this effort. A school for town highway superintendents was organized growing out of the studies by Catherwood and Hurd and involving staff in Agricultural and Civil Engineering, as well as the leaders from Warren Hall. It was so well received that it was subsequently jointly sponsored by the Association of Towns and continues as an annual school in this new century. A nutrition school for feed manufacturers and distributors was launched in 1937 with leadership from faculty in Animal and Poultry Husbandry and assisted by faculty in Agricultural Economics and other relevant departments. Dean Ladd was an effective leader in building the idea of interdepartmental schools and finding the resources to make them a reality [Colman 1963, 447–56].

In the last three years of the decade, travel by rural people was enhanced as funds for improved roads began to affect county highways and some town roads. Attendance at Farm and Home Week reached an all-time high in 1938 with 14,111 attendees registered. As always, agricultural economists were important contributors to programs on each of the days, reporting on the results of current research and outlook for individual crops and livestock products.

**CLASSROOM TEACHING**

After reaching a high of 1,591 undergraduate students enrolled in the College of Agriculture in 1915–1916, numbers dropped off during World War I. In 1920–1921, 1,142 four-year undergraduates were enrolled; by 1929–1930, full-time enrollments in the college had fallen to 709. Thus, the decade of the 1930s started with a small number of students greatly concerned about the future of farming and the national economy. Throughout this decade, however, the number of four-year students gradually grew again. It had climbed to 1,003 for the 1934–1935 year, and had reached 1,368 in 1939–1940.

Enrollments in courses in agricultural economics and farm management grew steadily, as well, in the 10 to 12 courses offered each semester. Paul Williamson had large enrollments in Farm Records and Accounts as did Stan Warren for Farm Management. In the early 1930s, there were about 100 students in each of these courses. By 1938, student numbers had increased to 266 for Farm Records and Accounts and 231 for Farm Management. These were the big courses in the fall and spring terms respectively. The only other course offered in the department that regularly attracted more than 100 students was Business Law, taught by Allen Treman, a well-known local lawyer. In 1939, there were 1,024 students in classes taught in Agricultural
Economics in the fall semester and 755 in the spring semester. A large share of the students in the college took one or more courses in Warren Hall.

**THE FACULTY**

The early 1930s was a period when adding new positions to the faculty was not even discussed. Retaining the positions allocated to the college and finding salary money to meet the commitments to employees was of central concern. Salaries were reduced across the board early in the decade, but, with prices also reduced, this was not a major problem except in meeting debt payments. Most were happy to have continuing employment and a new building in which to work.

There were essentially 20 faculty positions in the department during most of these years. Those in farm management included Cunningham, Misner, Scoville, Stan Warren, and Williamson. Closely related in terms of extension and teaching interests were Hart, Hill, and Myers in farm finance, but during many of these years both Myers and Hill were in Washington.

The faculty in marketing were Bond, Boyle, Harper, Hedlund, Rasmussen, and Spencer. Bond’s work was primarily in extension; Boyle worked with the processing industries and the commodity exchanges; Harper was concerned with consumption issues; Hedlund did some work in finance as well as with cooperatives; Rasmussen’s central interests were in the fruit and vegetable markets; and Spencer headed up work in milk marketing.

Catherwood, Hurd, and Kendrick developed a set of strong programs directed toward local governments and could be thought of as leading the work in rural economy. Whiton Powell taught the courses in business management and accounting; Lauman continued to teach a course in political economy; and Pearson worked with Warren on prices, statistics, and index numbers.

This was a faculty of able men, selected by Warren from among the students who had completed their Ph.D.s at Cornell, with the exception of Boyle. Boyle (Ph.D., Wisconsin) had been chosen by Lauman after a substantial national search, before
the Department of Rural Economy had been incorporated into Agricultural Economics in 1919. While the faculty brought to the department and college a wide range of experiences, their economic training and perspectives were strongly influenced by Warren and his senior colleagues. Most had completed a minor in economics with Davenport, Reed, or Copeland. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, the graduate program in agricultural economics at Cornell attracted the largest number of students of any program in the country (Colman 1963, 395). Warren and his approach to solving real-world problems—by collecting quantitative data about the situation, its history, and the associated issues, and then examining what had been learned statistically—was fundamental to the training of both the faculty and their students. Around the United States, the faculty increasingly was seen as an “inbred” department that lacked some of the inherent differences of opinion and approaches to research that were more evident in other major graduate centers.

During most of 1933 and the first half of 1934, Warren spent substantial time in Washington as an advisor to FDR and Morgenthau, although he continued to teach his course in public problems each week. While his advice was much talked about in the media, he left most of the interviews to others in the political process. He went to Germany in the summer of 1934 to attend the ICAE meeting in Bad Eilsen, and then returned to Ithaca to finish Gold and Prices. In 1936, he went to St. Andrews, Scotland, for the fourth meeting of the ICAE, which was to be his last journey outside the United States. Now in his sixties, he enjoyed travel in France, Germany, Denmark, and England before the meetings in Scotland. He returned to work with Pearson on his final book, mentally vigorous, but failing in health. He died in May 1938, much loved and revered by his associates and former students.

James E. Boyle died in 1938, only a few months after Warren. Both had grown up on farms in Nebraska. Boyle completed his A.B. at Nebraska in 1900 and his Ph.D. in economics and political science at Wisconsin in 1904. Boyle also wrote a textbook, Agricultural Economics, published in 1921 shortly after he joined the Cornell faculty. His articles appeared in the Atlantic Monthly and the Saturday Evening Post on topics such as agrarian policy and the commodity markets. His teaching was in cooperatives and marketing.

**WARREN’S LEGACY**

Warren’s legacy to the department’s faculty and students was substantial in terms of both content and example. He had embraced many different subjects in his academic lifetime and prospered. As one who had come to Cornell to study horticulture, he moved quickly to use his undergraduate major in mathematics and statistics in the first farm management surveys. His path-breaking work in this new field, which he helped to develop, won him deserved national recognition. He was the first head of the Department of Farm Management and then head of the Department of Agricultural
Economics and Farm Management, when work in the rural social sciences was combined into one academic unit in 1919. He became a central figure in organizing what became the AFEA in 1919 and the International Association of Agricultural Economists (IAAE) in 1930. His main professional interest shifted from farm management to prices and index numbers during the years of World War I, where it remained for the rest of his life. But his interests in the rural economy were large, and he fostered and encouraged faculty colleagues in their efforts to study and learn more about the problems associated with land use, taxation and local government, cooperatives, and the marketing of farm products. He was the center around which the life of the department revolved.
Warren was an activist in encouraging the state to respond to the results of faculty and graduate student research, where public input, funding, and action were necessary to bring about changes to improve the lot of rural citizens. He became a frequent visitor to Albany in the second half of the 1920s, helping the leadership of the college work with the legislature and the governor. Warren and FDR communicated well in Albany and, subsequently, in Washington. The building bearing his name is a lasting tribute to the imprint he left in New York State, nationally, and in his profession. He was a dominant figure in the discipline of agricultural economics in its first half of the century, and his commitment to farm people and rural America left its mark on all who were associated with him. The statement in the university’s necrology concluded, “In the death of George Frederick Warren, the Faculty recognizes an irreparable loss. The most eminent agricultural economist of his time, a teacher of rare ability and great influence, a pioneer in agricultural science and teaching, a noted citizen and respected colleague, we record our heartfelt tribute to his memory.”

New Leadership for the College and the Department

There was only a span of nine years from the time Carl E. Ladd completed his Ph.D. in farm management and his appointment as the director of extension for agriculture and home economics in 1924. Dean Albert Mann had quickly recognized Ladd’s considerable talents as an administrator and his abilities to work effectively with a wide range of individuals who often thought otherwise. In August 1931, when Mann became the university provost, Ladd became the clear candidate to succeed Mann as dean and director of the experiment station.

While Mann tended to be reserved and fitted the mold of the traditional academic, Ladd was friendly, gregarious, and enjoyed mixing with the public. He was an active Rotarian and enjoyed writing articles for the American Agriculturist with Ed Eastman, its editor, recounting tales from his boyhood days of horses and one-room schools. In 1943, he and Eastman wrote a book published by Nesterman Press that drew together a number of tales from their respective early years, entitled Growing Up in the Horse and Buggy Days.

Carl Ladd started as dean in the depths of the Great Depression. It was a good time for a dean to be an optimist by nature. Relationships with the governor were good and the new building for agricultural economics was going up when he took office. Colman observed, “Ladd worked through both political parties to promote public policies of benefit to New York agriculture and to place men in office who would carry out these policies. While more politically active than his predecessors, Ladd avoided any appearance of public involvement. His frequent trips to Washington and Albany were not publicized and his strong opinions on major public issues were not generally known” (Colman 1963, 416). Ladd saw his position as dean of the college as
one of the key voices representing farmers and rural people in both the state and nation.

Perhaps the dominant agricultural leader during Ladd’s tenure as dean was H. E. Babcock, general manager of the GLF and a member of the university’s board of trustees, of which he became chairman in 1940. They worked well together through the Conference Board of Farm Organizations in seeking funding for the college and establishing state programs to improve rural roads, provide additional funding for rural schools, and expand rural electrification. They made their voices heard in Washington in support of the reorganized Farm Credit Administration and farmer controls over federal agricultural programs.

During his 11 years as dean, five of the heads of major departments selected by Bailey retired. Ladd sought strong leaders from across the country as replacements, sometimes losing his first choice to the University of California, Berkeley. After the new heads were appointed, it was Ladd’s view that they must be made known to the people of the state. This was accomplished through the extension service by scheduling them to speak before farm groups and over the radio. Farm and Home Week continued to grow as an annual event where farm people were encouraged to come to Ithaca to see the results of research, get the latest recommendations, and meet the faculty who made them.

One of the men Ladd chose to head a department was William I. Myers. Myers was the acknowledged heir-apparent in agricultural economics before he went to Washington in 1932. His experience in handling the growth and development of the FCA provided him substantial stature both within and outside the department. He had worked successfully with farm leaders, bankers, industrialists, and economists in the Federal Reserve System across the nation. His long-standing relationships with farm leaders and his former students in the Northeast added to the logic of his assuming direction of the department at the time Warren died.

The transition from the point of view of the faculty was easy and natural. For Myers, the return to Ithaca must have been more complex. After both the challenge and excitement of leading a major government agency and answering questions from within and outside Washington, the quiet of an academic department with a smaller budget than it had in 1931 presented different needs and opportunities. He clearly missed his old mentor and friend George Warren. But his natural instincts were to follow the patterns long established by his predecessor. When the opportunities to obtain new faculty occurred, he looked from within, not from outside.
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The Impacts of World War II and New Technology

1940–1949

In 1940, World War II had begun in Europe and the depths of the Great Depression were no longer so troubling to farmers, small businesses, and most of the nation. For most rural people, the war was in Europe; prices for commodities were rising; and it was a time to obtain a new or different used car or tractor and to enjoy some relief from the pressures of a decade of scarcity and need. In this setting, agricultural economics naturally sought to have state funding return to the levels of the late 1920s. Governor Lehman was a solid supporter of these efforts. With Bill Myers as department head and Carl Ladd as dean, the importance of work in agricultural economics was well recognized by the state and the college’s administration.

Priority was given to the work on county land utilization and classification studies, which had been slowed during the depression years. The efforts to identify land areas that should not return to commercial farming were seen as particularly important. The group with interests in land economics and farm finance became closely allied in their teaching, research, and extension efforts, with F. F. Hill as the acknowledged leader on his return from Washington. The teaching in public problems of agriculture, formerly the domain of G. F. Warren, was now handled by Dean Ladd, with guest lectures and assistance from Myers and Hill. F. A. Pearson continued his research on prices and index numbers, as well as his role as editor of Farm Economics. Research on regional markets and price determination for fresh fruits and vegetables was supported. Issues in milk marketing from farm to market and costs of milk production commanded major attention.

The Adjustment to Wartime Conditions

Almost as soon as the department began to operate with more students and a few more resources, the reality of involvement in a war of international proportions loomed on the horizon.

No one in Ithaca was prepared for the suddenness of December 1941 and the calls it made on faculty, students, and staff. Bill Myers’s comments in the
December 1942 issue of *News Notes* gives a sense of the situation: “The problem of reorganizing the work of this department to a war basis differs greatly from departments in arts colleges which devote their attention to the teaching of undergraduate students. As our teaching load has declined, we have had an increase in the demand for research on problems of great importance and a tremendous increase in the demand for extension work dealing with the problems of war food production. Our problem, therefore, has been to rearrange men and funds so as to take care of increased needs without unnecessary sacrifice of the long-time program of the department.”

Quickly, faculty were called into military service, or asked to assist in advising or to take responsibility for specific programs. Martin Catherwood, professor of public administration, was called by Governor Lehman to be commissioner of commerce in Albany. Myers and Van B. Hart were called to give advice on programs at the U.S. Treasury. Rasmussen went to Washington to serve on the War Production Board. T. Norman Hurd was appointed farm manpower director for New York State. Dean Ladd was tireless in his encouragement of the faculty and staff to find ways to support the war effort and help increase agricultural output. One of the costs of the effort was Dean Ladd’s own health. He died on July 23, 1943, at age 55.

Many of Dean Ladd’s friends and associates felt this tragedy occurred as a result of too many long hours at work and an inability to rest when pressures mounted. He had lived through the Great Depression and now succumbed in the midst of a great war, as a soldier on the home front. He was remembered with great warmth and admiration by his colleagues and many friends across the state and nation. They saw him as a true friend of agriculture and the people who lived on the land. In his honor, the Carl E. Ladd Memorial Scholarship endowment fund was established and hundreds of students have since benefited from this tribute to an agricultural economist who did so much for the department and college in the first half of the century.

W. I. Myers was named dean of the college by President Day shortly after Ladd’s untimely death, and this appointment received the unanimous support of the college’s faculty (Slaybaugh 1996, 157–58). There was a substantial difference in the style of the two men and their interaction with the college faculty and staff, as well as the farming community. Ladd, first as a
professor with a primary extension appointment and then as director, was open, friendly, and particularly enjoyed being out, interacting with the public. He got to the office early and worked late, with his door open to visitors and students.

While at the Farm Credit Administration (FCA) in Washington, Myers operated, first out of necessity and then by personal preference, through a chain of command and with great efficiency. He knew what was going on because the chain of command he established worked well and reported regularly. On his return to the department in 1938, he was offered and then accepted positions on the boards of directors of major industrial corporations, and he began a regular association with the leaders of business in this country, which continued and grew during his years as dean. While he did not lack interest or commitment to the rural people of the state, he was less visible to the man on the street and to students and the faculty than was his predecessor. Amy Whetzel served as secretary to both men while they were dean. Slaybaugh, in his biography of Myers, observes, “Whetzel also perceived a very different focus for each of the two deans. Ladd’s was with the problems of the college and the farmers of New York State. By contrast, Myers’ was toward the business aspects of agriculture, nationally and internationally” (Slaybaugh 1996, 158).

In this difficult wartime setting, Frank Forrest (“Frosty”) Hill was named department head. He, too, had had substantial experience in Washington, working with Myers as his immediate deputy and then as governor of the FCA. Frosty was a people person, full of ideas, and had the ability to know in a conversation what you were going to say often before you said it. Like Myers, he expected high levels of performance from his associates, but he also could relax from business and was at ease with all his associates. Some excerpts from his lead article in the December 1945 issue of News Notes gives a sense of the situation then.

Research during the war period was necessarily confined to wartime problems because these were most urgent and because of the shortage of manpower and transportation. Farmers are now faced with the necessity of adjusting to postwar conditions. For one thing, the farm population of the United States decreased by something over five million persons between 1940 and 1945, which is nearly three times the decrease that occurred in the preceding 30 years. Of the total number living on farms, approximately 75 percent were civilians. The question arises as to how many of these people will return to farms after the war. . . . Shortage of all trained manpower will undoubtedly continue to plague us for the next four or five years, particularly if business continues to actively bid for scientific personnel of all kinds (News Notes 1945).
THE POSTWAR PERIOD AND ITS CHALLENGES

Immediately after the war, the veterans returned to pick up where they left off or start new careers in new places. With access to the G.I. Bill, many who had been in college when they were drafted or enlisted, or had wanted to go to college but could not afford it, now appeared on college campuses. Cornell was no different from every other university. While Navy V5 and V12 students were still marching to class in the fall of 1945, the veterans started coming in substantial numbers to the College of Agriculture and filled some classes to overflowing. There was a short-run shortage of instructors and resources to meet the classes, but a delight in returning to a normal pattern of life on campus.

RESIDENT INSTRUCTION

At the beginning of the decade, there were almost 2,000 students enrolled in the 30 different classes taught by department faculty during two semesters. At the low point in 1944–1945, there were only 311 students in the 15 courses offered. The largest classes were 40 students in Farm Management taught by Stan Warren and 67 students in the new class in Agricultural Geography offered by Herrell DeGraff.

In 1949–1950, student numbers were back to 2,110 for the 27 courses offered over two semesters. Agricultural Geography became the introductory course for most freshmen in the college with 432 students, a reflection of its excellent content and DeGraff’s masterful skills as a teacher. Stan Warren’s course in Farm Management attracted 317 students. Other large enrollments were in Business Law with 154, Pearson’s Prices course with 109, Cooperatives taught by Hedlund with 114, Marketing taught by Darrah with 104, and Taxation taught by Kendrick with 115. There were a total of 1,484 four-year students again in the college; many were enrolled in classes taught in Warren Hall.

In the May 1948 issue of News Notes, Frosty Hill provided a useful picture of the ways in which the department was trying to respond to what he saw as its critical needs in the immediate postwar years: “There is evidence that production is beginning to catch up to demand in the case of textiles, washing machines, deep freezers, and certain other items. There is little evidence that we are catching up with the demand for work or trained manpower in almost all branches of agricultural economics, resulting from the fact that the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 and increased appropriations in many states have increased the demand for men. Although prediction is always dangerous, it looks as though it is
“going to take another year or two, or perhaps longer, for the supply of trained manpower to catch up with demand.”

**MARKETING**

Nearly everyone acknowledged the need for research and additional attention to work in marketing agricultural products. New federal funds, widely distributed across the country by formula, made this possible. As Hill pointed out, the number of qualified individuals to direct this work was smaller than the obvious need. But changes in methods of assembly, packaging, distribution, and retailing were moving forward at surprising rates. The needs for assembly and distribution during the war years had brought about substantial efficiencies at different points in a far-flung system of agricultural markets for perishable products dominated by small firms at nearly every level. The need for many changes seemed readily evident; research to assist the process had now been made possible with federal funds in most states.

The first interest at Cornell was for additional work in milk marketing because of milk’s dominant place in the state’s agricultural economy. Additional work in fruits and vegetables had almost equal priority. Two senior faculty took leadership of these new initiatives. Leland Spencer was already a central figure in milk marketing in the Northeast and nationally. In a similar manner, M. P. Rasmussen was widely recognized as an authority on regional and central markets for fruits and vegetables.

Two new faculty members in marketing with recent Ph.D.s from Cornell provided new energy and enthusiasm in this research effort. Max E. Brunk had completed his M.S. before the war and then returned to Florida, where he prepared five experiment station bulletins based on his research emphasizing methods of improving efficiency in the use of labor and materials in the production and marketing of perishable crops. In 1945, he returned to Cornell, where he completed his doctorate on a project considering cost-effective methods of mechanizing harvest procedures in the field which bypassed the packing shed. Brunk, when appointed to the faculty, immediately established a time-and-motion laboratory on campus, looking for ways to save both time and materials in marketing perishables, from roses to fresh
market apples. In this same period, Lawrence B. Darrah took over leadership for marketing work in poultry and eggs. He set about looking at both production costs on the farm and the rapid innovations that were taking place in the industry to reduce labor at every level, with cages, new technology, and mechanization.

New funding brought graduate student interest and the necessary support for field work with both retailers and wholesalers. Cooperative work was established with faculty in Pomology, Floriculture, Vegetable Crops, and Poultry Science. Leland Spencer and his students completed a series of studies on the seasonality of milk production and its impact on prices and markets, the impacts of differences among milk control agencies in the Northeast, and potential efficiencies in processing and distribution of milk in the region. The report of the New York Milkshed Price Committee, chaired by Frosty Hill, was issued in February 1949. The first studies of merchandizing practices were initiated with the cooperation of retailers. Important new contacts were established at nearly all levels within the food industry, from farm to retail.

The new technology associated with freezing perishable foods and the place of this technology in the marketplace was examined by several graduate students and faculty members. The frozen food locker as a cooperative or business in rural communities was examined; the foods best adapted to this technology, the potential for home freezers, and freezing products on farms were also considered. Over the span of the decade, this method of preservation became a part of American life. The need for additional short-term studies evaluating the feasibility of new technology became part of the department’s extension and research agenda.

LAND UTILIZATION AND LAND ECONOMICS

A number of counties wanted land classification maps completed in a manner similar to those prepared before the war for other counties as part of the efforts initiated when Franklin D. Roosevelt was governor of the state. The intent was to identify areas where commercial agriculture might be feasible and to point out where forestry and recreation were the wisest uses of these natural resources. The State Conservation Department had a program after the war in which hundreds of thousands of trees were available for private reforestation projects. The need was to identify appropriate locations throughout the state for this effort that was designed to discourage farming where it was likely to be unsuccessful.

As an indicator of what would become a more important issue in succeeding decades, Howard Conklin, as a graduate student, initiated a study on the “rural-urban” fringe under the direction of Frosty
Hill in 1942, which was subsequently completed after the war. Conklin took over primary responsibility for the county land classification studies when he joined the faculty in 1948, after completing his Ph.D. and spending a period at the University of California, Berkeley. He had a strong interest in statistics and methods of sampling, which helped to bring about modifications in procedures followed in gathering data for these studies and those conducted in farm management. Experimentation with the use of aerial photographs and U.S. geological survey topographic quadrangle maps in establishing segments and probability samples was begun.

**FARM MANAGEMENT**

The Tompkins County survey was repeated in the Town of Dryden for the year 1947, as had been done every 10 years since 1907. Likewise, the Livingston County survey was conducted for the 1948–1949 business year. Partly because of costs, the number of labor income records obtained was reduced in each case to about 100. Receipts and expenditures on a “typical” commercial farm in 1947 were substantially greater in number and complexity than even in 1937. Short-form records were obtained from all the other farms and rural residences from which records had been obtained 10 years earlier. The cost account project was renewed with those participants who had kept records before the war years. Assistant Professor C. Delmar Kearl, a new faculty member following the war, took over responsibility for this program. Survey records for fruit farms in the Hudson Valley and in Niagara County were completed under the direction of Professor Gad P. Scoville.

Concerns about the costs of producing milk and the feasibility of dairy farming in the postwar years continued. L. C. Cunningham prepared two bulletins discussing these issues: *The Cost of Producing Milk, Montgomery County 1944–45* and *Commercial Dairy Farming in New York* in November 1947 and December 1949. The advantages of increased herd size and the experience gained from earlier studies across the state were emphasized. Two other bulletins issued in December 1949 recognized the need for increased emphasis on efficiency in the use of farm labor: *Labor in Dairy Farm Chores* and *Labor Used and Cost of Harvesting Hay in New York.*

**FARM WORK SIMPLIFICATION**
As part of the effort to save time and effort during the war years, a cooperative project was initiated at a number of universities under the direction of Dr. E. C. Young of Purdue University and financed by the General Education Board. Ivan Bierly led the work at Cornell, with time-and-motion studies of carrying out farm chores, harvesting hay and corn silage, cultural practices and harvest methods for potatoes, and pruning and brush removal in orchards. Further work was done after the war years, seeking ways to reduce labor requirements in milking and manure management on dairy farms, and the evaluation of new labor-saving technology relative to the associated costs of ownership and operation. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, there was an important national commitment to this approach directed toward reducing manual labor and costs in farm production that was carried out at a number of experiment stations. By the end of the 1950s, efforts to evaluate new labor-saving technology continued at agricultural experiment stations. The labor-intensive and costly procedures of time-and-motion studies, however, were left to engineers and the firms developing new farm equipment or systems of production.

**AN EXTENSION PROGRAM IN FOOD MARKETING FOR CONSUMERS**

A new cooperative program was established in 1948–1949 with the College of Home Economics under the direction of M. C. Bond, extension leader in Agricultural Economics, and Frances Scudder, state leader in home economics extension. A regional office to serve the metropolitan New York area was
established in New York City with Research and Marketing Agency (RMA) funds, under contract with Cornell University. Personnel were hired to carry out extension education programs with metropolitan consumers, the first extension effort in the state specifically directed toward urban consumers. Information developed in the metropolitan area for this extension effort was distributed directly to the press, radio, and other news sources. The materials prepared in Ithaca, from its office base in Warren Hall, were distributed primarily through the county extension system. A food marketing bulletin was issued weekly and another weekly news sheet, *Food Marketing Information*, was distributed directly to institutions, social workers, and food industry representatives.

**Publications from the Faculty and Staff**

During the 1930s, the department had begun a series of numbered mimeographed publications to report the results of research and to summarize farm account records for individual county programs. This type of report allowed timely summaries to be made available to participants in projects and to reduce costs of publication. Printing extension and experiment station bulletins was still given priority, but funds and time requirements encouraged the greater use of these Agricultural Economics (A.E.) mimeographed reports. During the war years, the preparation of A.E. reports became one of the most important means of communicating the results from research projects in a timely fashion and of sharing economic information with extension staff.

*Farm Economics* continued to be a major outlet for price data and index numbers about the economy, as well as a means of providing short summaries of results from research. Between July 1932 and June 1940, 43 issues were distributed with an average of 28 pages each. Every issue included a lead article by Warren, usually coauthored with Frank Pearson, until April 1938. Pearson continued the lead articles in the 1940s, emphasizing prices and economic outlook, but now with a junior author, W. I. Myers, who had replaced Warren as department head. The support of Dean Ladd in funding this series in a time of financial stress was critical to this publication’s continued success and wide distribution.

During the years of World War II, *Farm Economics* was a major source of economic information and outlook materials. It included short articles on coping with shortages directed to both farmers and consumers. Bill Myers had lead articles such as “Looking Back at 1943 and Ahead at 1944 in New York Agriculture” and “Effect of Production Controls on Farm Income.” It also included short reports summarizing results from graduate student theses. The emphasis was on the economic conditions imposed by the war
and ways of understanding them, as well as how to cope with these problems.

One lead article in April 1945 was titled “Meat” by Pearson, Myers, and Lorie. It presented graphs of expansions and contractions in livestock numbers from 1890 to the present, liquidations in numbers during the war years, trends in production, the meat shortage, the spring outlook for metropolitan areas, and the future demands and potential for meat production in Europe in the postwar years. Another article in the same issue was titled “Effect of War on Retail Sales and Consumer Savings” by F. A. Harper, while the final article was “War Veterans Want Land” by V. B. Hart. From October 1940 through October 1945, *Farm Economics* and its 776 pages of current prices, index numbers, and topical information about agriculture and the general economy served its many readers in the state and across the country very well.

In the immediate postwar years, the flow of information through A.E. reports continued to grow, while the role of printed extension bulletins and experiment station bulletins declined as printing costs and time requirements between manuscript delivery and publication increased. In the academic year 1948–1949, one memoir, Don Paarlberg’s *Prices of Butter, Lard, and Cottonseed Oil*, two extension bulletins, and two experiment station bulletins written by faculty and staff were published. In the same period, 37 A.E. reports were issued covering extension and research topics. *Farm Economics* remained a major publication outlet, with a substantial distribution list both within and outside the state.

**Prices and Presidents**

Perhaps the most widely discussed and frequently quoted article to appear in *Farm Economics* appeared in the September 1948 issue. It was written by Pearson and Myers and titled “Prices and Presidents.” Some quotes from the article itself help to tell the story:

> During the spring and summer of presidential election years, one of the major enterprises of the American people is speculating on the outcome of the current political campaign. Much of the guessing is based on rumors and political gossip. Perhaps greater success would attend these forecasts if more attention were paid to the lessons of history... The theory is this: The public tends to vote for the continuation of administrations that have been in power during prosperous times and to vote against the incumbent administration when depression marks the approach of election time. This theory does not imply that there is any objec-
tive connection between changing or continuing administrations and the health of the nation’s economy. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that the policies of our major political parties would almost be indistinguishable from each other if they were not clearly labeled “Democratic” or “Republican.” There is a strong implication, however, that there is a connection in the minds of voters between political administrations and the country’s economic welfare.

Following these introductory comments, Pearson and Myers reviewed presidential elections from 1828 forward through 1944. They divided all these elections into two groups: those when prices were declining or when “low” prices had prevailed for some time, and those where prices were rising or “high” prices prevailed. In each case, they found two exceptions to their general theory, but most followed the expected pattern. They discussed each of the cases in some detail. They concluded their article with six scenarios for the election in November between Truman and Dewey. They considered: (1) three states of the price level—stable, rising, and falling; and (2) the number of votes for Wallace-Dixiecrats—few or many. Their concluding paragraph stated: “The only startling conclusion that this type of reasoning leads to is that Truman will win in November if the price level is stable at the present level or continues to rise—provided that Wallace and the Dixiecrats get few votes. If any one of the other combinations occurs, that is, if prices decline or the minor contenders have a substantial success, Dewey will be the winner.”

The article concluded with a line, “Written July 15, 1948.” In the November 1948 issue, there was a one paragraph lead, titled “Prices and Presidential Elections” by Pearson and Myers, dated November 3, 1948: “The recent election followed the time-honored pattern. If one had looked over the shoulder of Time and studied the role of the price level in our 31 presidential elections during the past one and a quarter centuries, he would have reached the conclusion that President Truman would succeed himself unless the Dixiecrats and Wallace obtained a substantial vote.”

During the months of November and December 1948, Pearson and Myers received substantial newspaper and radio coverage for their article and their correct forecast of the election. At the end of the century, pundits now consider the state of the economy to be much more important than 50 years ago when commenting on their forecasts of elections.

Books

Faculty members produced a number of new books during the 1940s. A new textbook designed primarily for students of agriculture in high schools and junior colleges, *Farm Management and Marketing*, was written by V. B. Hart, M. C. Bond, and L. C. Cunningham, and published by J. Wiley & Sons in
1942. In the same year, *Statistical Methods Applied to Agricultural Economics*, written by F. A. Pearson and K. R. Bennett, was also released by Wiley.


**THE FACULTY AND ITS ACTIVITIES**

During the war years, faculty members not serving in the military or in some government agency maintained a core teaching and research program, as well as a sustained extension effort. In 1945 and early 1946, most of those on leave returned and funding from both state and federal sources made possible the addition of new staff to meet the growing needs in teaching and the expanded work in marketing, both extension and research.

Herrell DeGraff joined the faculty in 1941 as assistant professor of land economics after completing his doctorate under the direction of F. F. Hill. He then did postdoctoral study in economics at the University of Chicago for one year and organized the materials for a new introductory course, *Agricultural Geography*, covering “... the natural, economic, and historical factors influencing the geographic distribution of crop and livestock production.” By the end of the decade, this course attracted the largest enrollment of any in the college and over time became the department’s key introductory course. DeGraff’s professional interests centered increasingly on population and food economics, particularly livestock products and their appropriate place in the diet.

M. P. Catherwood, professor of public administration and the key figure in the department’s programs in local government, was on leave during much of the war, serving as New York State’s commissioner of commerce. In 1947, Catherwood resigned his position in the department to become the dean of the School of Industrial and Labor
Relations at Cornell that had been established immediately after the war. Edward A. Lutz was appointed as a new assistant professor of local government on Catherwood’s resignation.

Whiton Powell, professor of business management, served as chairman of the college’s Library Committee, making plans for the new building and consolidated library (now Mann Library) to be built in the space between Plant Science and Warren Hall on the eastern end of the quadrangle. In 1947, he was named college librarian and devoted his energies to planning this major project and administering the existing library. On his return from Albany, T. Norman Hurd was appointed to Powell’s former position in business management.

The first faculty member in the college appointed with the title of professor of rural economy, George Lauman, retired in 1942 after more than 40 years of service. His final years were largely devoted to teaching his classes in Rural Economy and the History of Agriculture. He died in 1944 and was remembered by his friends in the *Necrology of the Faculty* as “. . . a sturdy individualist, who lived his own life and no other. . . . In Professor Lauman, gentleness and humor were blended with understanding. He was in his personal relations the soul of courtesy, consideration, and honor.”

Three faculty members, F. A. Harper, W. M. Curtiss, and I. R. Bierly, left the department in the years following the war to work at the Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington-on-Hudson. The foundation and its work was strongly oriented toward a free market economy with a minimum of government “interference” in the affairs of the citizenry and the operations of business. None of these faculty members returned later to academic positions.

Glenn W. Hedlund, who had resigned in 1941 to head the department at the Pennsylvania State University, returned to the faculty as a professor of business management, working with cooperatives and farm finance. C. A. Bratton, after his tour of duty in the military, joined the faculty as assistant
professor of farm management, a new position as extension economist. Carleton Wright and Mary Wood joined the staff as extension economists to prepare materials and administer the new program in food marketing for consumers.

To meet undergraduate teaching needs for students oriented to careers in business management and marketing, part-time lecturers in business law and accounting were hired, rather than trying to find an agricultural economist who was prepared and qualified to teach these subjects. The department head, Frosty Hill, recognized that individuals in the community practicing in these fields and interested in teaching were available. This approach provided students with insight into current issues in each of the fields, as well as the basic subject matter.

While finding qualified and competent lecturers was at times a challenge, the net result of this concept and decision by Hill, first taken in the 1930s and continued throughout the rest of the century, has proven to be of benefit both to students and the faculty. In succeeding years, senior lecturers in business law, accounting, and statistics have all been chosen to receive the “Professor of Merit Award,” an annual college-wide selection made by the seniors to one individual from among all of the college’s teachers for the quality of their teaching and advising. The first recipient of this award, established in 1948, was Stanley W. Warren, professor of farm management. Over time, teachers in Agricultural Economics have won more than a proportionate share of these awards, reflecting the department’s commitment to teaching and the high quality of their efforts.

At the end of the 1940s, the senior faculty in farm management included Van B. Hart, E. G. Misner, and G. P. Scoville, all of whom had been on the faculty for 30 years or more. Stan Warren and Lou Cunningham were major figures in research and teaching. The newcomers were C. D. Kearl, responsible for cost accounts, and Art Bratton, leading the extension efforts along with Lou Cunningham. Stan Warren served as vice president of the AFEA in 1947 and served on a national panel sponsored
by the Social Science Research Council on research in farm management.

The senior men in marketing were Leland Spencer and M. P. Rasmussen, along with Maurice C. Bond, who was also extension leader for the department. New active figures in marketing were Max Brunk and Lawrence Darrah. Filling a new position at the end of the decade was Wendell Earle, in poultry marketing with major responsibilities for extension. In addition, four new faculty positions were filled with “acting assistant professors” of marketing; more permanent appointments in these new slots were made in the 1950s.

The faculty in land economics and farm finance included F. F. Hill, Herrell DeGraff, and Howard Conklin. Frank Pearson continued as editor of Farm Economics, as well as carrying out his work in teaching and research in prices and statistics. All of the new faculty hired in the 1940s had completed their Ph.D.s at Cornell, although both DeGraff and Conklin had been encouraged to spend a year, respectively, at Chicago and the University of California, Berkeley.

The decade of the 1940s ended much as it started—on a positive note. More resources were available to the department and faculty positions awaited qualified individuals when they became available. The head of the department was a nationally respected figure, F. F. Hill, as had been the case when W. I. Myers held the position. Enrollment in the college was growing and demand for places in department course offerings was high. A solid set of programs in research and extension was in place. The staff exhibited a strong sense of collegiality as it set about meeting the many challenges and opportunities to make important contributions to the welfare of the people of the state.
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*News Notes,* first issued in October 1931 as a mimeographed staff publication, was issued several times each year to keep faculty and staff informed. It soon had sections reporting on positions taken by graduate students and reports from them in their current locations. In December 1945, the numbered series had reached 37. From this point forward, it became an annual publication reporting on events in the department, changes in faculty, numbers of students in courses, and news from former graduate students around the world. This publication continues into the twenty-first century. Past issues of *News Notes* (one copy) are held in Mann Library [S560, N7, A2].
As the new decade opened, the national economy was no longer on a wartime footing. The veterans had returned to new jobs and a rapidly industrializing world in which farming was to become a smaller part of the whole in terms of employment and income generation.

In this setting, the College of Agriculture was enrolling fewer than 1,500 four-year undergraduates. The college also offered an active two-year program with reduced entrance requirements in terms of mathematics and science, which enrolled 199 students in 1950–1951 and 195 in 1960–1961. In a like manner, the numbers of regular four-year students held steady (1,462 in 1950–1951 and 1,448 in 1960–1961) throughout the decade. Graduate students majoring in one of the fields in the college numbered 788 in 1950–1951 and 943 at the end of the decade. All in all, the college had returned to stable funding and enrollments.

The 1950s were a time of tremendous change in agriculture as new technology and capital were applied at nearly every level where food and agricultural products were produced, assembled, and processed. No sector of the food industry escaped the sweep of innovation, discovery, and advancement. Farmers invented new machines to harvest snap beans in the field. Egg production became industrialized as caged-layer operations replaced the two- and three-story chicken houses and operations so common in New York. Freezing fruits and vegetables became a standard method of processing. Loose-housing and milking parlors began to replace stanchion barns in the dairy industry. Bulk tanks on farms and refrigerated tank trucks carried fresh milk to processing plants.

It was an exciting time with many challenges as the faculty and staff were called to help evaluate new technology and assist in the processes associated with these fast-moving currents of change. Problems of adjustment were real and difficult. The calls upon extension and research faculty to reach out and help to answer questions were many.

In this setting, the services of agricultural economists were in greater demand than the supply of well-trained, able individuals who were prepared to work in this field. The market for applied economists who had a good background in agriculture and the food industry grew rapidly as businesses,
government agencies, and universities competed for their services. In particular, businesses learned that individuals with advanced degrees in agricultural economics were well prepared to do many useful tasks, and interest in graduate programs grew accordingly across the country.

Dean Myers provided the lead article in the February 1951 issue of *Farm Economics*, titled “American Agriculture at Mid-Century.” His introductory comments provide a sense of the times and the author’s views, when they were widely sought and in great demand:

The United States is moving steadily in the direction of becoming a nation of employees of business corporations and government; and especially of large corporations and big government. The change has brought great economic gains but a loss of political stability. The six million self-employed farmers—each part capitalist and part worker—are the most important single group in maintaining freedom and private competitive enterprise.

The interdependence of farmers and other businessmen is equally clear in economic affairs. During the past century American agriculture has shifted from dependence on the muscles of men and animals to largely mechanized production. In 1850, each farm worker produced food and fiber for himself and about four other persons. The 1950 farm worker feeds himself and about 14 other persons.

Midway through his article, Myers commented,

The greatest threat to continued progress in agricultural efficiency is the possibility of rigid governmental controls accepted as part of a program of price and income supports. Price-support programs have evolved as attempted solutions to the problem of protecting farmers against severe losses resulting from declining or low prices during depressions. Wide fluctuations in farm prices are the most important economic problem of agriculture. The general price level is becoming increasingly rigid because of administered prices, fair-trade laws, long-term wage agreements, pension plans, and such. Farm prices fluctuate more widely than costs because, in large part, they represent basic commodities sold on competitive markets.

Myers concluded his article,

All this adds up to the need for a continuing increase in production and efficiency on American farms. In the future, as in the past, progress will be based primarily on the application of science and engineering to agriculture. The best progress will not be possible unless farm families can continue to operate in a free economy
without rigid governmental regulation. Farmers and other businessmen are natural allies in working for greater economic stability and for the preservation of the free choice system of private competitive enterprises in America.

When Eisenhower was elected president in 1952, he chose Ezra Taft Benson to be his secretary of agriculture. Benson established an agricultural advisory committee with whom he met in Washington, D.C., once a month. Myers served as chairman of this committee throughout most of Benson’s eight years as secretary. Myers’s general philosophy and outlook, regularly reflected in his writings and speeches, is suggested in the preceding excerpts from his article. He repeatedly talked about the changing number of consumers each farm worker fed as a result of improved technology and increased efficiency in nearly all of his speeches.

HANDLING AND MERCHANDISING PERISHABLE PRODUCTS

Washington, D.C., provided new funds to find ways to increase efficiency in the processes of moving perishable products from the farm to the consumer. From the starts made in the late 1940s, major gains were made in the 1950s. One of the breakthroughs in this process was provided by carefully observing consumers’ behavior in their purchase decisions in retail stores with perishable products. Max E. Brunk and his graduate students worked with Walter T. Federer in Biometrics in establishing a set of controlled experiments that could be conducted in retail stores where treatments could be varied, while controlling for many other variables influencing purchase decisions and sales. Donald A. Van Waes, Bennett A. Dominick, and Peter L. Henderson completed a series of increasingly sophisticated studies for their Ph.D.s on alternative merchandising techniques in the sale of apples.

The results from this body of research were reported rapidly in many places because of the great success achieved and the immediate applications in retail outlets. A good summary is provided in a September 1953 article in the Journal of the American Statistical Association titled “Experimental Designs and Probability Sampling in Marketing Research,” by Max E. Brunk and Walter T. Federer. The article includes information about the early work of Van Waes in studying the effect of bruising on sales of apples: “In order to simulate actual conditions, it was necessary to have only one degree of bruising in a store at any one time, and in order to obtain valid comparisons among the various degrees of bruising it was necessary that they be tested under comparable conditions. Since time and store
differences represented two major sources of variation, a design with two-way elimination of variation was desirable. The Latin Square design was admirably suited for this situation."

Building on these early experiments and with excellent cooperation from apple growers and retail stores, where the studies were conducted, more complex experiments were conducted where merchandising innovations in such concerns as size and location of displays, and the size and form of packaging were considered. Double changeover designs using orthogonal 3 x 3 Latin Squares were used to control for such events as holidays, day of week, and differential customer traffic patterns. One innovation, the packaging of apples in polyethylene bags together with apples in a bulk display, increased sales so rapidly in some test stores that it was difficult to keep managers from abandoning the study plan and using that practice “to get on with selling more apples.”

The methodologies developed in these initial studies also were successfully tested with a variety of other commodities by L. B. Darrah and his students, as well as by Brunk and other marketing faculty. Merchandising studies with eggs, poultry, meats, potatoes, dry beans, roses, carnations, peaches, and even ornamentals were conducted in supermarkets and retail outlets throughout the 1950s. Retailers and food manufacturers recognized the value of these procedures to study consumer response to new products or new methods and began to carry
out their own studies. By the end of the decade, both food suppliers and retailers had quite widely adopted this methodology for testing new products and alternative merchandising practices.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

Building on an expanded research and teaching program in marketing and the strong relationships established with food processors, manufacturers, and food retailers, a new Food Distribution Program was initiated in 1958.* Wendell G. Earle, a Vermonter who joined the faculty in 1951 after completing his Ph.D. under the direction of Darrah in poultry marketing, was chosen to direct the program. Earle had recently spent his sabbatic leave at the University of Wisconsin and was eager to work with the National Association of Food Chains [NAFC] and a group of major food manufacturers to establish the program.

The first students were enrolled in 1958–1959. Earle, describing this new initiative in the 1959 issue of News Notes, wrote, “The program offers three types of training: (1) special student training, usually for one year, for those who are not interested in becoming candidates for degrees; (2) four-year undergraduate degree training for those who desire broad training with specialization in the food distribution field; and (3) graduate work, leading to the Master’s and Doctor’s degrees for qualified individuals. Four new courses and two seminars were offered by the department for the first time as a contribution to the training program. . . . The remainder of each student’s course program is developed from existing courses available in the College of Agriculture, Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, and the College of Arts and Sciences.”

After commenting about the new courses, field trips, and seminars presented by leaders in the food industry, Earle summarized, “This year, nine of the 25 men are graduate students registered for the Master’s degree. The balance are special students in the College of Agriculture. Most of the men range in age from 23–30 years. They bring to the campus a wide range of experience, such as store managers, grocery buyers, management trainees, salesmen, and product managers. Three food manufacturers and nine food chains are represented, including Kroger, Grand Union, American Stores, . . .

*Max Brunk was a key figure in establishing this new program. His pathbreaking merchandising studies had been quickly adopted and used by food manufacturers and the food chains. Dean Myers’s excellent contacts with corporate leaders helped to bring support and early commitments to the program from NAFC.
Stop & Shop, Daitch Crystal, Elm Farm, Food Fair, First National, Scott Paper, Wegmans, General Foods, and Libby, McNeil & Libby.”

The second year of the program, 1959–1960, included 27 students, 10 of whom were registered for the master’s degree. The students were sponsored by 16 different firms in the industry. Professor Brunk developed a new course in merchandising procedures and methodology directed to these students as well as juniors and seniors in the undergraduate program. Strong support for the program continued as top executives from all sectors of the food industry provided seminars each week. These regular seminars attracted the attention of a number of undergraduate students and faculty. The integration of this special program into the regular life of the department had begun.

A closely allied effort had developed earlier in food marketing extension. Funds became available to Director of Extension M. C. Bond in the 1950s to employ regional marketing agents in association with regional markets in upstate New York. One of the early activities, under the general direction of Bennett Dominick, Earle, and R. Brian How, was to analyze the grocery departments of food chains with the objective of improving the quality of the produce presented to consumers and the efficiency of the produce departments. The earlier lessons learned from the time-and-motion studies were used. Goodwill was established with the produce departments, and the regional marketing agents learned and helped others understand more about the several components that make up the food industry, from farm to consumer.

**Extension Programs**

New federal funding that became available at the end of the 1940s and in the early 1950s provided a substantial boost to agricultural extension programs across the country. New extension staff were employed in the counties and at the colleges. The food marketing programs for urban consumers and the regional marketing agent positions are good examples of such new initiatives. Faculty positions in the department to work with county staff were first filled with temporary appointments. In the 1950s, qualified new faculty with central responsibilities in extension were hired to develop and carry out new programs: Robert Story (milk marketing), Dominick (marketing fruits), How (marketing vegetables), Earle (marketing poultry), and Robert Smith (farm management).

At Cornell, the director of extension assigned these new positions to the departments and with them the responsibility for hiring and maintaining the expanded extension programs. At the majority of agricultural colleges nationally, the new appointments were not so quickly integrated into academic departments. Often the director controlled the appointments and extension faculty members were located in a different building from their academic colleagues in research and teaching. At Cornell, the directors of extension were responsible for organizing and maintaining strong county and statewide
programs, but departments were responsible for developing the content of extension programs, with faculty having major extension appointments taking the leadership. The integration of extension faculty into the department was taken as given and nearly all faculty took on some extension responsibilities as a matter of course, whether or not they had an official extension appointment.

Interdepartmental schools became a regular part of county and statewide extension programs in the 1950s. Department faculty members were regular participants in a range of county programs centered on such topics as fruit production and marketing, field crops, dairy production, and horticulture. Farm and home management was given substantial attention nationwide. Successful programs were established in a number of counties centered on records programs and financial planning, organized by faculty from home economics and the Department of Agricultural Economics. These were intensive programs spanning two or three years with a selected group of families, who upon graduation were followed by a new group of enrollees.

In November 1954, the secretary of agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, ordered the separation of publicly supported extension service activities from the American Farm Bureau and its state organizations. The use of the term “farm bureau agents” ceased in New York State and the long-term relationships, primarily at the state level, were ended. The separation had been earlier recommended in 1951, but was finally put in place with Benson’s order (Colman 1993, 476–78).

County boards of supervisors provided an important part of the support for extension programming, along with state and federal funds allocated from the state director’s office. County and regional extension programming in agriculture reached its peak during the late 1950s and 1960s in terms of numbers of county extension staff, schools, and programs. Strong relationships were established. Funding was available and teaching programs were well attended. Farm and community support grew and a fine spirit of cooperation among county and state staff prevailed. Maurice C. Bond served as the department’s extension leader until 1954, when he became director of extension. C. Arthur Bratton became his able replacement within the department.

**MANN LIBRARY**

The new library building connecting Warren Hall and Plant Science on the eastern end of the Ag Quadrangle was completed in 1952. Additional office and classroom space was provided at the eastern ends of both buildings. The Departments of Rural Sociology and Biometrics moved into the new space connected to Warren Hall.

The new library meant losing the department’s library and its staff. In the long run, faculty and students recognized this was necessary and a gain for the department. In the short run, they missed the two librarians, who
had now gained senior status in the new library, but whose knowledge and services were no longer as readily available. The large tables from the old library in the basement were moved to the seminar room and the third-floor space formerly used by Brunk for his time-and-motion laboratory. These tables, fashioned at the time the building was built in 1931–1932, remain a fine legacy—much used, if not fully appreciated for their quality and workmanship.

REBUILDING THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES

In the years following World War II, the needs in the countries ravaged by war were almost overwhelming. The Marshall Plan and the Economic Cooperation Administration set about responding to some of these needs in a variety of locations. One of the most difficult situations was in the Philippines, where the College of Agriculture at Los Baños, outside Manila, had been decimated during the war, but whose faculty members were again trying to function with very limited resources.

As part of U.S. efforts in technical assistance and cooperation following the war, a number of land grant universities were invited to establish formal relationships with colleges of agriculture at a number of overseas locations. The initial partnerships were established and funded in 1952 as part of the Point Four Program. Contracts were signed between the University of
Arizona and Iraq, the University of Arkansas and Panama, the University of Illinois and India, Michigan State University and Colombia, Oklahoma State University and Ethiopia, Purdue University and Brazil, Utah State University and Iran, and Cornell University and the Philippines. These initial contracts were followed by many more; in 1964, 154 contracts between American universities and foreign countries had been signed (Turk 1974, 6–7).

Dean Myers was a strong supporter of these initiatives. He saw these efforts as a way of not only rebuilding the physical plant and capital of these colleges of agriculture, but also extending their capacities to serve more nearly as land grant colleges, with a mission to serve both their students and rural people. The emphasis was on “mutual cooperation.”

Dean Myers commented: “Why does any university undertake a project to promote public welfare internationally? Intelligent selfishness. You know that your staff will benefit from being overseas, as will graduate students who have the opportunity to engage in foreign service. But it must be emphasized that no reputable university would go into an international program solely, or even primarily, for selfish reasons. But I also think no university ever takes on a public service job that it does not benefit from—not financially, but in the satisfaction of helping the people of that nation and in the additional training experience of its faculty and students” (Turk 1974, 31).
The contract specified three general duties that Cornell was to carry out: provide specialists in various fields of agriculture as agreed by both parties; provide assistance and advice in the selection and use of supplies and equipment at Los Baños; and assist the college in the selection of staff and students for training in the United States and in making arrangements with the necessary organizations and institutions for this training (Turk 1974, 32). Funds for rebuilding some of the college buildings and housing for the visiting staff from Cornell were also provided.

The first faculty to go to Los Baños included an agricultural economist, and one or two were in residence for each of the years of the contract from 1952–1960. Professor Bratton was the first to go, arriving in the fall of 1952. In response to the great overload for the Filipino staff in teaching, Bratton pitched in and taught two courses each semester—four different courses—for which he left behind his notes and teaching materials. Besides his classroom work, he helped the staff assemble economic data on prices and agricultural statistics. He initiated farm surveys in the college students’ communities, from which 1,500 records were eventually collected. These, in turn, provided useful data to support teaching and the beginnings of farm management research. In 1953–1954, four farm management projects were completed and improved relationships between college staff members and government agencies were established. Professor L. S. Robertson, recently retired from the faculty at Purdue, followed Bratton at Los Baños for the 1953–1954 year.

In 1954, C. D. Kearl arrived as the third visiting professor. He found the department without its young acting head, who had resigned to accept a much more attractive salary in Manila. This phenomenon continued to be a problem for the college. As the skills of Filipino staff improved and were recognized by government and business, they were often bid away. This was a substantial loss to the college and the project, but still amounted to a gain for the country as these able people used their skills to increase output and improve working relationships for the country as a whole.

Shortly after Kearl arrived, the Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs (CECA) granted Cornell additional funds for the support of a second professor at Los Baños for two years. Horst von Oppenfeld (Ph.D., 1953) was named to the position and arrived in 1955. The CECA also provided funds for graduate study for one student in agricultural economics and the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) for another, bringing the...
first Filipinos to Cornell for study. Kearl found that the teaching commitments of the department in Los Baños had mushroomed—with over 900 students enrolled in one course, with no classroom available in which to teach that seated more than 180. Fourteen student thesis projects were completed in 1954–1955, but classroom teaching required most of the resources of the staff.

With von Oppenfeld’s presence to help students with research, work in land use, farm management, and tenancy was expanded and new studies on rice consumption and marketing, as well as poultry and vegetable production, were initiated. Sixteen articles and papers were published by the staff during the 1955–1956 academic year. In 1956, G. W. Hedlund arrived to help with the business and academic organization of the department and the college, as well as to enlarge its efforts to work with cooperatives. The project on land use and farm management yielded data from 5,344 farms, which von Oppenfeld and Hedlund helped the Filipino staff to analyze. The results from this research led to Central Experiment Station Bulletin no. 1, published by the college in 1957.

Darrah succeeded Hedlund in 1957 for a two-year stay to expand work in marketing. By this time, some of the Filipino staff sent for study in the United States had returned to take responsibility for more of the teaching and research programs. Manuscripts and books prepared using Philippine data were now available in some courses. P. R. Sandoval, after graduate study at the University of Minnesota, was named to head the department. A new Filipino institution, the Agricultural Credit and Cooperatives Institute, was funded by the government and located on the Los Baños campus. Darrah prepared a new textbook, *Marketing of Farm Products in the Philippines*, illustrating basic principles with Philippine examples and data.

E. A. Lutz joined Darrah in the Philippines later that year to help establish a program in local government as part of the nation’s community development initiative. He worked with faculty in agricultural education as well as economics. A course in rural government was added to the college’s curriculum in 1958 to be taught by a recent Filipino holder of an M.S. in public administration returning from Cornell. A project on barrio governments and their capacity to develop and maintain barrio roads was started. A Ph.D. graduate student from Cornell working with Lutz, Nicolaas Luykx, included barrio governments along with others in Southeast Asia in his study of comparative local government.
While von Oppenfeld continued in the Philippines, funded by CECA grants through 1962, Ed Lutz was the last department faculty member to work at Los Baños on this project. In reviewing the accomplishments of this effort, Darrah and Lutz noted that the number of courses offered in agricultural economics had increased from 10 to 20, with local teaching materials now available to aid staff and students. Filipino staff members were now involved in joint work with colleges in Mindanao and Silliman University. Students from Vietnam, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Korea had been attracted to enrol for graduate study at Los Baños. Substantial progress had been made in developing a teaching and research program of recognized quality in the span of eight years.

OTHER INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Faculty from Cornell were among the many Americans attending the ICAE meetings held at Michigan State University in August 1952. F. F. Hill and H. E. Conklin had places on the program. Three years later the conference was held in Helsinki, Finland. Two new faculty, Kenneth L. Robinson and Bernard F. Stanton, attended, and Robinson presented a major paper, “Political Obstacles Tending to Retard the Increased Economic Welfare Offered by Technical Change in Agriculture.” Of the 300 people in attendance, 34 had studied at Cornell. The 1958 conference was held in Mysore, India, with T. N. Hurd, Darrah, and Oppenfeld in attendance.

Professor Bratton received a Fulbright Award for the academic year 1959–1960 to lecture and carry out research at the Institute of Farm Accounting, Kyoto University, Japan. Professor Kuwahara, head of the institute, had spent a semester at Cornell in 1957 studying Cornell recordkeeping programs and the summaries prepared from them.

Professor Robinson taught at the Farm Management Research Institute at Hokkaido University, Japan, for six weeks during the summer of 1959 under sponsorship of the Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs. This program was set up to help young faculty in Japan and neighboring countries learn more about production economics and the mathematical models being fitted statistically, much of what Robinson was teaching in his graduate course on farm resource allocation.

During the summer session at Cornell in 1957, a special seminar program was conducted under the sponsorship of the CECA. The faculty for this program were Bratton; A. B. Lewis (Ph.D., 1933), now an employee of the CECA; and W. Y. Yang of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), who had completed his doctorate at Cornell in 1937. The 18 participants came from 10 different countries and, at that time, were enrolled in eight different graduate schools in the United States. The intent of the program was to help participants in adapting the contents of their degree programs and thesis experiences to their respective situations when they returned home.
The program was so well received by participants that a similar program was conducted the following year at Ohio State.

In February 1959, Associate Professor John Mellor and family left for Balwant Rajput College near Agra, India. The CECA provided an 18-month fellowship to Mellor to learn more about the processes of agricultural development in India and to aid in further developing his knowledge base for a new program in teaching and research in this field.

**LAND ECONOMICS AND FARM MANAGEMENT**

During much of the 1950s, Howard E. Conklin worked with either temporary staff or research associates in efforts to complete the commitments made to Cayuga, Lewis, Oneida, and St. Lawrence Counties to prepare land classification studies and county maps. With encouragement from F. F. “Frosty” Hill, Conklin and his students began to think in terms of defining agricultural regions and identifiable areas across county boundaries, rather than the detailed county mapping that land classification projects required. There was a recognition that a carefully drawn county map from the 1930s was no longer valid, merely 20 years later, in a number of places as new technology had redefined what was required for a viable farm business.

An important effort was made to establish procedures by which small-area segments of farms could be drawn from U.S. geological survey maps, laid out in topographic quadrangles, to obtain information for the region as a whole. A number of students worked on developing such a workable system for obtaining farm data at reasonable cost. One of Conklin’s Ph.D. students, Quentin West, won an American Farm Management Association (AFMA)
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award for his dissertation, “Some Alternative Sampling Techniques in the Measurement of Farm-Business Characteristics.” Subsequently, West and Conklin published an experiment station memoir in 1956 presenting this methodology and the results of their studies with farm management data.

Professor L. C. Cunningham took an active interest in this work. He decided to use the new sampling methodology for two regional farm management studies reflecting common market conditions and physical resources. The first study was conducted in the Central Plains region in 1953–1954. Cunningham organized bus trips for college faculty and administrators to visit the region to see what had been learned from the study and the great variability in performance on individual farms. This experience was deemed so beneficial that the same process was followed in a major study in the North Country in 1955–1956. Cunningham again followed up with a bus trip to the region, as well as with experiment station bulletins for both studies and a number of mimeographs on specific topics for both studies.

Farm record summaries had been regularly prepared in individual counties in the postwar years. The information was obtained from a group of farmers participating in an extension project to learn more about their businesses and to consider ways to improve their management performance. The initial concept was to limit participation to three years, but a number of farmers wanted to continue to benefit from the comparisons and data that these projects provided.

In 1957, the department prepared the first statewide summary for farms participating in county extension projects and for former participants who
desired to continue in this kind of program. A statewide summary has been prepared each year since then, which has become the most important source of dairy farm management data available for extension and classroom teaching. These records have also provided excellent data for research and have been widely used on a confidential basis for many studies over the second half of the century. Art Bratton provided initial leadership for this basic source of farm management data.

CONFERENCES

Cornell University and the Department of Agricultural Economics were hosts for two national conferences in the 1950s. The American Institute of Cooperation (AIC) held its national meeting on campus in August 1954. The co-chairpersons for arrangements were Dean Myers and G. W. Hedlund. This was a “command performance” for faculty in the department because of the strong efforts of the GLF, the Dairymen’s League, and other cooperatives in the northeast to have the meetings on campus and be a success. Many of the guests expected air-conditioning in the meeting rooms and in the dorms, but August instead provided sultry summer weather. Faculty and graduate students were “challenged” to keep guests from around the country in semi-good humor. Most participants appreciated the efforts made for them, but the advantages of holding such a large meeting in a commercial facility were readily evident.

Nearly 50 years after the first meeting of the American Farm Management Association was held in Ithaca, the now American Farm Economics Association (AFEA) held its meetings here in late August 1959. This was a smaller group to host than the AIC, with more realistic expectations by participants about facilities and weather conditions. It was a well-attended meeting. Ray Bressler, then at the University of California, Berkeley, was president of the AFEA, but had spent his first years on the faculty at the University of Connecticut. He helped to keep everyone in a good mood. C. D. Kearl became the secretary-treasurer of the AFEA in 1959, a position he held until 1969.

Following World War II, the AFEA established a national awards program that recognized the “best” journal article of the year (selected by the editors) and three outstanding Ph.D. theses each year. Award winners from Cornell in the 1950s were Maxwell S. Myers (1951) for “Farm Tenure Processes in South Dakota” and Quentin West (1952) for “Some Alternative Sampling Techniques in the Measurement of Farm Business Characteristics.” Myers spent most of his academic life at South Dakota State University and became dean of the college. West held a number of administrative positions overseas and was administrator of the Economic Research Service, USDA, in the 1960s.

The AFEA established its Fellows program in 1957. Ten living agricultural economists were initially designated to hold this title. In succeeding years,
the first Fellows established the selection procedures that have been used in subsequent years. Either two or three individuals were selected each year by a committee of Fellows for this honor. William I. Myers was chosen in the second class of three individuals. His years of service to the association as secretary-treasurer (1927–1931) and president (1934), and his scholarship and work at the Farm Credit Administration before his years as dean were all appropriately cited in recognition of his contributions to the profession.

**HILL’S LEADERSHIP AND CONTRIBUTIONS**

Forrest F. Hill served as head of the department from 1943 to 1952. The new president of Cornell, Deane Malott, asked Hill to serve as provost of the university shortly after his arrival on campus. “Frosty” took leave from the department, not knowing how well he and the new president would work together or what kind of response he would receive from faculty and others in this new post. He was a big success. It was quickly clear that he was a man of his word and that he was in the provost office to help solve problems at a time when resources were short. Professor Glenn W. Hedlund, who had served as interim department head for two years, stepped into the headship when Hill decided to stay on in Day Hall.

Hill was a man of ideas and he liked challenges. He had been chairman of the Greater Ithaca Committee in the late 1940s and early 1950s that considered and outlined the efficiencies that might be gained if the services for sewerage, water, highway maintenance, and police protection were consolidated for the local governments surrounding Ithaca. Unfortunately, none of these units, including the city, were yet ready to accept such a plan. He was elected president of the American Farm Economics Association for the 1950–1951 year. During his term as president, he pushed a membership drive that yielded a 12 percent increase to 2,255 members. The association started a new book, *Readings on Agricultural Marketing*, during his tenure and ended the year with a small surplus by finding ways to reduce the costs of producing the *Journal of Farm Economics*.

In 1955, Hill resigned as provost to become vice president of the Ford Foundation. His new assignment was open-ended, but included oversight of the substantial overseas projects funded by the foundation in international agriculture and rural development. He established strong and cordial working relationships with J. George Harrar and his staff at the Rockefeller Foundation, who were also seeking to improve agricultural conditions in less-developed countries. Hill was impressed with the progress made in the country research programs by agricultural scientists at Rockefeller. He and Harrar concluded they might help the processes of agricultural development more effectively if the two foundations worked together on some projects.

Hill and Harrar agreed that improved rice varieties and technology could make a significant difference in helping the peoples of Asia to feed themselves and improve their standards of living. They conceived the idea of creating
an international center in Asia devoted to rice research and were able to sell the idea to their respective boards to establish such a center adjacent to the College of Agriculture at Los Baños in the Philippines. The rest of the success story is history. The International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) was organized in 1960 and the seeds of the “Green Revolution” were quickly planted. The concept of the international agricultural research center was established and some 17 others were established with support from foundations and governments from most of the wealthier nations of the world.

Hill retired from the Ford Foundation in 1967 but continued as chairman of the board of the IRRI until 1976. He retired to live in Ithaca and died in 1988. He was much respected and appreciated by those with whom he worked throughout his life. His positive outlook and perceptive comments made a difference in all of the places where he lived, from Saskatchewan, where he grew up, to the Philippines, where he spent many fruitful days helping to build and support not only the IRRI but the international centers concept. He is one of the major figures who shaped the development of agricultural economics at Cornell in the twentieth century and broadened its horizons, nationally and internationally.

**FARM ECONOMICS AND FRANK A. PEARSON**

During the early 1950s, *Farm Economics*, under the editorship of Frank Pearson, continued to be a major outlet for reporting the results of faculty and graduate student research. In 1951, for example, six issues were printed on a total of 176 pages, an average of nearly 30 pages per issue. Most graduate students were encouraged to publish a short summary of their thesis work (usually one or two printed pages) in this publication. Dean Myers was frequently a signed author of the lead article, along with Pearson and sometimes a third faculty member.

Pearson continued as editor of *Farm Economics* until he retired in 1957. He had contributed to nearly every issue. Much of its character reflected his commitment to include a variety of short articles in each issue reflecting the current work of the department. Over the 35 years of its life, he and Warren were its largest contributors.

In the February 1957 issue, Pearson, along with Myers and A. R. Gans, wrote “The Fact-Finder,” a 66-page summary of the life and professional work of his long-time colleague George F. Warren. In December 1957, the entire edition was devoted to “Warren as Presidential Adviser,” a 78-page story of Warren’s experiences in Washington in 1933 and 1934, based on the authors’ considerable efforts to reconstruct the events of those years using personal papers and library records from multiple sources. A quote from the final
paragraph gives a sense of Pearson’s perceptions, some 24 years after the events he describes: “Incredible is the adjective that best fits Warren. So far as prices were concerned, he had the golden touch of Midas. A most significant single fact about the gold controversy is that Warren achieved in large part what he set out to do, but there remained a hard core of resistance that was not his fault. Warren was at times praised and at other times reviled . . . he got most, but not all, of what he thought was in the best interest of the nation.”

The last issue of *Farm Economics* was published in March 1958. It was a relatively big issue of 48 pages and included no statement from the acting editor that this was in fact the end of an era. With Pearson retired from the faculty and Myers retiring as dean in 1959, this relatively expensive and widely distributed free publication was no longer feasible for the college to continue from its limited publication budget. The mimeographed publications of the department became the primary way of providing timely information to the several publics of the department.

Pearson was one of the colorful characters of the department during his 35 years on the faculty. He was a natty dresser. Seldom was he seen without a flower in the buttonhole of his jacket. Most of his contemporaries referred to him as “Happy” Pearson, perhaps because of the quizzical smile he often wore as he walked around the basement of Warren Hall between his office, the IBM room, and the library.

He had lots of hobbies during his lifetime and he explored them with vigor. At one time he was interested in “roses.” He sought and tried all the new varieties and shared his blooms with secretaries and the dean’s office. He was a Civil War buff and had walked most of the major battlefields before and during his retirement years. He pursued photography with all the latest equipment in the years immediately following retirement. His work in this field was of a high standard and he shared it with many people in and around Warren Hall. Rumor had it that Pearson either cornered the pepper market for a brief period in the “Roaring Twenties” or nearly did, but he never was willing to respond to questions on that subject posed by those brave enough to ask. Regardless, he was a memorable figure, one whom his students and colleagues could not forget.

**THE A.E. SERIES**

The importance of the mimeographed A.E. (Agricultural Economics) series grew rapidly in the 1950s as an effective means by which to make the results of research and extension work in the department available to the public. These reports were both timely and relatively inexpensive to produce. It was generally understood that all research projects should result in publication; this was a way to return results rapidly to participants in projects and get comments before further publication in bulletins, journals, or trade publica-
tions. This series also provided an effective way to carry extension materials to the field and keep them available in a numbered series.

An indication of the range of topics and materials covered in these publications is provided in the following list of titles and numbers from late 1955 and early 1956:

1011 Costs and Returns in Producing Milk, Central Plain Region, NY, 1953–1954
1012 Egg Merchandising Studies in Supermarkets, Part V, Transparent Cartons
1013 Economic Aspects of the National School Lunch Program in New York State
1014 Merchandising Yellow Onions in Retail Food Stores
1015 40 Years of Farm Prices in New York State
1016 Costs and Returns in Producing and Marketing Maple Products
1017 Costs and Returns in Producing Sweet Corn for Processing, 1955
1018 Costs and Returns in Producing Snap Beans for Processing, 1955
1019 Livestock Marketing in NY 1953—How NY Farmers Market Their Livestock
1031 Specification and Costs for a Moderately Small Milk Pasteurizing and Bottling Plant
1032 Computed Indexes of Proofs for 736 Holstein Sires
1033 Milk Vending Machines in Industrial Plants
1034 How to Calculate the Cost of Milk Production
1035 Guides to Farming in the Central Plain Region of New York
1036 Salaries Paid Agriculture College Graduates by Commercial Banks and PCAs
1037 Buying a Farm on Contract
1038 Packaging Apples at Country Points in Film or Mesh Bags and in Gift Packages
1039 A Half-Century of Significant Developments in the Distribution and Pricing of Market Milk
1040 The Operation of Forced Air Mow-Driers on New York Farms

The series included short publications of 10 pages or less as well as substantial pieces of work, like A.E.s 1015 and 1039, written by Pearson and Leland Spencer, respectively.

Because the annual output of these A.E. publications had grown to become so important in the published work of the department, in 1958 the series was divided into the A.E. Extension and A.E. Research series. These new series became a central part of the published efforts of the faculty and staff, and were well received by their diverse audiences.
Changes in the Faculty

Glenn “Swede” W. Hedlund became interim department head in 1952 when “Frosty” Hill moved to the provost’s office; Hedlund was officially named head in 1954. With his past experience as department head at Penn State and his ability to work well with nearly everyone, the change in leadership was both easy and natural. Dean Myers knew him well and they had worked effectively together with the leading cooperatives in the Northeast. He maintained his strong interest in cooperatives and farm finance throughout his professional career, including his tenure as department head.

He generally followed past traditions in looking for new faculty. When vacancies occurred or new positions became available, he and the senior faculty tended to look first at former Ph.D. students at Cornell who were doing well at another institution. “Frosty” Hill had broken with this pattern by hiring Kenneth L. Robinson in 1951 after he completed his Ph.D. at Harvard with John D. Black. Likewise, it was Hill who brought Bernard F. Stanton to Cornell in 1953 after he completed his Ph.D. at Minnesota. Both were known to a few of the faculty; Robinson did his M.S. at Cornell in 1947, while Stanton had completed his B.S. in 1949 at Cornell.

Lloyd H. Davis filled an extension marketing position in 1951 as soon as he completed his degree. Before starting his doctoral program, he had been an instructor in extension teaching and information. Davis took responsibility for marketing programs with fresh market vegetables and the supermarket industry. He was made an associate professor in 1953 and resigned in 1955 and moved to Washington, D.C., to head extension marketing programs nationally.

Immediately after completing his doctoral program carrying out merchandising experiments on apples with Max Brunk in 1951, Bennett A. Dominick, Jr., a native of Florida, was appointed as extension economist in fruit farm management and marketing. In a similar manner in 1952, Robert P. Story, who had been an instructor at the University of Vermont before his graduate program here with Hedlund, was appointed as an extension economist in milk marketing. Both spent their subsequent professional careers at Cornell with distinction, much appreciated by colleagues on campus and throughout the country.
In 1953, John W. Mellor joined the faculty in land economics, after completing his degree with Dr. Hill. He immediately plunged into teaching the large introductory course in agricultural geography, as a result of Herrell DeGraff’s appointment to the newly created Babcock chair in the School of Nutrition, and focused on the relationships between agriculture and human nutrition.

In 1954, three men were appointed as assistant professors. Kendall S. Carpenter (Ph.D., 1953) joined the faculty from his position as a USDA marketing specialist stationed at Cornell for a year, following the completion of his doctorate. Carpenter was the first of USDA field staff, usually one or two in number, who were located in the department to work on projects of mutual interest to staff at the USDA and Cornell. Similar cooperative agreements were signed at a number of land grant universities. Carpenter’s faculty assignment was in business management and cooperatives. Arthur W. Jeffrey was also a USDA staff member assigned to Cornell, working with Spencer on milk marketing research throughout the 1950s. Carroll V. Hess (Ph.D., Iowa State) also held an appointment as a visiting assistant professor while here on a cooperative agreement with the USDA in production economics. After three years, he moved to the University of Minnesota in 1959. The USDA replaced Hess with Randolph Barker (Ph.D., Iowa State), who was also appointed a visiting assistant professor and, like Hess, took an active role in department research programs.

Robert S. Smith (Ph.D., 1952) joined the faculty in 1954 after spending two years on the staff of the director of extension as coordinator of the Young Adult Program. His appointment was in farm management and farm finance, where he developed a substantial program in farm business arrangements and intergenerational transfers. Clifton W. Loomis (Ph.D., 1953) joined the faculty in 1955 after two years of teaching at the University of Missouri. His appointment was also in extension farm management.

R. Brian How joined the faculty in 1956 after working for six years, first at the Ontario Agricultural College and then at the University of Saskatchewan. His principal assignment was in vegetable marketing, filling the vacancy created by Davis’s resignation. After complet-
ing his degree with Brunk in merchandising dairy products in 1956, Joseph F. Metz Jr. was appointed an assistant professor in marketing with special attention to the floriculture and ornamental horticulture industries. In that same year, George J. Conneman joined the staff as extension specialist in farm management, working with the Farm and Home Development Program.

Two more new assistant professors joined the faculty in 1958–1959. Richard D. Aplin was appointed to work in business management and milk marketing, with special interest in improving costs and efficiency in handling milk beyond the farm gate. Dana Goodrich Jr. was appointed to work in poultry marketing, filling part of the need created with Wendell Earle now working full-time with the new Food Distribution Program and Darrah in the Philippines.

RETIREMENTS

Professor Gad P. Scoville retired in 1953 after completing 39 years on the faculty. He was hired initially to work with extension agents in 1914 on farm records programs and spent much of his career collecting and analyzing survey data from fruit farmers in Niagara County and the Hudson Valley. For many years, he taught an advanced course in farm management based on cost account data and problems associated with the management of farms, using data from the many years of financial records to provide examples of changes and problems over time.

Not only did Frank Pearson retire in 1957, but also Edward G. Misner, who joined the staff in 1914 as an instructor and became an assistant professor in 1918 after completing his Ph.D. “Misty” Misner made farm management studies in his early years on a wide range of crop and livestock farms. He was a regular contributor to *Farm Economics* throughout all its years of publication. For most of his career, he concentrated on studies of the dairy industry. Misner served as a milk marketing consultant to the Holstein-Friesian Association of America in his final 13 years as a professor. He died shortly after his retirement in 1958.

Professor Marius P. Rasmussen retired to Florida in 1959 after 38 years on the faculty. “Ras” worked on the marketing of vegetables and the functioning of central markets for fresh fruits and vegetables throughout his career. He was a highly organized individual; he expected his students and coworkers to be equally well informed and committed to fact-finding and understanding
changes in market development. His admiration for G. F. Warren and Warren’s approach to research was evident in his conversation and his writing.

In 1959, Van Breed Hart retired after 40 years on the faculty. He was the informal leader of the early extension programs of the department. Hart organized the first Bankers’ School of Agriculture and then helped this program to become a vital link for the college with the credit institutions of the Northeast. He took leaves of absence to work with the Federal Extension Service, at its request, and the Department of Treasury. He served on the Ithaca City Council and was director of one of the local banks. Everyone liked Van because he liked people and saw the good side of students and faculty alike.
Dean W. I. Myers retired in 1959 after a memorable career as an outstanding undergraduate teacher, distinguished researcher, successful administrator of the Farm Credit Administration in Washington, department head, and dean of the College of Agriculture. His impact on the department was especially strong in the 1920s when he was the teacher to whom students looked, as he served as personal advisor as well as director of many graduate theses and research projects. Warren turned to Myers for administrative assistance. Myers communicated easily with Ladd and Dean Mann as the department’s acting administrator. After his years in Washington, he took an active role in providing content for the lead articles in *Farm Economics* and in making sure that there was funding for its continued publication. He was a conservative in the mold of his mentor, George Warren, and looked for ways to reduce, rather than increase, the role of government in solving the problems of farmers. In retirement, at his farm north of the campus overlooking the lake, he enjoyed serving on the boards of the Rockefeller Foundation and several corporations. He particularly enjoyed gardening and riding his lawnmower during the warm months in Ithaca and then moving to the dry climate of Arizona in the winter. In 1976, he died at 82 after his long and illustrious career of service to this community and the nation.

**The Department Seminar**

One of the unifying forces in the department that added significantly to the work of the faculty and its programs in the 1950s was the weekly seminar program. Everyone, faculty and graduate students alike, was expected to appear on Monday afternoons in Warren 401 at 4:00 p.m. for the department seminar. A book, kept in the department head’s office, was passed around for all to “sign-in.” Every graduate student was expected to present a seminar based on his or her thesis research at some time before leaving the campus. Faculty also took their turns, along with all visitors to the department, for brief periods or longer. Special seminars were held if there was not time to accommodate student or faculty reports.

The range of discussions was wide and generally timely. New or proposed legislation was reviewed. Presentations were made by faculty from other departments on campus where joint work with our staff was in progress. Agricultural economists from other states, business people, and farmers spoke to the group. It was a place where the department gathered each week and paused to understand a little more about the work colleagues were doing, as well as the major events of the day.

**Overview**

In 1950, the Census of Agriculture found 124,800 farms in New York containing 16 million acres of land from which only 5.79 million had crops harvested. At the end of the decade in 1959, only 82,400 farms remained,
the largest drop in numbers for a decade in the century and in history. Land in farms fell by 2.5 million acres; only 5.03 million acres of cropland were harvested.

This exodus from farming was part of the transition of many families into a large number of different jobs, often not far from where they had lived all of their lives. Improved roads and a strong economy provided opportunity outside farming. The best cropland remained in farming as parts of other larger, mechanized farms. Physical output from New York farms at the end of the decade was larger than in 1950. The rate of change and its impact on individual families and their communities provided a continuing challenge to the college and the department.

The 1950s provided the department time to fill a number of new faculty positions, as well as an opportunity to embark on a number of new initiatives. Graduate student numbers increased from 48 in 1949–1950 (17 M.S. and 31 Ph.D.) to 88 in 1959–1960 (42 M.S., 24 Ph.D., and 22 noncandidates), in large measure because of the new Food Distribution Program. In 1949–1950, 36 of the 48 graduate students were Americans, 6 were from Canada and Western Europe, 2 from Puerto Rico, 2 from Egypt, and 2 from Asia. In 1959–1960, the majority again were from the United States, 53 of 88. The foreign graduate students included 18 from Western Europe, 13 from Asia, and 4 from Latin America. Funding for graduate study overseas had become
available from a variety of new sources. Twelve of the students from Europe
came to Cornell under the aegis of the European Productivity Agency.

Numbers of students in courses offered by the department increased
by 20 percent. The department offered 25 undergraduate courses and 15
graduate courses, with a total of 2,354 students enrolled, or an average of
59 per course, in 1959–1960. The largest enrollments were in Agricultural
Geography offered by Mellor with 282 students, followed by Marketing
taught by Darrah with 260, and Farm Management taught by Stan Warren
with 208 students. The number of undergraduates with a strong interest
and background in agriculture was still large—witness the size of the Farm
Management course.

At the close of the decade, the professional staff of the department had
grown. Besides the 28 faculty positions, the department had 16 nonpro-
fessorial, full-time appointments in teaching, research, or extension. The
extension component included 9 professorial lines with primary commit-
ments to extension responsibilities. In addition, most other faculty were
expected to spend some of their time in public service or extension. The food
marketing program for urban consumers that was started in the late 1940s,
with offices in New York City and Ithaca, accounted for 4 full-time posi-
tions in the department. There also were 3 full-time extension associates in
farm management and marketing. All in all, the commitment to cooperative
extension by the department in terms of professional time, budget, and cre-
ative energy may have reached its peak in these years. Much of the financial
support for these new efforts came from federal programs administered by
the USDA.

Relationships with the state of New York, always important, remained
strong. For the third time, T. Norman Hurd took leave in 1958 to become
director of the budget for Governor Nelson Rockefeller. This time, he stayed
in Albany for the rest of his professional career. Efforts to maintain strong
working relationships with the leadership of both the Assembly and the
Senate were fostered by Dean Myers and the agricultural organizations of the
state. A strong service orientation of the faculty to the needs of rural people
and their local governments was an important component of this success.
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IN 1960, FIFTEEN YEARS HAD PASSED since the end of World War II. A vigorous, young president was in the White House. The public problems of agriculture had not been solved by the Soil Bank and Ezra Taft Benson’s years in Washington. A new effort to increase farm income by controlling production of storable crops was proposed to Congress by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and his economic advisor, Willard Cochrane from Minnesota.

These leaders and the rest of the country began more fully to recognize the impact of new technology and mechanization that had led to steady increases in agricultural output requiring less and less farm labor. The exodus of farm families from the land, usually to off-farm jobs in nearby towns, continued. The national economy grew and adapted well to change in a time when rates of inflation were small. Agriculture’s contributions nationally and locally to gross domestic product were now smaller as a percentage of the total, even though agricultural output and productivity had continued to grow impressively.

Politically, the farm bloc was still active and powerful, but the issues that led to “Great Society” legislation captured center stage in Washington.

The college and the department benefited from Governor Nelson Rockefeller’s strong support of higher education. Benefits ranged from a new automatic elevator for Warren Hall in 1960 (a legacy of T. N. Hurd as budget director) to a welcome package of salary increases for all of the faculty and staff. Dean Charles E. Palm, an entomologist, quickly learned that the governor was happy to sit down with him and look through a notebook of requests illustrated with pictures of research accomplishments and areas where the college and the rural people of the state could benefit from new funding. These were good years because of the strong personal relationships established, the quality of the presentations made by the college leadership, and the nurturing support of the state’s Council of Agricultural Organizations.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER’S COMMITTEE ON MILK MARKETING

The College of Agriculture’s close working relationship with state government and its needs were manifest in the early 1960s. Governor Rockefeller appointed a Special Committee on Milk Marketing in April 1961 after vetoing...
the Drumm-Gordon Bill. This legislation would have given the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets broad authority to fix minimum retail and wholesale prices of milk and to regulate trade practices in the distribution of milk. Both consumers and producers had concerns about the prices they paid and received respectively for milk and the “lack of competitiveness” they felt existed in these markets. Other states had opted for much greater regulation of this basic commodity as proposed in the vetoed legislation.

The governor’s committee was asked to consider the question: Is the distribution system for milk and milk products functioning efficiently and in the best interests of both producers and consumers? To respond to this question, the governor appointed Glenn W. Hedlund to chair this committee, with Professors Aplin, Cunningham, Spencer, and Story from the Department of Agricultural Economics as members. The three other committee members were Jules Bachman, professor of economics, New York University, Frederick W. Crumb, president of the College of Education at Potsdam, and R. Parker Eastwood, professor of business statistics, Columbia University. The committee obtained the services of Dr. Sheldon Williams, University of Illinois, to serve as its research director and Robert G. Blabey, a lawyer on the staff of the Department of Agriculture and Markets, to serve as counsel.
Over the next three years, the committee worked with and sought information from representatives of the state’s dairy community, including producers, cooperatives, processors, and distributors. Legislation adopted in other states was considered, along with their experiences following the legislation. The substantial experience already garnered in the functioning of state and federal market orders across the country was reviewed and considered. The final report, issued in April 1964, reflected the committee’s findings and judgments after listening to the diverse views and experience of the many interested parties, both within the state and in other major producing areas. Its five recommendations to close the report were:

1. That no action be taken to authorize the fixing of minimum retail or wholesale prices of milk, either on a full-scale or on a limited basis.

2. That the New York Milk Control Law be amended specifically to charge the Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets with the responsibility of using his influence, through fact-finding and educational procedures, to encourage fair and active competition in the milk distribution industry, and to discourage unfair or destructive practices that tend to have the long-run effect of lessening competition and increasing the possibility of monopolistic abuses.

3. That legislation be adopted by the State of New York prohibiting discrimination in prices charged for milk and other dairy products sold by milk dealers and stores to different customers of the same class or in different sales areas, except to meet competition or as justified by differences in costs related to quality, quantities sold, transportation, and other services performed, where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to increase the possibility of monopolistic abuses.

4. That the New York State Milk Control Law be amended so as definitely to charge the Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets with the responsibility to investigate complaints or instances of monopolistic abuse and report his findings to the Attorney General.

5. That the Department of Agriculture and Markets follow a policy of granting and extending licenses to properly qualified dealers that will encourage effective competition and facilitate the adoption of new technology and methods of distribution. (Committee on Milk Marketing 1964)

The final report of the governor’s committee was widely distributed to those with concerns and interests about milk pricing and regulation of the
dairy industry. Much of the political pressure for increased regulation by the state was reduced by the work of the committee. Comments on the report and its conclusions were largely favorable, both within the region and across the country. This effort required a major commitment of time and energy from faculty in the department, but the net result was improved communication with all segments of the dairy industry and the implementation of most of the committee’s recommendations.

**Supply Response**

During the same years, a five-year research program studying the long-run changes in milk production in the New York milkshed was launched in cooperation with farmers in the seven states shipping milk to this market. A steering committee chaired by George Brandow of Pennsylvania State University was organized, with representatives from each of the states participating in the project. George Conneman was the principal investigator at Cornell University, with funding provided by the market administrator of the New York-New Jersey milk marketing area.
Data were collected from a randomly selected sample of blocks containing 1,200 farms shipping milk in 1960. These sampling units were selected using the area sampling techniques pioneered by Howard Conklin and tested in the 1950s by L. C. Cunningham. Conneman was successful in gaining cooperation from 95 percent of the farms in the blocks and keeping nearly all who remained in farming in his study over the five years. Using land areas as the sampling units allowed the study to follow farms that came into production during the years of the study, 1960–1964, as well as follow those who left farming.

This study was successful in charting the rapidly changing structure of the dairy industry as small farms dropped out of production and the most productive resources from these farms—cows and cropland—were integrated into other operating businesses. Prices of farm inputs, the availability of labor, and the impacts of new labor-saving technology were identified as major determinants of changes in supply in the market area. Milk production was observed to be the only remaining viable use of farm resources in a number of the areas studied, with recreation and forestry as the likely options when a farm dropped out of production. In areas close to markets or urban areas, pressures of nonfarm uses of land continued to challenge milk production on some farms.

**International Activities**

The 1961 issue of *News Notes* reflected the widening horizons of faculty as they reported on their experiences from their international studies and sabbatical leaves. Bratton commented on his year in Japan on a Fulbright fellowship, where he taught methods of analysis with farm management data. Ben Dominick was one of seven extension economists sponsored by the Foreign Agricultural Service on a trip to seven countries in Latin America seen as potential export markets. He came back with a much better understanding of the mechanisms of trade and the opportunities open to northeastern producers. Howard Conklin spent half a year in Venezuela considering the production possibilities of the Guyana region in a project headed by one of his former students and funded by the Rockefeller family. C. D. Kearl reported on his six months working with the Department of Agriculture in Uganda to help that country move from subsistence agriculture to commercial ventures that could be carried out under the control of indigenous peoples.

John W. Mellor described his 18 months of teaching and work with the faculty at a small agricultural college near Agra, India. He came back enthused about his experiences and offered a new course in the department, Economics of Agricultural Development, in 1960–1961. After teaching the course regularly for five years, he published in 1966 a textbook, *The Economics of Agricultural Development*, which soon became a standard for classroom teaching across the country.
In October 1960, Robert S. Smith left for Israel to spend one year as a member of the SUNY–Israel contract team. Bob’s assignment was to help Israel develop its extension service and build a farm management program of relevance to both the kibbutzim and the moshavim villages.

All of the department benefited from the insights and knowledge brought back from these overseas experiences by its faculty and those who accepted similar assignments throughout the rest of the decade.

**THE FORD FOUNDATION GRANT TO THE COLLEGE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

On his return from India, John Mellor worked with other faculty in the college and university in preparing a proposal to the Ford Foundation to expand international research and teaching at Cornell in the rural social sciences. This proposal was funded, bringing three new faculty positions to the department.

Mellor described the program: “A sizeable Ford Foundation grant to Cornell University has permitted a major expansion of the work in international agricultural development within the departments of agricultural economics, rural sociology, and rural education. The primary purpose of the grant was to provide a fully integrated program of teaching and research yielding improved training for American and foreign graduate students and significant research related to the development of agriculture in low-income countries. Because of the complementarity between this program and Cornell’s outstanding area studies programs in South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Latin America, field work will be concentrated in these three regions.”

The faculty associated with these three positions in Agricultural Economics were John Mellor, Solon Barraclough (Ph.D., Harvard, and a fellow graduate student with Ken Robinson), and Thomas T. Poleman (Ph.D., Stanford’s Food Research Institute). Barraclough had already worked for a number of years in Latin America and spoke Spanish fluently. Poleman, a native of Missouri, had just recently completed his graduate studies. A book based on his thesis research in Mexico was published shortly after his arrival on campus. As a result of these new hires, two new courses and three new graduate seminars were offered. Nicolaas Luykx, who had recently completed his doctorate with Professor Lutz on comparative aspects of rural public institutions in South Asia, joined the faculty in 1962. He added further strength to the program, together with all of the other faculty who had worked in the Philippines or returned from assignments overseas.

As part of the new initiative in international agricultural development, John Mellor became director of a major research contract, supported by
USAID, on agricultural prices in economic development—their role, function, and operation. This contract provided funding for graduate research and study in India, Pakistan, Nepal, Thailand, and Chile. A book, *Developing Rural India: Plan and Practice*, published by Cornell University Press, drew on some of the work completed by Mellor and his students in this project. More than 50 articles, bulletins, and A. E. Research reports resulted from work done under contract funding during the decade. A number of other faculty, besides Mellor, supervised some of the student work, including Barraclough, Sisler, Story, and Tomek. Because of the quality of the work completed and the productivity of the project, a new contract with USAID was signed for the start of the 1970s, titled “The Impact of New Agricultural Technology on Rural Employment and Income.”

The University of the Philippines-Cornell Graduate Education Program, 1963–1972

At the same time that the initiative with the Ford Foundation was providing new faculty in agricultural development, Phase II of the cooperative agreement with the University of the Philippines was established. Building on the successes of the programs in the 1950s, this second effort was directed toward building a stronger graduate education program for the college at Los Baños. This program was funded by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, together with a major loan to the Philippines from the World Bank, to rebuild the campus at Los Baños. The graduate education program established close linkages with scientists at the new International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), already under construction on a site close to the college.

At the start of the project, relatively few of the Filipino staff in agricultural economics at the college had completed at least one advanced degree. Most held the titles of instructor or assistant instructor. When Vernon Ruttan (Ph.D., Chicago) arrived in Los Baños to work as an economist with the new staff at IRRI, he volunteered to help the University of the Philippines staff with occasional teaching and the direction of research projects.

The first Cornell faculty member to arrive and work in this new program was Randolph Barker, who had transferred from his ERS/USDA appointment at Cornell in 1960 to faculty status. He was ably assisted by S. C. Hsieh (Ph.D., Minnesota), who joined the group from his former post in Taiwan with the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction. Barker and Hsieh worked well together and established new graduate courses and directed the research efforts of graduate students, including two whom Hsieh had brought with him. After two years in Los Baños, Hsieh left to assist in the formation of the Asian Development Bank.
in Manila. Barker harnessed the resources of staff at IRRI and the University of the Philippines School of Economics to develop a solid, continuing graduate program. IRRI scientists found ways to effectively use graduate students from the college in their field work and station projects, and, in turn, assisted in the direction of their thesis projects.

In his third year in the Philippines, Barker resigned from Cornell and joined the research team at IRRI, but continued his active participation in the graduate program of the college, directing many of the student research projects. Some Cornell graduate students came to the Philippines to complete their doctoral studies, working in cooperation with staff at IRRI as well as the college. L. B. Darrah returned to the Philippines for six months in 1968 to revise the textbook he had prepared a decade earlier. Working with Dr. Fabian Tiongson, they published their updated textbook, *Agricultural Marketing in the Philippines*, in early 1969.

In 1970, Larry and Wanda Darrah returned to Los Baños for the last two years of the graduate education project. In these years, Darrah turned his attention away from graduate teaching, as such, to the identification of major marketing problems faced by the Philippine government’s food and agriculture program, and the development of a research program relevant to these needs. This kind of program meant direct involvement with government officials and interactions by graduate students with officials and programs in Manila. As a result of this initiative, 11 major studies were instituted and 20 staff papers and reports were distributed. Funding for this work came from a variety of Filipino sources, and Darrah was in demand to serve on some 16 national committees during this period. Special mention should also be made of Mrs. Darrah’s contributions to the college and IRRI library systems, establishing a modified Library of Congress identification for all of the collections (Turk 1974, 335–37).

When Darrah prepared his final report and observations on the impact of the project, he concluded: “The department has a young, well-qualified group of senior staff members. And as others return from study abroad, or complete advanced degrees locally, the capability of the staff will further improve and the dependence of governmental agencies upon the staff for advice and assistance will be more intense. This is good. But to keep the department strong, efforts must be exerted to provide such financial and promotional incentives as are necessary to keep the staff members in the department. Otherwise, their movement to more financially rewarding opportunities will again develop as in previous years, and the department and college will once again have to rebuild a staff in agricultural economics” (Turk 1974, 338–39).
K. L. Turk, director of the International Agriculture Program at Cornell and author of *The Cornell-Los Baños Story*, closed his book with some comments from F. F. Hill, vice president of the Ford Foundation and former department head in Warren Hall:

It seems to me that one can state the following axioms with respect to development:

1. Money by itself does not solve problems. Only men and women who know how to use money effectively make it valuable in the development process.

2. Institutions in which men and women can work effectively are essential to human progress. They provide individuals with the resources they need, including colleagues, to get jobs done. Man being mortal, they also provide links between one generation and the next.

3. Institutional development is a slow business better measured in decades and generations than in years. Cornell’s agricultural programs in China and the Philippines not only illustrate these axioms, but stand as monuments to all who worked to make them a success (Turk 1974, 449–50).

**FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM**

Five years into the new Food Distribution Program, initiated in 1958 with the National Association of Food Chains (NAFC), an average of 25 to 30 students from the food industry were studying on campus each year. In addition, undergraduate interest in this specialization grew, with 47 students enrolled in the program in 1963. During 1964–1965, Wendell Earle, director of the program, spent his sabbatical leave with the Jewel Tea Company in Chicago, gaining further insight into the operations of a major retailer in the food industry.

Responsibility for the annual *Operating Results of Food Chains*, sponsored by the NAFC, was undertaken by Cornell in 1963, after this work had been done at Harvard for the previous seven years. These analyses were based on data obtained from confidential questionnaires completed by over 50 of the nation’s food chains. Changes in operating costs, gross margins, and net profits were among the key indicators reviewed annually. A special study of the application of computers to food retailers was a part of the first study completed at Cornell.
In 1963, Earl H. Brown (Ph.D., Michigan State) joined the faculty with responsibilities for work associated with marketing and the food industry. He took an active role in research and publication. In 1965–1966, three publications were issued reflecting this new cooperative work with the NAFC and the analyses resulting from these new sources of data: Operating Results of Food Chains, 1964–1965; An Analysis of Grocery Shipments from Grocery Manufacturers to Food Chain Warehouses; and Grocery Distribution Center Efficiency Report, March 1966.

It was also in 1963 that the first steps in establishing a new correspondence course for food industry personnel were initiated. The first course offered, Economics for Business, was developed by Gene A. German (M.S., 1959) with a textbook and study guide, and was well received by the industry. From this beginning, Cornell's Home Study Program was launched in January 1964 and, at the end of the century, was widely known throughout the world as the Cornell University Food Industry Management Distance Education Program.

The initial Home Study Program was launched because leaders in the retail food industry recognized the lack of opportunities for their employees to obtain further education while working at their regular positions. Sponsorship by the NAFC, together with the excellent experience of participants in the Food Distribution Program, ensured that a cadre of students would participate and the first courses would be carefully evaluated. From the beginning, enrollees or their companies paid for the courses they took, receiving books and assignments as part of the package. A certificate of completion from Cornell was awarded to each student after successfully finishing all the assignments associated with each course.

By 1967, the Home Study Program was well established. The study programs were directed to the interests and needs of employees in the food industry. Professor Earle and Gene German, a graduate from the first class in the Food Distribution Program and now a full-time employee of the department, directed the program. More than 16,000 people had completed one or more of the six courses offered before the end of 1967.

**Extension Initiatives**

Using the additional resources provided by state and federal sources in the 1950s, faculty with important extension assignments provided leadership
for a number of new and innovative efforts. L. C. Cunningham conducted a successful short course in farm management in 1960, consisting of five weekly lessons over WNBF-TV in Binghamton. County agents in 10 counties enrolled 1,236 farmers, who received workbooks in which to carry out their assignments. As a follow-up, this program was then carried to the Buffalo area where the local county agents gave the lessons on television, as prepared by Cunningham, and then carried out the interactions with participants (Colman 1963, 493).

As part of a federal extension service contract, R. Brian How and two associates, Ransom Blakeley and John Spencer, completed three motion pictures emphasizing ways to improve labor and equipment efficiency in handling fresh produce. Besides using these new movies and eight publications they had prepared for use in New York State, they also ran workshops in Michigan, Virginia, and Pennsylvania demonstrating the films and their associated teaching materials. The films—*Hidden Profits in Apple Packing*, *Carton Making the Easy Way*, and *Work Sampling Practice*—as well as special publications were made available to each state for use in their own extension programs.

Operation Advance was developed by Ed Lutz and Nicolaas Luykx as a new extension education program to help citizens and local leaders examine the problems of local governments and community decision making. The program trained local leaders in the 40 counties participating, who in turn then used a series of printed leaflets and fact sheets with local groups to consider how changes could be brought about in their local communities. Stage II involved leaders of local government and local institutions in the discussions. Stage III in the program took the resulting proposals for action to the publics of the institutions involved. Individual counties usually pursued an important local issue, such as roads, schools, or public safety, and then moved forward. The 1964 issue of *News Notes* reported that 1,500 groups had met in the past four years with over 15,000 active participants in these programs.

A special study on the future of New York’s agricultural industry, recreation, and urbanization was developed and organized in the second half of the decade. A set of 14 publications with the general title *Toward the Year 1985* was prepared by department faculty. This was a department-wide effort with primary leadership provided by Olan Forker and George Casler. The individual publications covered such traditional topics as milk production and consumption, opportunities in the fruit industry,
and the future of fresh and processed vegetable production. The set also included separate publications on such topics as outdoor recreation, conversion of rural land to urban uses, and food wholesaling and retailing.

This project was funded by a variety of private and public institutions, with strong support and encouragement from the college administration. The published reports were widely distributed throughout the state and the Northeast. Special sessions were held in Albany with legislative leaders and state agency personnel to discuss the projections made and the implications of the reports. Responses to this sizable special project from across the state were positive and highly supportive.

The concept of “rural resource development” gained considerable interest across the state. A set of schools on the topic “Land, Water, People, and Economic Growth” was organized and led by David Allee, Dan Sisler, and Darwin Snyder, with more than 860 local leaders participating. The newly created Water Resources Center at Cornell assisted with this project. The role of the new federal Economic Opportunity Act and the impact of the newly passed 2 percent state sales tax were issues of special interest.

Collaborations between regional extension agents and program planning committees to work on activities across county borders were instituted in the mid-1960s. Department faculty helped to establish the support system required in the field, as well as to develop the content of the new regional programs in farm management, marketing, and rural development. Registration fees became associated with extension-sponsored programs because public funding for cooperative extension was not sufficient to cover all the costs of programming. A mail-in electronic farm accounting system was launched on campus in January 1966 with 125 cooperators enrolled. The computer facilities associated with the Dairy Herd Improvement Association (DHIA) were utilized for this program on a cooperative basis. By 1968, 600 farmers were enrolled on a fee basis.

When the final issue of Farm Economics was published in 1958, a need was recognized for a replacement publication or newsletter providing current economic information to its readers. A new monthly newsletter, Current Economic Situation, was launched in 1960 and sent to a revision of the original mailing list for Farm Economics. Emphasis was placed on agricultural prices and costs in New York State, along with commentary about national agricultural policy issues and economic data. This became a place to provide information on policy developments, news about activities within the state, and data on production and stocks of key commodities. Initially a two-page sheet, the newsletter grew to a four-page format over time, always centered on current data about the economy, as well as agricultural prices and costs. K. L. Robinson and W. G. Tomek took on primary responsibility for this continuing project.

The established extension teaching programs and schools of the department continued and grew. The work in farm business management and record analysis reached more and more farmers built on cooperation, in each
case, with individual county agent staff. Special programs on such topics as intergenerational transfers, planning for expansion of a business, early cutting of hay and forages, and the like, were well received. The regular programs for the dairy industry and its cooperatives, the fruit and vegetable industries, and the interdepartmental efforts in teaching went forward with vigor. Special schools, from those to update vocational agriculture teachers on economic issues to the annual farm income tax schools for tax-preparers and farmers, were mounted and revised as needed. The commitment to a more regionalized extension system remained strong.

Sugar Beets

Sugar beets were reintroduced into the state in the 1960s in an effort to find a new and potentially profitable crop for New York farmers and jobs for upstate workers in plants that were being closed because of new, more efficient production facilities located in other regions. (Sugar beets were commercially grown in the Elmira area in the first two decades of the century.) Leaders from farm organizations, legislators, the mayor of Auburn, representatives from the USDA, and the college’s administrators supported this initiative.

Economists at the USDA and C. D. Kearl, in charge of cost accounts and with experience from the irrigated West with the crop, argued forcefully that this crop could not compete with other alternative crops in New York. Their advice was not welcomed, and college agronomists set up field trials for sugar beets. Plans for a plant to be located in Weedsport along a mainline railroad in Cayuga County were developed.

The Department of Agricultural Economics was directed to study the potential production of sugar beets in central and western New York if a processing plant were built at the proposed site in Cayuga County. B. F. Stanton was directed to carry out this assignment. The plant was built, despite a publication and presentations showing estimates for different likely scenarios that only limited acreage and production could be expected. Support for
production of sugar beets in the college, outside Warren Hall, was generally positive, if not enthusiastic.


While it was clear from the outset that sugar beets could be produced by able New York farmers, the problem, not recognized by enthusiasts, was that in most cases other crops that could be grown on acreage suitable for sugar beets were more profitable. Further, for a processing plant to operate efficiently, a relatively large volume of beets was required from farms located in relatively close proximity to the plant. The study of harvesting costs made on 17 farms in 1965 reflected the problems inherent with a new crop. Commercial production was physically possible. The new plant, with refining equipment imported from Germany, did not work well in its first runs. Beets had to be shipped by rail to processing plants in other states. The plant in Weedsport never produced sugar from beets. Interestingly, more than 10 years after the plant was built, it was sold to a firm from the Midwest that
remodeled it to make liquid sugar from corn for use in central New York in making soft drinks and other processed products.

**Undergraduate Teaching**

In the 1960s, the number of undergraduate students admitted to the College of Agriculture gradually increased, although the university set caps on the numbers of students to be located in Ithaca. As a unit of the State University of New York (SUNY), the college also had to meet some general requirements of the SUNY system, as well as those of Cornell University. Essentially, 60 percent of the college’s students were expected to be upperclassmen and 40 percent students in the first two years. The intent was to find appropriate places for qualified transfer students, particularly from the state’s community colleges and other two-year institutions.

In the early 1960s, the college’s old farm practice requirement, and then the “practice” requirements that replaced it, were withdrawn, except for a few specializations. Thus, the nature and basic interests of the student body admitted to the college came to more nearly mirror the backgrounds of the state’s people. Most of the students came from urban and suburban homes and school systems. Students from farms and rural communities had some preference in admissions, but the makeup of classes in Warren Hall came to have a more urban/suburban character compared with the immediate postwar years. Integrating an increasing number of transfer students into class schedules added to advising responsibilities. One important source of transfers was the flow of students from other undergraduate colleges at Cornell, some of the academically most able coming regularly from engineering.

To meet the need for instruction in accounting and business law, two new courses in each area were added to the curriculum. Teaching in business law was made possible by hiring a lawyer full-time on the faculty, Joseph B. Bugliari. A unique arrangement was made with the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration in which each unit paid part of his basic salary, with Bugliari housed in Warren Hall and advising some of our students, while teaching two courses for each program each semester. Bugliari was an excellent teacher, well liked by the students in both locations. Instruction for accounting was largely provided by our faculty interested in business management and marketing. Kendall Carpenter and Dana Goodrich
did much of the teaching, maintaining a high standard of quality throughout the decade.

Undergraduate enrollment in courses in Agricultural Economics grew over the decade to make up 20 percent of the college’s total. The department offered 30 courses, intended primarily for undergraduates, enrolling nearly 3,000 students. Dan Sisler’s introductory course attracted 400 students each fall. There were 13 courses with 100 or more students enrolled in 1968–1969. Following in the tradition of Stan Warren (1948), Herrell DeGraff (1950), Larry Darrah (1955), and Ken Robinson (1959), the students of the senior class presented their Professor of Merit Award to Dan Sisler in 1964 and to Ken Carpenter in 1965. All of these outstanding teachers helped to set a high standard of classroom performance, which was widely recognized by students across the campus.

**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

A major change in the requirements for the Ph.D. was instituted in 1966 by Cornell’s graduate faculty, following a number of years of discussion and debate. Most important for many students was the decision to give the field of study the right to decide the foreign language requirement. Agricultural Economics opted to establish no formal language proficiency requirement, but left the option open for decision by each special committee. These changes were widely welcomed by students and faculty alike.

During the second half of the 1960s, graduate student numbers fluctuated between 95 and 100. In most of the years between 1966 and 1969, there were 50 or more Ph.D. students, 45 master's candidates, and two or three noncandidates registered. Students from abroad made up about 40 percent of those registered for degree programs, with wide representation from all the continents of the world. Interest in international agricultural development increased rapidly and many students chose to work on field research overseas. The field of Resource Economics drew increased enrollments as well.

**PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND AWARDS**

One of the department’s more important contributions and commitments to the American Farm Economics Association (AFEA) in the 1960s was made by C. Delmar Kearl, serving as its secretary-treasurer. He held the position from 1959 through 1969. He was ably assisted by the staff in his office working with the cost accounts program. Special recognition of his service was made by Past President Willard Cochrane of the American Agricultural Economics
Association (the name of the association was changed from "Farm Economics" to "Agricultural Economics" in 1968) at the awards program in 1969.

Also during the 1960s, AFEA recognized two master’s degrees and three doctoral dissertations from Cornell as outstanding. In 1965, A. Wayne Bartholomew received an award for his thesis, “An Analysis of the Interrelationships Between the Livestock and Feed Grain Industries: Exemplified by the Swine and Corn Industries,” directed by Dan Sisler. The second winning master's thesis was presented to Emmy Bartz Simmons in 1969 and was titled “The Food Balance Sheet as a Parameter of Tropical Food Economics: The Case of Mauritius,” directed by Thomas T. Poleman.

In 1963, Daniel G. Sisler’s doctoral dissertation, “Direct Production Payments in the Feed Grain Livestock Sector in American Agriculture,” directed by K. L. Robinson, was recognized. In 1968, Abraham Subotnik's dissertation, “The Development of an Econometric Model for Policy Decision Making in Israel,” directed by Dan Sisler, was given an award. In 1969, John Mellor’s student, Lee Teng-Hui, completed his dissertation, “Intersectoral Capital Flows in the Economic Development of Taiwan, 1895–1960,” and received the AAEA's national award. In further recognition of the quality of this study, it was then published as a book by Cornell University Press in 1971. Somewhat to the surprise of all of his teachers, Lee became a major political figure in Taiwan and was elected president in 1990. He returned
to Cornell in 1995 to receive an award as a distinguished alumnus of the college and participate in the university’s reunion activities as a “private citizen.” This visit received substantial national attention and was considered an affront by the government of China.

Mellor’s article entitled “Toward a Theory of Agricultural Development” in Agricultural Development and Economic Growth, edited by Southworth and Johnston, was recognized by the AFEA in 1968 in the category of Outstanding Published Research. In 1967, Stanley W. Warren received the only AFEA award that year for distinguished undergraduate teaching.

Perhaps the most prestigious award given each year by the AFEA is the recognition of three or four individuals as Fellows for their contributions to the profession during their professional careers. F. F. “Frosty” Hill was so honored in 1966. Some of Hill’s considerable achievements are discussed earlier in this book. The final paragraph of his citation was printed in the Journal of Farm Economics: “Professor Hill was best known among graduate students for his colorful metaphors, his ability to anticipate questions, and even to formulate and answer them before the questions were completed. He is at his best in informal discussions. Talking with Frosty Hill is as stimulating to colleagues as to graduate students because of his quick mind, enthusiasm, and sense of humor. He combines to an unusual degree a keen analytical mind with the colloquial expressions, common sense, and pragmatism of the American frontier.”

In 1960, the AFEA made Leonard K. Elmhirst a Fellow, recognizing his leadership and support in creating the International Conference of Agricultural Economists in 1929 and 1930, and then providing the energy and resources to maintain that organization into the postwar years. He was president of the IAAE for 30 years until 1958 and then recognized as its founding president. Elmhirst was proud of his Cornell degree and his continuing association with our faculty. He regularly visited the campus and stayed at Willard Straight Hall in its lodging facilities. One of its rooms for special events is designated the Elmhirst Room. Three of the department’s faculty, Robinson, Stanton, and Allee, held scholarships provided by Elmhirst for a year of graduate study at Oxford’s Agricultural Research Institute in the late 1940s and early 1950s. A book recognizing Elmhirst and his achievements was published in 1964 by Iowa State University Press, titled International Explorations of Agricultural Economics.
A number of faculty members were also recognized for their achievements by organizations for whom they had given special service and assistance. In 1965, Max E. Brunk received the American Farm Bureau Federation’s Distinguished Service Award, its highest honor, for his creative work in marketing agricultural products. Brunk also received the Johnny Appleseed Award in 1967 from the Western New York Apple Growers for his continuous service.

The Farm Credit Banks of Springfield presented its first Agricultural Counselor’s Award to Robert S. Smith in 1965. In 1967, this award also was tendered to Glenn W. Hedlund for his service to the banks over his career at Cornell. In 1967, the Association of Teachers of Agriculture of New York presented its Distinguished Service Award to L. C. Cunningham for his meritorious work with its members. Clifton W. Loomis received the Epsilon Sigma Phi Achievement Award in 1967 for his extension programs.

**THE FACULTY**

With a new dean for the college in 1959 and strong encouragement from the university administration, searches for new faculty were commonly national in scope. If former students who had completed their Ph.D.s at Cornell were to be considered seriously for positions, they would be expected to have obtained successful experience at a competing institution. The position made available by the retirement of Professor Pearson was filled in 1962 with the appointment of William G. Tomek. Bill had completed his B.S. and M.S. degrees at the University of Nebraska and his Ph.D. at Minnesota with Willard Cochrane. His work here was to center on prices and applied econometrics. Philip Baumel (Ph.D., Iowa State) accepted a position in business management in 1961, but chose to return to Iowa State in 1963, where he completed his academic career.

In 1963, T. T. Poleman (Stanford) and Solon Barraclough (Harvard) joined the faculty as a result of the Ford Foundation grant mentioned earlier. In addition, Nicolaas G. M. Luykx was appointed as an assistant professor of local government after completing his Ph.D. in 1963 with Professor Lutz and working in the Philippines and other locations in Southeast Asia. Daniel G. Sisler was appointed to the faculty on completion of his degree with Ken Robinson in 1963. He had taught the introductory Agricultural Geography course as a lecturer while completing his doctorate.

David J. Allee joined the faculty in 1964 after a number of years at the University of California, Berkeley. Allee completed his Ph.D. with Professor Conklin and spent one
year at Oxford on an Elmhirst scholarship. His responsibilities were in land economics and water resources. Donald K. Freebairn also joined the faculty in 1964 after seven years of experience in Mexico working for the Rockefeller Foundation. Don completed his B.S. and M.S. degrees at the University of Illinois and was fluent in Spanish. His major professor for his Ph.D. was L. C. Cunningham. The opening occurred for Freebairn because Barraclough was on leave and then finally resigned. Barraclough subsequently returned for brief periods as a visiting professor and worked with a number of students on their thesis research.

New additions to the faculty in 1965 were George Casler and Olan D. Forker. Casler completed both his B.S. and M.S. at Cornell. He farmed for a number of years, but returned to graduate school because of back problems. He completed his Ph.D. at Purdue and was appointed to a position in farm management. Olan Forker came as a tenured professor from the University of California, Berkeley. A native of Indiana, he did his B.S. at Purdue, M.S. at Michigan State, and Ph.D. at the University of California, Berkeley. His appointment was in marketing.

Additional new faculty were appointed in 1966. Daniel I. Padberg, a native of Missouri, completed his B.S. and M.S. at the University of Missouri, obtained his Ph.D. at the University of California, Berkeley, and then joined
the faculty at Ohio State University. He subsequently took leave and joined the National Food Commission before his appointment at Cornell in marketing. Robert J. Kalter joined the faculty immediately after completing his Ph.D. in resource economics at the University of Wisconsin. A native of Ohio, Kalter’s B.S. and M.S. were also from Wisconsin.

The last new appointment of the decade was Timothy D. Mount (1969). A native of Kent, United Kingdom, Tim completed his B.S. at Wye College, M.S. at Oregon State, and his Ph.D. at the University of California, Berkeley. His appointment was in applied econometrics and quantitative analysis.

With these appointments, faculty numbers increased modestly during the decade, reflecting the increased teaching responsibilities for both undergraduate and graduate students.

**Retirements and Deaths**

M. Slade Kendrick retired in June 1962 after 37 years of teaching and research in taxation, local government, and public finance. In the 1920s and 1930s, Kendrick worked effectively with his colleague, M. P.
Catherwood, on a succession of projects that called attention to and led to reforms in the ways that state aid was distributed to counties, towns, and school districts. He taught courses in public finance and taxation from the 1930s onward, until his retirement. His courses were cross-listed and accepted for credit in the Department of Economics. Slade was the consummate gentleman; he was kindly, polite, and could only make positive comments about his fellow man. He fitted the prototype of the university professor of his era: always in a shirt and tie, which may or may not have matched his jacket and trousers. He was well liked by students and staff alike.

Maurice C. Bond retired as director of extension for the state colleges in June 1962. He received his Ph.D. at Cornell in 1928 and served on the faculty for 35 years. His initial appointment was in marketing extension and he served as project leader for the department’s extension activities in the postwar years. He was appointed director in 1954. Bond was a Vermonter and a “doer.” He led by example and took leadership for the expanded marketing extension programs for fruits and vegetables in the 1930s. He had a strong interest in the agricultural census and prepared county summaries by township in the years when such data were available in the 1940s and 1950s. He was a warm and friendly person, remembered for his frequent compliments for work well done. In retirement, he and his wife immediately left for a two-year assignment in the Philippines to help the college at Los Baños develop an extension program in farm and home development (Turk 1974, 364).

In June 1964, Leland Spencer retired after 40 years as a faculty member and four years previous to that as an instructor. Spencer was “Mr. Milk Marketing” in the Northeast, as well as for much of the country. He served on nearly every state and federal commission that was convened over the years to help propose legislation or make changes to existing legislation concerned with market orders and the orderly marketing of milk. He had observed the milk strikes in 1917 in New York as a student and spent his lifetime trying to work with all the forces within the industry, from farmer to dealer, to maintain peace and reduce the causes for tension between regions and industry groups. Spencer was widely recognized as an “unbiased” source of factual information. Federal market orders worked as well as they did, in part because of his lifetime efforts. In retirement, he continued his scholarly pursuits, completing a
four-volume history of actions taken and legislation enacted on milk marketing issues between 1910 and 1970.

Kendall S. Carpenter died suddenly from a heart attack in June 1967. He was only 51 and had been on the faculty since 1954. He had just recently been named Professor of Merit by the seniors and was regularly teaching two large classes: the introductory Accounting course and the junior-senior Farmer Cooperatives course. His research was in business management and cooperatives, and he had worked closely with the leadership of most of the cooperatives in the northeastern United States. Ken seemed to wear a perpetual smile on his face and had a real New England sense of humor. He and his colleagues, who completed their degrees at Cornell in the immediate postwar years, were close friends, and his sudden loss was particularly difficult for both students and faculty.

Lowell C. Cunningham retired in 1969 after 37 years on the faculty. He was a native of Illinois and kept his roots alive there throughout his years at Cornell. His initial position was in farm management extension, but his career was marked with solid performances as an innovative researcher with his regional farm management studies and extension follow-ups with extension agents, farmers, and college administrators. His field trips were special; highly structured and organized, he was quite prepared to leave any stragglers, including the dean, behind. There was never any question of who was in charge, whether on a field trip, a survey crew, or in an extension meeting. “Lou” taught the course Advanced Farm Management in his final years and continued his stream of publications and extension materials into retirement. His was a full and productive career; his colleagues and students remember him for his forceful personality and his commitment to helping farmers and rural people improve their management skills.

**Hedlund Steps Down as Department Head**

After serving as interim head of the department from February 1952 to July 1954, and then head for another 14 years, Glenn W. Hedlund decided to leave this administrative position in 1968. He wanted to use his remaining years as a professor to pursue his interests in cooperatives and their opportunities to make a difference in agriculture, both nationally and overseas. The transition was made on April Fools’ Day, which appealed to both “Swede” and “Bud” Stanton,
who agreed to serve as the new “chairman.” Dean Palm was never quite happy with the title of chairman. Nevertheless, the movement toward greater involvement by faculty in decision making on new faculty appointments and all other important departmental decisions was already well under way while Hedlund served in the 1960s. The central university’s position on the title and role of the chairman was put in place with this change in leadership.

CAMPUS UNREST

There was substantial restiveness by students seeking change and greater power in administrative and academic decisions on campuses across the U.S. in the late 1960s. Cornell had its share of unrest in both 1968 and 1969, and Hedlund wrote a meaningful summary of these momentous events for News Notes in November 1969:

Agricultural Economics Faculty, Early 1960s


Much as at many other universities, Cornell had its share of unrest, demands for change, and confrontations during recent years. It was not until last spring, however, that circumstances catapulted Cornell into the national and even international limelight. Until then, the Cornell campus did not make real news. But the picture of armed students emerging from Willard Straight changed all that and subsequent actions of the faculty did not enhance the off-campus image.

It is the writer’s view that the Spring confrontation by black students grew out of the general demands for change in our society. The situation at Cornell was somewhat different from that at many universities because of the university’s efforts, stimulated primarily by its then president, James A. Perkins, to do its part in providing first-class educational opportunities for disadvantaged students, primarily blacks. For several years, it sought out and recruited competent blacks from urban areas and elsewhere. Admission standards appropriate to the experience of these students were applied and substantial financial aid was provided.

These students did good work at Cornell. Over time, many of them evidenced their preference not to accept the university as it was, nor to integrate with the white community. Some of them, as elsewhere, demanded a more "relevant" program which came under the general rubric of "black studies." In pressing their desires, they no doubt found ample bureaucratic roadblocks to frustrate anyone even if he were a member of a minority. The university accepted black studies in principle, however, and established a faculty-student committee to plan a program and to recruit a director. Evidently, progress was unsatisfactory to the black leadership because they engaged in some demonstrations last winter in Willard Straight, the library, and elsewhere.

Hedlund then reviewed in some detail the events that led to the takeover of Willard Straight Hall, the picture of armed students at the entrance, and the university-wide meetings which followed in Barton Hall. He concludes his statement:

The repercussions from the events of the week tended to polarize the campus. At least two professors of government resigned as did President Perkins at a later date . . . . A Trustee Committee was established to study the underlying problems. The campus established a constituent assembly composed of students, administration, trustees, alumni, faculty, and employees. . . . In early September, the Board of Trustees appointed Provost Dale R. Corson to the office of President. It also adopted regulations for the maintenance of public order as required by a new state law . . . . Cornell had a revolution so to speak. It received much adverse publicity
although there was no bloodshed or burning buildings . . . . A director of black studies has been appointed and is on campus. Our new president has been well received. It is hoped that most of us gained insight and understanding so that we can make change and progress through rational debate and compromise.

Warren Hall and the department lived through this time of trouble without incident. Demonstrations were held by Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) on the quadrangle outside the building, but classes went on as usual except for the few days when the university was in recess. We all learned some things about ourselves in these weeks of turmoil, but were finally the stronger and wiser from the peaceful resolution of a difficult period in the life of the university.

OVERVIEW

The 1960s were an important decade in the life of the department. Eleven new faculty members were appointed as a result of retirements and support granted for a few new positions. Most of the new appointments had completed their doctorates at other universities or spent important periods on the faculty at other institutions. There was general acceptance within the department that this strategy was wise and necessary in building our academic strength and reputation.

Commitments to serve the needs of New York’s citizens were evidenced in such general, far-reaching projects as Operation Advance and Toward the Year 1985. An active research and teaching program in international agricultural development was established, built on the substantial overseas experience and interests of an important group of faculty. The undergraduate teaching program attracted increased numbers of students, and graduate student numbers were at an all-time high. The department’s resources were in demand within the college and across the state and region. A positive atmosphere prevailed in this decade of growth and increased responsibility.
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CORNELL UNIVERSITY, LIKE MOST UNIVERSITIES IN THE COUNTRY, responded positively to the events of the late 1960s. President Dale Corson sought and provided stability at the center of the campus, with strong support from the board of trustees and the deans of all the colleges. Channels of communication were reopened and campus life, changed somewhat by the challenges of the recent past, returned to a more “normal” pattern. The university established a new position, judicial administrator, and Joe Bugliari agreed to serve in that role while carrying his full teaching load in both Agricultural Economics and the business school. He was aided in this responsibility by a full-time person working to handle cases in a newly established office in Day Hall.

A university senate was established in 1970. Dan Padberg was one of the faculty members representing the social sciences. Dave Allee’s university-wide committee on housing and dining made its report to the president. Many others from the department served on committees and boards, which, in turn, reviewed the recent events across the university and then made recommendations to resolve the problems that had been recognized. It was a time when people came together to improve the way things were done in the university and to rebuild a sense of community.

A sense of the atmosphere in 1970–1971 is suggested by the lead paragraph in the September 1971 issue of News Notes: “It was a normal academic year. After two Spring terms marked by instability, students, faculty, and administration worked hard this year to achieve a stable academic environment at Cornell. This effort produced an enjoyable Spring, final exams for everyone, and a much more relaxed atmosphere. We hopefully have learned something from our experiences of earlier years and will be stronger and more aware as a result.”

WOMEN IN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Out of the turmoil, confrontations, and committee efforts of the late 1960s came an increased awareness of the need to take positive actions to ensure that the interests of minority groups were given more than passing concern. New ways to listen to the nonprofessional staff and respond to their complaints were
implemented. The role of women at the university at all levels, from janitorial services to administrators to faculty positions, was given new visibility. President Corson made it clear that the academic departments, as well as the central university, needed to examine what they were doing to respond to this heightened awareness.

The profession of agricultural economics, like most of the applied agricultural sciences in 1970, had few women with professorial titles and small numbers of female graduate students. This department had no women on its faculty and only a few professionals other than the clerical and secretarial staff. Efforts to change became evident starting in the 1970s, both at Cornell and across the country.

The first woman to obtain a graduate degree from the Department of Agricultural Economics was Lucy E. Ellenberg, who obtained her M.S. in June 1939. Her thesis was “An Experiment in the Single Tax,” written under the direction of M. Slade Kendrick. Ruth E. Phelps was granted her master’s in 1946 for “A Study of Agricultural Production in the Northeastern United States.” Marcia Bowden wrote her M.S. thesis, “The Development of Agriculture in Cayuga County, 1788–1855,” in 1950. Three other women completed their M.S. in the 1950s: Patricia Froelich, who came from the market administrator’s office in New York City and returned to a professional position there on completion of her degree; Anita Mackie, who was a county agricultural agent in New York State and remained in this position; and Gloria R. Vega, one of the first graduate students to come from the Philippines as part of the Los Baños project who then returned to that faculty.

The first woman to complete her Ph.D. in agricultural economics at Cornell was Uma J. Lele in 1966. Her thesis, “Efficiency in Jowar Marketing: A Study of Regulated Markets in Western India,” was directed by John Mellor. Dr. Lele subsequently held a number of senior positions at universities and the World Bank. She was made a Fellow of the AAEA in 1999.

Before 1970, a total of 12 graduate degrees had been granted to women at Cornell with majors in agricultural economics. In the 1970s, 20 women completed graduate degrees and, by the end of the decade, graduate study in agricultural economics was far from a “males-only” preserve. The appointments of Jan Sweeney in accounting and Lana Hall in marketing as assistant professors in 1977–1978 brought the first women into faculty roles at the college, as well.

**Changes in the College**

The college changed its name officially on July 1, 1971, and became the New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, a statutory college of the State University of New York at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. The change in name was made to reflect more fully what the college and its faculty members were doing in research, teaching, and extension. Dean Charles Palm, in a statement about the name change, called attention “to our broad-
ened mission in the study of the many living systems that surround us . . . . Through coordinated efforts in research, resident instruction, and public service, the college works to expand the existing body of knowledge in agriculture and the related life sciences and to harness its achievements for the benefit of man.”

In July 1972, Dean Palm stepped down and returned to his status as a professor of entomology. A new set of professorships was created honoring Liberty Hyde Bailey, and Palm became the first holder of this title among the faculty. Palm’s years as dean were marked by excellent relationships with the governors of the state and the legislature. He was particularly effective in explaining the needs of the college with splendid photographs of what had been accomplished in the past and the needs for additional resources to move forward in solving new problems.

The new dean selected for the college was W. Keith Kennedy, an agronomist. Kennedy moved to his new position from Day Hall, where he had served as vice provost. Earlier he had served the college as director of research. He had been a college leader in agronomy, establishing interdisciplinary research projects with faculty in Animal Science, Plant Breeding, Agricultural Engineering, and Agricultural Economics. His selection as dean was a popular one.

Three more new administrators appeared in Roberts Hall in 1973 and 1974. David L. Call (Ph.D., Cornell, 1960) was appointed director of extension from his position as Babcock Professor of Food Economics in the School of Nutrition. Call had returned to Cornell in this endowed chair after three years on the agricultural economics faculty at Michigan State University. Noland L. VanDemark, a dairy scientist from Ohio State University, replaced Nyle Brady as director of research when Brady became president and director of the International Rice Research Institute. Kenneth L. Turk retired as director of International Agricultural Development in 1974. His replacement was Edwin B. Oyer, former chairman of the Department of Vegetable Crops. Joseph F. Metz (Ph.D., 1955) then followed Oyer as director in 1977.

**Doctoral Research Programs**

One way to get a sense of faculty and graduate student interests and research in the late 1960s and early 1970s is to examine the list of students receiving Ph.D.s between September 1970 and June 1971. The list of students and the titles of their theses may be found on the next page.

As one looks over the list of titles, one is struck by the range of interests they covered and the commitment in these theses to finding solutions to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE OF THESIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bjergo, Allen C.</td>
<td>A Study of Decision Making in 21 New York Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chayat, Meir</td>
<td>Bargaining Power to Farmers and Its Welfare Effects: A Case Study of the Egg Production Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham, Wallace C.</td>
<td>The Role of National Trade Associations in the Food Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gessaman, Paul H.</td>
<td>A Study of the Impact of Transportation on Land Use and Rural Life in Four Southern Tier Counties of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene, Brook A.</td>
<td>Rate of Adoption of New Farm Practices in the Central Plains, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammonds, Timothy M.</td>
<td>Utilization of Protein Ingredients in the U.S. Food Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazell, Peter B. R.</td>
<td>Rational Decision Making and Parametric Linear Programming Models for Combining Farm Enterprises Under Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby, Lawrence W.</td>
<td>The Political Economy of Water Management: Conceptual Model and Decision Strategy for the Susquehanna Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLaren, Donald</td>
<td>Agriculture and the Trade Balance of the United Kingdom: A Theoretical and Econometric Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCullough, T. David</td>
<td>Unit Pricing in Supermarkets: Alternatives, Costs, and Consumer Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romm, Jeffrey M.</td>
<td>Nuclear Power, Cayuga Lake, and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder, Mark C. W.</td>
<td>The Impact of the Sonauli-Pokhara Highway on the Regional Income and Agricultural Production of the Pokhara Valley, Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubbs, Alan R.</td>
<td>Capital Investments in Agricultural Marketing Cooperatives: Implications for Farm Firm and Cooperative Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss, Joseph S.</td>
<td>The Benefits of Broader Markets due to Feeder Roads and Market News: Northeast Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkerson, L. John</td>
<td>Factors Influencing Consumer Acceptance of Fluid Milk Substitutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wunderle, Robert E.</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Pilot Food Certificate Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
real problems. Work on issues of interest and concern in the food industry and marketing were central to six of the theses. International agricultural development problems in three different countries were considered, reflecting the continuing work of faculty in this major area of study. Studying natural resource issues—water, roads, and power—was important in this research, both in the United States and overseas.

The newer quantitative methods were evident in the titles of two of the theses, but, clearly, were a natural part of the analytic process in most others. Hazell, within the decade, created MOTAD, a further development of linear programming that came to be widely used in research internationally. MacLaren, 30 years later, is professor of economics, University of Melbourne, working on problems in international trade. This list includes a future dean at Maine and professors at Nebraska, Ohio State, Oklahoma State, and the University of California, Berkeley. Leaders in the food industry at the close of the century and in business are also well represented.

A revision of Chayat’s thesis and additional work by faculty won the AAEA’s Quality of Research Discovery Award (Chayat, Forker, and Padberg 1974).

**Computing Facilities and Quantitative Analyses**

Viewed from the perspective of the beginning of the twenty-first century, it is somewhat difficult to appreciate the state of facilities for computing on this campus in 1970 and the changes that occurred slowly, but with great significance, during the decade. The statistics laboratory in Warren 360 was simply a room full of rotary calculators in 1970. Only a few had the capacity to do square root “automatically” and these cost almost $1,000 per machine. The IBM facility in the basement of Warren was “modern” in terms of its capacity to convert data into alphanumeric form for standard calculations. Complex statistical calculations had to be sent to other locations for solutions.

The university had established a computing center in Rand Hall in the early 1960s to carry out statistical calculations and other mathematical operations, including the capacity to receive requests and data from the IBM equipment in Warren Hall. Commonly, however, students and faculty took their “jobs” (a stack of IBM cards that included a detailed program with instructions) to the computing center in Rand and picked them up the next day or whenever they were ready in the queue. Students, both undergrads and grads, walking around with output on large lined sheets and packs of cards were a common sight on campus in the 1970s.
New, more powerful equipment for central computing systems was developed and acquired by the university throughout the decade. The ability to communicate from a small satellite computer and printer located in Warren Hall with the central facility in Rand became a reality during the decade. Computing power increased while the space requirements for new, more efficient hardware were greatly reduced.

The list of Warren Hall professional staff in 1971–1972 for the first time included one full-time person, Norman Rollins, identified for computer programming. Much of his work was associated with the farm accounting projects, including both summaries of county records from individual farm businesses and input for an “electronic farm accounting system” in which farmer participants could enroll.

The list of courses in 1973–1974 also reflected the increasing emphasis on quantitative methods beyond statistics and the capacity for students to submit assigned problems to central computing facilities for solution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title of Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Introduction to Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Econometrics I</td>
<td>Tomek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Econometrics II</td>
<td>Mount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Quantitative Methods I</td>
<td>Boisvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Quantitative Methods II</td>
<td>How</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Econometric Models</td>
<td>Mount, Tomek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early in the 1970s, the demand for computing from all parts of the campus exceeded the capacity of available equipment in Rand Hall. Individual installations requiring substantial space began to appear at different locations. Thus, the Department of Animal Science had a sizable IBM installation to handle DHIA records. Its primary use was for the research programs in animal breeding and nutrition. Agricultural Economics used this on a fee basis for its electronic farm accounting project and county summaries. Software programs, including basic statistical packages developed by SAS and SPSS, were installed at central computing facilities and were widely used by students and faculty for teaching and research by the end of the decade. Some knowledge of computing languages, such as BASIC and FORTRAN, was valuable in getting projects ready to send to central facilities for solution.

The first personal computers became available in the mid-1970s from Altair (1975) and Apple (1977), but their important role in both teaching and research did not come until the 1980s, when the move to using personal computers in nearly every office on campus began to have its full effect.
UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

One of the major changes in the work and life of the department came in response to the jump in the teaching load that occurred in a span of 10 years. In the previous two decades, the number of students taught had increased steadily as the number of students in the college increased. In the 1970s, the interest in courses taught in the Department of Agricultural Economics grew by leaps and bounds. A comparison of actual numbers in classes taught in 1969–1970 and 1979–1980 provides a rather dramatic story.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Economics of Agricultural Geography</td>
<td>Sisler</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>Aplin</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Sweeney</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Goodrich</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Resource Economics</td>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Farm Management</td>
<td>Conneman</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Introductory Statistics</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Business Law I</td>
<td>Bugliari</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Business Law II</td>
<td>Bugliari</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Taxation in Business/Personal</td>
<td>Bugliari</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Managerial Accounting</td>
<td>Sweeney</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Economics of the Public Sector</td>
<td>Barkley</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Economics of Marketing</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
<td>Goodrich</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Marketing Milk and Dairy Products</td>
<td>Story</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Marketing Horticultural Products</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Resource Economics</td>
<td>Allee</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Farm and Food Policies</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Agricultural Prices</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Advanced Farm Management</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Farm Cost Accounting</td>
<td>Kearl</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Farm Finance</td>
<td>LaDue</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Farm and Rural Real Estate Appraisal</td>
<td>Conneman</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Advanced Agricultural Finance</td>
<td>LaDue</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Production Economics</td>
<td>Casler</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Linear Programming</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Advanced Business Law</td>
<td>Bugliari</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>Advanced Business Law</td>
<td>Bugliari</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Managerial Decision Making</td>
<td>Aplin</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Personal Financial Management</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the decade, some introductory classes more than doubled in size and the total number of students served essentially doubled as well. Substantial pressure was put on the advising system, with more than 600 students seeking assistance in finding classes, needing letters of recommendation, and requiring personal advice and attention. Teaching and student advising claimed time from both research and extension commitments for an important group of faculty.

The elements of an undergraduate business program, with emphasis on the food and agriculture industries, were now well established. Transfers to the department from other colleges within Cornell became more numerous. News of the quality of the program in Warren Hall had been spreading steadily in the postwar years to guidance counselors in high schools across the state, including the suburban metropolitan areas around New York City. The SAT scores of applicants for these business-oriented programs rose accordingly. A student body, cosmopolitan in background, emerged to challenge each other and their teachers in rigorous academic programs.

A new program was established in 1972 for upperclassmen interested in farm finance, which continues into the twenty-first century. Funded by the Farm Credit Banks, the Farm Credit Fellows provides an opportunity for selected students to gain experience during the summer between their junior and senior years working as an intern for one or two weeks in that system. During their senior year, the Fellows spend a week between semesters in New York City visiting financial markets and the banking system. They also participate in a senior course in finance, which includes the preparation and presentation of a consulting report to a farmer and his lender on an existing credit problem. The fellowship covers all expenses associated with the internship, travel, and fieldwork, including compensation for lost income while participating in these projects. The success of this program has led to the subsequent development of somewhat similar programs for selected upperclassmen within the college in food marketing, agribusiness, and dairy science.

Further evidence of the excellence of the faculty’s teaching performance is provided by the Professor of Merit awards that were garnered during the
1970s. Joe Bugliari was so honored by the seniors in 1970; Robert S. Smith, professor of farm finance and organizer of the new course in personal finance, in 1972; George Conneman, who followed Stan Warren in teaching farm management, in 1975; and Dick Aplin, teacher of two new courses in business management, in 1976. Bugliari was recognized again with the SUNY Chancellor’s Award for Distinguished Teaching in 1977. The American Agricultural Economics Association (AAEA) award for outstanding undergraduate teaching was presented to Larry Darrah in 1971 and to Dan Sisler in 1978. Both had received Professor of Merit awards in the 1960s.

All of these awards reflected the substantial commitment and high standards established by the recipients and the department to a creative and scholarly program in business management and agricultural economics. Employers recognized the solid preparation of our graduates, and news of their successes in a variety of businesses added to the flow of students into department courses throughout the decade.

**W. I. Myers Professorship in Farm Finance**

With the strong support of Dean W. Keith Kennedy, the department set out to establish an endowed professorship in farm finance to honor W. I. Myers, former dean of the college and its first professor of farm finance. The campaign to fund the chair was launched by the college in 1977 with a goal of obtaining $750,000 as an initial endowment. This goal was reached with the strong support of the Farm Credit Banks of the Northeast, the commercial banks of New York State holding agricultural portfolios, and the host of friends of Myers and the college. Key figures in the success of the campaign were Dean Kennedy and a faculty committee from the department headed by Bob Smith and including Forker, Bratton, Brunk, Conneman, LaDue, and Stanton. One of the strengths of the campaign was the number of individual alumni and friends of Myers who contributed to the project.

The newly endowed chair was announced as fully funded in May 1979 by Dean David L. Call. Professor Robert S. Smith, recently retired as professor of farm finance and then chairman of the board of the Tompkins County Trust Company, was named as the first holder of the chair on a part-time basis. A story in the *Cornell Countryman* in April 1979 was titled “First Endowed Chair in the College.” It reported, “The Cornell University Board of Trustees felt that the first individual to
occupy the chair should be from New York State. Professor Smith has been a key figure in the field of farm finance for the past 10 to 15 years. Said Smith, ‘It has been particularly meaningful to me to be chosen Myers professor because my career was greatly influenced by Bill Myers. For many years, I taught the course he initiated. He was one of the giants in my field.’” Smith continued as the Myers professor until John Brake moved from Michigan State University to hold this new position on a full-time basis in 1981.

**The AAEA**

After C. D. Kearl completed his 11 years of service as secretary-treasurer of the AAEA in 1969, the department continued to contribute to the operations of our profession in the 1970s. William G. Tomek agreed to serve as editor of the *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* (AJAE) for three years, 1974–1977. His associate editors during this period were Donald Freebairn and Richard Boisvert. Bill and his associates took on this responsibility without additional support staff. A good working relationship with the technical editor for the AJAE was an important part of their successful years as editors, much appreciated by their professional colleagues across the country.

After serving as chairman of the AAEA Awards Committee for two years, B. F. Stanton was elected to the board of directors of the AAEA in 1974 for a three-year term, and then was elected president of the association in 1979. His presidential address in 1978, “Perspective on Farm Size,” reflected his central interest in the changing structure of agriculture. He concluded his comments, “If there are diseconomies to increased farm size, given current technology, let us seek to discover and measure them. If such diseconomies do not exist, then the numbers of commercial farms will decrease more rapidly in the next decades than they have in the last 40 years. The issue of farm size, far from dead, is a recurring and lively subject for study.”

Considerable pressure was exerted by the AAEA board to continue the tradition of holding the national meetings at Cornell and Iowa State in successive years. This tradition began in 1909 and 1910, and was followed again in 1959 and 1960. Reluctantly, the department agreed to host the AAEA meetings in 1984, to be followed by Iowa State in 1985. The great concern by the department remained that the facilities at Cornell were not adequate to meet the needs and expectations of those attending because of the lack of air-conditioned rooms for meetings and for sleeping. The university was prepared to assist in planning and carrying out many of the necessary functions of being a host on receipt of a part of the registration fee, which was now an expected part of the costs of national meetings. The meetings were duly held.
in warm, muggy August weather—as predicted—with a large attendance. The department proved to be a good host, but was also a strong supporter of moving the meetings in the future to commercial facilities, which has been done in most years since the late 1980s.

Cornell did well in the AAEA awards programs during the 1970s. In 1972, Ed Lutz was recognized for his extension program, “The In-Service Training of County Officers of Government Coordination and Management.” Howard Conklin’s program in land economics won an award as a policy contribution, citing his leadership for developing the concept of agricultural districts, which allow commercial farming to continue in an urbanizing environment. John Mellor’s book, The Economics of Agricultural Development, was designated a Publication of Enduring Quality in 1978, only 12 years after its publication. Two master’s theses won awards: Geoffrey Jackson’s “An Economic Analysis of the Quota on United States Beef Imports” in 1971 and John Staatz’s “The Economic and Nutritional Impact of Changes in Agricultural Production Patterns: The Case of the Philippines” in 1976. The advisors for these two theses were K. L. Robinson and D. G. Sisler, respectively.

Kenneth L. Robinson was named an AAEA Fellow in 1979. He had served as vice president of the AAEA in 1967 and was a member of the editorial council of the American Journal of Agricultural Economics in 1965–1967. His citation in the Journal starts, “Kenneth L. Robinson has been an important contributor to agricultural economics in the fields of agricultural policy and prices. He is unique in his ability to do high-quality work and provide leadership in all functional areas: teaching, extension, and research. His work symbolizes the combination of academic excellence and breadth that most of us seek, but few attain. His intellect, humility, integrity, and a strong sense of public service combine to make him an outstanding individual and agricultural economist.” This national recognition was widely applauded.

Two theses by graduate students from Cornell were given special recognition during the 1970s by the American Institute of Cooperation. In 1971, Alan R. Tubbs’s Ph.D. thesis, “Capital Investments in Agricultural Marketing Cooperatives: Implications for Farm Firm and Cooperative Finance,” was designated as the best in the country concerned with a cooperative issue. In 1978, the master’s thesis by William Warren Smith, “Economic Coordination and Growth in Agricultural Cooperatives: A Study of the Fruit and Vegetable Industry in the United States,” was given similar national recognition. Advisors for these theses were, respectively, Robert S. Smith and R. Brian How.

**EXTENSION AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

With the 14 publications prepared for Toward The Year 1985 in hand, faculty and staff worked in meetings across the state with colleagues in other depart-
ments, leading discussions of changes that had occurred in the postwar years and the needs for change in the decades ahead. State legislators and their staffs were briefed in Albany, along with agricultural leaders, on the contents of the publications. Copies were made available for use as background materials when policy issues involving agriculture and the food industry were proposed or came under question. A filmstrip was prepared, highlighting the contents of the 14 publications, and was widely used. Demand for the publications was large enough that reprinting of individual bulletins was required. Substantial interest in the project was expressed by other states, and similar initiatives were launched based on this successful venture in New York.

Building on the success of Operation Advance in the 1960s, the local government program was expanded by hiring a full-time program leader, Clark Hamlin, for continuing extension efforts. Hamlin had been a leader in the New York State County Officers Association and a strong supporter of the efforts and schools designed to work with local government officials in improving their knowledge base and skills in carrying out their elected or appointed responsibilities. In response to the flood damage resulting in many communities from Hurricane Agnes in 1972, Allee, Conklin, LaDue, and Smith organized programs to assist local officials in responding to the cleanup and rebuilding of public and private facilities. They worked with state and federal officials in securing needed assistance. This emergency also provided an opportunity to remind individuals and communities about problems associated with flood plains and what was insurable.

A regional school, Investment Decisions for Greater Profit, was organized by Dick Aplin for upper-level managers of dairy businesses in the Northeast. The teaching faculty included Aplin, Bragg (University of Massachusetts), Butz (Penn State), Devino (Rutgers), Fife (Vermont), and Hahn (Ohio State). The school attracted enrollees from 10 states and Puerto Rico. A number of informal regional efforts grew out of this successful interstate program.

In response to the growth in the number of roadside markets and pick-your-own operations, programs in direct marketing of fruits and vegetables received strong leadership from Brian How and regional staff. Department assistance in strengthening relationships between the Pro-Fac Cooperative and Curtice-Burns in marketing vegetables for processing was given priority. Faculty took the leadership in building on the work of the New York State Cooperative Council with Hedlund’s active support and counsel.

The monthly newsletter *Current Economic Situation* had a wide readership, with Robinson and Tomek providing monthly updates on policy issues of interest in agriculture and the general economy. The focus of interest was on New York State and Washington. Important changes in trends for farm
products and costs were highlighted. Two additional newsletters were developed during the decade. *Agricultural Update* was prepared to keep extension staff and agricultural leaders informed about the latest information on farm management and finance in New York and the rest of the country. *Rural Manpower Issues* was launched on a quarterly basis with the addition of Dennis Fisher to the staff to report on labor regulations and requirements. Special schools were conducted with the assistance of Professor Frank in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations (ILR) on farm labor management.

Art Bratton reported in *News Notes* that between July 1975 and June 1976 the department had issued 107 publications in the three mimeographed series: 43 Staff Papers, 37 A. E. Research Bulletins, and 27 A. E. Extension Bulletins. The output and work of the faculty and staff were also widely shared in a variety of media, including radio and television.

**INTERDEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ON MANAGING WATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE**

Public concerns with increased levels of nitrogen and phosphorus entering lakes and streams led to the passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendment Act of 1972. The college obtained funding from the Rockefeller Foundation to carry out a study of the Fall Creek watershed in some detail to determine, insofar as possible, the sources of nitrogen and phosphorus entering streams from alternative sources. Faculty from Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Engineering, Agronomy, Natural Resources, and Rural Sociology participated in this four-year study. All agreed on the complexity of the problems of identifying sources of non-point pollution, but progress was made.

The book summarizing this research, *Nitrogen and Phosphorus: Food Production, Waste, and the Environment*, was edited by Keith S. Porter. It cited two main purposes for the study: “[1] to consider the effects of man’s activities on the flows of nitrogen and phosphorus, especially in rural areas; and [2] to consider management of the two nutrients with respect to food production and the environment so the welfare of society is increased.” The individual chapters of the book were written by faculty, research associates, and graduate assistants who had worked on the project. George Casler and Jim Jacobs, subsequently director of research at the University of Wyoming, were the contributors from the Department of Agricultural Economics.

This was a major undertaking by the college and produced some of the first precise measurements of nitrogen and phosphorus moving from rural areas from many sources into streams in a watershed. The final chapter of the book, “Assessment and Management of Nitrogen and Phosphorus,” summarized the data and provided a set of recommendations on ways to reduce the movement of these nutrients into streams. In retrospect, this study was a pioneering effort, widely cited in later years for the collaborative efforts of faculty and staff to examine the complex soil-water interactions that occurred in...
a watershed over time. Much was learned, as well, about integrating research from several disciplines.

**The Food Industry Management Program**

The original Food Distribution Program that was developed in the late 1950s had evolved into the broader Food Industry Management Program by the 1970s. Not only was there a continuing program of courses for Cornell undergraduates and graduate students interested in careers in the food industry, but also a growing program of correspondence courses, now designated as the Home Study Program, serving the needs of employees in the food industry.

Research, led by Professors Wendell Earle and Earl Brown, was a natural part of the program. The publication of the annual *Operating Results of Food Chains* was supplemented by another summary publication, *Operating Results of Self Service Department Stores*. With continuing cooperation from the National Association of Food Chains (NAFC), the *Grocery Distribution Center Efficiency Report* was also prepared on an annual basis.

Gene A. German, a student in the original program in 1958–1959, had at first returned to work with Kroger, but was then persuaded to return to Cornell to help establish an expanded program in 1963. He helped develop the first successful correspondence courses and took leadership for the Home Study Program as it became an industry-wide program in the United States and Canada, including French language courses for students in Quebec. In the 1970s, the first overseas students were recruited through a workshop in the Philippines, and a subsequent close alliance with partners in Japan was established. The partnership with the food industry in Japan has grown from these initial beginnings into a lasting and fruitful working relationship.

German also began teaching undergraduate courses and was encouraged to complete his doctorate in marketing, working with Max Brunk, which he accomplished in 1977. With student numbers expanding in the Home Study Program, George (Bud) Hayward and Robert Nolan were hired to manage and further develop this program for industry employees. Lillian Edds served as writer and editor for this effort, and Gerard (Rod) Hawkes served as a research specialist.

The list of courses offered by the Home Study Program at the end of the decade included these titles:

- Economics for Business
- Accounting
- Business Math
Some 100,000 students had completed one or more courses from this series by the end of 1979.

Wendell Earle was in substantial demand for consulting and advisory work throughout the food industry and opted for early retirement from the faculty in 1977. He continued to do some teaching in retirement on a part-time basis. This left substantial responsibility to German for leadership in the undergraduate student program and its major teaching responsibilities. Other faculty in marketing advised graduate students in food industry management, broadened the scope of the research program, and contributed to the overall effort.

The Julius Hendel Visiting Lectureship was established with an endowment in 1972 to bring executives from the food industry to campus. Lecturers included Donald Gannon, past president of Stop & Shop; Thomas Rich, past president of P&G Food Markets; Herrell DeGraff, past president of the American Meat Institute; Edward Mooney, former editor of Chain Store Age; and Lloyd Moseley, past vice president of Grand Union. A two-week program at Cornell during the summer for food executives was established under Earl Brown and Wendell Earle’s leadership.

**INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES**

By the 1970s, there was an international flavor to many of the activities of the faculty, graduate students, and staff. For example, in 1970, Clif Loomis spent his sabbatic leave as economic advisor to the Agricultural Development Fund in Iran. Olan Forker took a leave for the year as economic advisor to the USAID mission in Turkey. Larry and Wanda Darrah returned to the Philippines for the third time on a two-year assignment at Los Baños, which was extended to four years when Larry moved over to the Philippine government’s Department of Agricultural and Natural Resources to help set up an economic research program. Dan Sisler was invited to give one of the...
major papers at the IAAE meetings in Minsk, USSR in 1970. Peter Hazell and Brian How wrote one of the contributed papers that was published; George Conneman also attended. That same year, Cornell University Press published Yaaqov Goldschmidt’s book, *Information for Management Decisions*, based in large part on his doctoral thesis completed with Stanton in 1968.

In 1971, John Mellor obtained another large research contract with USAID, titled “The Impact of New Agricultural Technology on Rural Employment and Income.” Working on this contract in Ithaca was Roger Selley as a visiting assistant professor for two years. Uma Lele (Ph.D., 1966) returned to teach agricultural development for a semester and work on the project as well.

Tom Poleman took his sabbatic leave in the Philippines at IRRI and in Ceylon. Subsequently, he and Freebairn edited the book, *Food, Population, and Employment: The Impact of the Green Revolution*, growing out of a conference discussing these issues held at Cornell and sponsored by the Program on Science, Technology, and Society.

Ken Robinson served as senior economist at the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture in Ibadan, Nigeria, for an academic year. Bud Stanton taught at the World Bank’s Economic Development Institute in Washington and Iran. Max Brunk spent a sabbatical in Australia working with that country’s National Meat Board considering market development and trade. The next year, Brunk gave the Klinck Lectures in Canada, requiring presentations in each of the provinces across the country. Earle followed Brunk to Australia in 1976 to be the keynote speaker at the national conference, Supermarketing into the 1980s. Randy Barker spent his sabbatical from IRRI at Cornell in 1974 developing a new course in production economics directed to students in the production sciences interested in development issues. Poleman completed an around-the-world lecture tour sponsored by the FAO focusing on the balance between food and population.

While the previous paragraphs describing some of the faculty’s international activity during the decade is not complete, it gives some sense of the ways in which Bill Myers’s and Frosty Hill’s early encouragement of international activity had become a part of the department’s natural life and work. In 1976, graduate students and faculty were pursuing research in Colombia, India, Indonesia, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, and Peru. Some were supported in part by Mellor’s USAID contract, but the rest were the result of faculty and student initiatives with foundations, national governments, and international research centers.

In 1977, John Mellor resigned after serving for a year as chief staff economist to the administrator of USAID to become the director general of the International Food Policy Research Institute in Washington, DC. In his 25 years on the faculty, he had been an effective teacher of the department’s introductory course and initiated one of the first undergraduate courses in the country on the economics of agricultural development. His research in a number of countries in Southeast and South Asia was widely cited and
documented in 38 books and major reports. He was named a Fellow of the AAEA in 1980 in recognition of his substantial achievements in teaching and research, and as an important contributor to the literature of the profession.

**Changes in the Faculty**

At the beginning of the decade, 35 faculty members were listed on the roster of the department in *News Notes*, two of whom were stationed overseas (Barker in the Philippines and Barraclough in Peru). Two visiting professors were here for one year on Fulbright Awards: Ihamuotila from Finland and Rahmani from Iran. The USDA had one staff member here, H. Hinman, working on a land economics project. In addition, Dave Call and Joe Metz had their professorial appointments in Agricultural Economics, but were paid elsewhere: Call as the Babcock Professor in the School of Nutrition and Metz as associate director of research for the college and after 1977 as director of the International Agriculture Program.

New appointments to meet the growing demands in teaching and bolster existing programs in extension and research were made in 1970 and 1971.
Three new assistant professors joined the faculty in 1970: Sanford Belden from Purdue and Doyle Eiler from Oregon State joined the group in business management; Eddy LaDue, completing his degree at Michigan State, was appointed in farm finance. Duane Chapman (Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley) arrived in 1971 in natural resource economics after two years at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Richard Boisvert (Ph.D., University of Minnesota) was appointed in rural resource development, along with Harry P. Mapp, Jr, who completed his doctorate at Oklahoma State. From this group of six new appointments, only three remained at the end of the decade. Belden and Eiler moved to positions in industry, while Mapp returned to Oklahoma State, where he later became a regents professor and leader in his field.

In a similar manner, Darrell Good, a native of Illinois, joined us in 1972 after completing an AAEA award-winning thesis at Michigan State. In three years, the University of Illinois sought him for their faculty and he returned to his home state, where he has continued as an influential contributor to his field. It was also in 1972 that Earl Brown was chosen associate director of resident instruction for the college, requiring another replacement in the fields of business and food industry management, where the teaching needs were large.

Two new appointments to meet needs in these areas were made in 1973. Dennis Lifferth, (Ph.D., Iowa State) came to join the group in business management, along with David Barton (Ph.D., Purdue). Dennis Fisher, (Ph.D., Michigan State) accepted a new position in agricultural labor and manpower here in 1974. By the end of the decade, all these new appointments had other homes. Lifferth was managing the business interests and charities of the Church of the Latter Day Saints in Salt Lake City; Barton was a faculty member at Kansas State; and Fisher was a resource economist at Texas A&M. The market for holders of Ph.D.s in agricultural economics was active and strong. Competition for top students continued well after their initial appointments.

A new economist from the USDA’s natural resource economics division arrived in Ithaca
in 1973, Nelson Bills (Ph.D., Washington State University). His initial work was closely related to the research program directed by Howard Conklin in land economics. This relationship worked well from the perspective of the department, as well as that of the USDA. In 1985, Bills was appointed an associate professor of resource economics with tenure, resigning his position with the USDA.

Once again in 1975, three new faculty appointments were made, out of which one remained in the department at the end of the century—Robert Milligan (Ph.D., University of California, Davis). The other two new appointments, Bert Mason (Ph.D., University of California, Davis) and David Blandford (Ph.D., Manchester, United Kingdom), in 2001 were professors at the University of California, Fresno, and Pennsylvania State, respectively. (Blandford also serves as Penn State’s department chairman.) In the summer of 1975, Dan Padberg resigned to become department chairman at the University of Illinois. Lee Day (Ph.D., Iowa State) also arrived at Cornell in 1975 from Penn State to become director of the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development. He had been department chairman at Penn State and held an appointment in agricultural economics. This new regional position at Cornell was funded through the USDA.

After serving eight years as chairman, B. F. Stanton resigned that post and was replaced by Olan D. Forker on April Fools’ Day in 1976. Both thought that the date of the transition was a good tradition to follow. Forker had been at Cornell for 10 years as professor of marketing after his years on the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley. Stanton returned to his regular faculty status after a sabbatical leave of teaching, first at the Australian National University, Canberra, and then at Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, India.

Wayne A. Knoblauch (Ph.D., Michigan State) joined the faculty in 1976 with an extension-research appointment in farm management. Roger Hexem, an ERS/USDA employee in the natural resources division, arrived to work with Nelson Bills on the USDA cooperative project.
In 1977–1978, a large group of new faculty arrived in Warren Hall. Bruce Anderson (Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley) was hired as an assistant professor in business management with a special commitment to work with cooperatives. Randy Barker (Ph.D., Iowa State) rejoined the faculty after his years in the economics department at the IRRI in the Philippines. His appointment as a professor was in international agricultural development to fill the vacancy created by John Mellor’s resignation. Jon Conrad (Ph.D., Wisconsin) moved to Cornell from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, to teach statistics and work in natural resource economics. William Lesser (Ph.D., Wisconsin) arrived in January 1978 to work in marketing and policy, with special emphasis on problems of the food industry.

Other new appointments in 1977–1978 included Jan Sweeney (Ph.D., Cornell; MBA, Alberta), who accepted a position in business management with responsibility for teaching accounting and financial management. Gerald White (Ph.D., Penn State) was appointed with responsibilities for production economics and leadership for extension work in farm management with the horticultural industry. Lana Hall (Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley) accepted a position in marketing research, and Andrew M. Novakovic (Ph.D., Purdue) was appointed to a position in marketing, with an emphasis on research and extension in the dairy industry.

A new professorial appointment in 1979 was made for Paul Barkley (Ph.D., Kansas State), who moved here from his tenured position at Washington State University. His appointment was in local government and public policy to fill the void created by the retirement of E. A. Lutz. Loren Tauer (Ph.D., Iowa State) joined the faculty as well in 1979 as an assistant professor of production economics and farm finance.

These new faculty brought with them a wide range of experiences and backgrounds to enrich the department’s teaching, research, and extension programs. While there were the inevitable associated costs in searching for and then integrating these able new people into the department and university community, they provided new energy and ideas. When some of them left for new positions and opportunities, they left as friends and colleagues.
These collegial connections across the country continue to prove professionally and personally useful.

By the end of the decade, the department’s faculty included men and women with Ph.D.s from 13 different universities. With this came a rich diversity that enriched the department’s programs.

**Retirements**

Stanley W. Warren, one of the department’s beloved teachers and mentors to countless students, farmers, and citizens of the state and community, retired on June 30, 1972. Warren was a legend to many. He taught Farm Management to more than 9,000 students over 40 years, missing but one class. His dedication to teaching was recognized early. He was the first faculty member to be selected by the seniors of the college to receive the Professor of Merit Award in 1948. He received the AAEA Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award in 1967. Stan also taught Farm Appraisal, Research Methods in Farm Management, and a special course for foreign students, U.S. Farm Organization, to help them understand farming in this country. Stan’s professional interests over the years centered on the growth and development of farms, rural people, and their communities.

Stan’s retirement party was a great occasion—one student from each of his 40 Farm Management classes attended and presented him with a small farm implement or tool for the museum he had started. Presentation speeches were limited to under 2 minutes and almost all met the requirement. The mood was as happy as the man being honored, a great tribute to this friend of northeast agriculture. A decade after his retirement, the Stanley W. Warren Teaching Endowment Fund was established by his colleagues and former students. The income from this fund supports excellence in undergraduate teaching programs in farm and business management.

Glenn W. Hedlund, a national authority on agricultural cooperatives, retired in 1974, some 38 years after he had completed his doctorate at Cornell in 1936. “Swede” had served as department head for 16 years (1952–1968) following Frosty Hill, when Hill became provost of the university. Shortly after he completed his doctorate, he had gone to Nanking, China, for a year, working with J. Lossing Buck. During the war years (1941–1946), he served as department head at Pennsylvania State University but returned to Cornell to resume leadership for work with agricultural cooperatives and farm finance. His substantial abilities to work effectively with others and provide leadership within the department led Dean Myers to name him as department head as Hill’s replacement. His tenure as head was the longest of anyone in the department, except for G. F. Warren. During the 1960s, he fully embraced the idea of bringing new faculty to the department from other leading departments across the country.

Hedlund loved to play golf and bridge, and achieved substantial skill at both. When he passed on the headship to Bud Stanton in 1968, he looked
forward to devoting substantial time to work with the cooperatives in the Northeast, as well as more time for golf. He made a major trip to Southeast Asia and India for the Ford Foundation in his final years on the faculty. Sadly, only two years after he retired, Swede died in 1976, the sudden victim of cancer. His legacy was a cohesive and cooperative faculty and staff, maintaining a strong identity with the central mission of the department. He was much liked and appreciated.
Another retiree in 1974 was Lawrence B. Darrah, 30 years after he had joined the staff as an assistant professor. Larry led the work in poultry marketing and established excellent working relationships with colleagues in poultry and food science. He and his students carried out market tests of many new products, from “naked eggs” to chicken hot dogs, and he contributed in important ways to this methodology in the 1950s. He led the teaching of the introductory course in marketing with great success and published *Food Marketing* in 1967. He was one of the first teachers in the University of Philippines-Cornell project in the 1950s. He then returned to the graduate education program in 1967. His work was so well received by the Philippine government that he served in the 1970s as a project specialist in agriculture funded by the Ford Foundation and then SEARCA [Southeast Asia Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture].

After retiring, the Darrahs continued in the Philippines until 1980. His awards and honors for his work in the Philippines included honorary M.A.s from the Philippine Special Studies Division, Agriculture; and the National Food and Agricultural Council. Special awards were also presented by the ministry of agriculture, the Philippine Council for Agricultural Research, and the University of Philippines, College of Agriculture Alumni Association.

Clifton W. Loomis opted for early retirement in 1975 after 20 years as a Cornell faculty member. Clif completed his B.S. in agriculture in 1937 and was commissioned as a reserve officer in the U.S. Army. He served as a county agricultural agent in Delaware and Seneca Counties until he was called into military service, where he was a field operations officer for a battalion in France and Germany. After the war, he continued in the active reserves and retired with a rank of colonel. After a brief return to work in extension, Loomis entered the Graduate School at Cornell and completed his Ph.D. in 1953. He joined the faculty at the University of Missouri for two years before returning to Cornell to work in farm management extension. He provided leadership in organizing county-based farm business management projects and in developing an electronic farm accounting system for use by farmers across the state. He spent one sabbatical year teaching at the American University of Beirut, Lebanon, and a second as advisor to the president of the Agricultural Development Fund of Iran. Throughout his years at Cornell, he was active in the United Way and served as chairman of the Cornell division in 1969.

Edward A. Lutz, scholar of the political economy of local government, retired in 1976 after 30 years on the faculty. Reared in Greene County, New York, Ed completed his B.S. at Cornell, an M.B.A. at Harvard, and his Ph.D. at Cornell in 1940. He worked in Albany in the Department of Commerce with his mentor and colleague, M. P. Catherwood, until called to serve in the U.S. Navy during the war years, serving in the Pacific. In 1946 he joined the department faculty, where he took leadership for the programs in local government for the rest of his career. He was the initiator of a wide range of training programs for town and county officers, as well as teaching his
courses in local government and maintaining a research program to support them. His activities in the field of community education received national recognition. He was largely responsible for developing Operation Advance, an education program aimed at community leaders. This program was soon followed by a second such educational effort designed to improve the management skills of local government officeholders.

Professor Lutz received the national AAEA award for these extension programs in 1974. Ed served a term as president of the Ithaca Board of Education. He was a regular consultant to state agencies in Albany and to New York’s Association of Towns and the New York County Officers Association. He is fondly remembered by his friends for his wonderful gardens of azaleas and rhododendrons, from which he shared cuttings he had layered and started.

Wendell G. Earle, professor of food distribution and marketing, chose early retirement in 1977 after only 27 years on the faculty. Proud of his Vermont heritage, his colleagues all knew that his first degree was from
the UVM in 1946. After serving two years in the U.S. Air Force, he came
to Cornell for his M.S. in 1948 and Ph.D. in 1950. Appointed initially in
extension and research for poultry marketing as an assistant professor, he
moved to a research and teaching appointment in 1957, taking on one of the
large undergraduate courses in marketing from his major professor and men-
tor, Larry Darrah. He took the leadership role in the new Food Distribution
Program in 1958 and developed it into a position of stature at the university
and the food industry nationally.

Following his retirement, Wendell continued to teach on a part-time basis.
This allowed him more time for consulting with firms in the food industry
and greater opportunity to help the college and university obtain funding
and endowments to expand and strengthen programs in food distribution
and marketing. He continued to serve as faculty advisor to the men’s hockey
teams (1976–1988) and to build programs for Boy Scouts in this region of the
state. A scholarship in food distribution and marketing was established in his
name in 1975. Wendell appeared to be easygoing and relaxed, always friendly
and at ease with students and faculty. Under the calm exterior was a drive to
excel, which all those around him recognized and appreciated.

Robert S. Smith, professor of farm management and finance, retired in
September 1977 at age 57 and then became the first W. I. Myers Professor
of Farm Finance on a part-time basis. Bob joined the faculty in 1954 as an
associate professor after working full-time in extension and establishing a
new young adult program. A native of New Hampshire, he completed all of
his degrees at Cornell and served as a county agent before World War II in
both New Hampshire and New York. He worked closely with V. B. Hart in
building and expanding programs in farm finance, including the Bankers’
School of Agriculture. He taught the undergraduate course in Farm Finance
and developed a new course in Personal Financial Management. He worked
closely with the staff of the Farm Credit Banks in Springfield, Massachusetts,
and the New York State Bankers’ Association in developing educational
programs for their professionals, as well as farmers and agricultural business-
men. He was a director of the Tompkins County Trust Company and became
chairman of the board in 1977. Bob maintained his fine contacts with exten-
sion agents throughout his professional career. He was widely in demand as
a speaker throughout the Northeast and contributed in many ways to the
Cornell and Ithaca communities.

C. Arthur Bratton, professor of farm management, retired in 1979 at
the age of 65 after 42 years at Cornell as a graduate student and faculty
member. Art grew up on a farm in northwestern Ohio and graduated from
Ohio State, where he was editor of the Agricultural Student. He finished his
Ph.D. in 1942 and entered the U.S. Army after a short period as an instruc-
tor. He returned in 1946 and took leadership for the department’s extension
programs in farm management for much of his career. He was Cornell’s first
visiting professor at Los Baños in the Philippines in 1952–1953 and Fulbright
lecturer at Kyoto, Japan, in 1959–1960. He also served as visiting professor
in 1968 at the East-West Center in Hawaii. He and his wife were hosts to many Asian scholars and graduate students throughout their years in Ithaca. Art was a leader in the college’s farm records programs and started the annual statewide dairy farm management business summaries in 1956. These continue at the end of the century as a key source of basic data for teaching and research, as well as extension. Art will be remembered as a friendly, mild-mannered, but determined leader and champion of the department’s extension programs. There were few people he didn’t like, and few who didn’t like him.

DEATHS

During the decade, two untimely deaths of active faculty occurred as well as those of emeritus professors following long and effective service. Brief quotations from the university’s annual statements of necrology, written by close associates, follow in recognition of their contributions to the college and community.

**BENNETT A. DOMINICK, JR. (1921–1971), PROFESSOR OF MARKETING**

“Among his colleagues, students, and fruit industry audience, Professor Dominick established a lasting reputation as a hardworking, industrious person of the highest integrity. He pursued his work with lasting vigor, leaving no detail unturned. His humility and constant consideration of others made him the perfect gentleman, long to be remembered by those privileged to know him.”

**CHASE DELMAR KEARL (1917–1973), PROFESSOR OF FARM MANAGEMENT**

“The life of Chase Delmar Kearl was dedicated to family work and service, and to living each day fully. He organized and managed well, was meticulous in attending to details, and was devoted to the improvement of agriculture and the well-being of mankind. He was strong in his convictions, believed in the right to think otherwise, respected the rights of others, and fostered the Cornell tradition of freedom and responsibility.”
### Van Breed Hart (1894–1976), Professor of Farm Finance

“The death of Van B. Hart brought to an end a long period of service to agriculture in New York State and the nation. His major responsibilities were in agricultural extension. He had a large part in developing the role of the subject-matter specialist in extension work. This was recognized in 1950 when he received the USDA Superior Service Award ‘for exceptional ability and zeal in developing and maintaining a well-balanced farm management program with special foresight in adjusting to changing conditions and for his pioneering efforts and accomplishments in the field of farm finance.’”

### Glenn W. Hedlund (1909–1976), Professor of Agricultural Economics

“To his colleagues and friends with whom he worked, Professor Hedlund was not only a trusted and loyal friend, but also an objective and honest observer and critic, able to separate educational activity from giving advice or proposing decisions for others. He thought first of the welfare of the Department of Agricultural Economics and the College of Agriculture as a whole and of their service to commercial agriculture and its institutions. His selflessness and concern for the welfare of his colleagues was one of his lasting legacies to those with whom he worked.”

### William I. Myers (1891–1976), Professor of Farm Finance

“Bill Myers, as he was affectionately known by all who worked with him, remained close to the soil throughout his productive career. His bright cheery greeting, his fairness in dealing with others, his vision and guidance for the future of agriculture will long be remembered.”

### Martin P. Catherwood (1904–1978), Professor of Business Management

“Few members of Cornell’s faculty have served the university, New York State, and the Ithaca community with such devotion and distinction as Martin P. Catherwood. To these employments he brought energy, probing intelligence, administrative skills, and close knowledge of industry labor and government. Basic to Catherwood’s remarkable achievements were his sterling traits of character. He was forthright, candid-to-the-point, plain spoken and just. He possessed rare integrity.”
Between the census years 1969 and 1978, farm numbers dropped to 43,100 from 51,900 as the farm consolidation of the postwar years continued. Land in farms dropped modestly to 9.5 million acres from 10.1 million acres, a little less than one-third of the land area of the state. The rate of exodus from agriculture had slowed substantially. Farm numbers had decreased by 73,000 between 1950 and 1970; land in farms by 6 million acres. The adjustments of the 1970s, while still difficult for those leaving farming, were quite modest by comparison to the previous two decades.

The agricultural community, farmers, and the business professionals with whom they worked commonly held college degrees and were a busy, well-informed audience for the materials and reports prepared by the department. Sources of unbiased, high-quality information for the farm sector had increased. Faculty had fewer county meetings to attend and schools to teach as regional and state meetings, and work with farmer organizations became more important.

The decade had started with turmoil and a new president of the university, Dale Corson, who led the return to a normal pattern of university life and high standards of productivity. Agricultural Economics grew rapidly within the college as a recognized center of high-quality teaching based on solid applied research and extension. More and more of its undergraduates looked to careers in business when they graduated. Graduate student numbers continued strong, between 80 and 95 each year. Many graduate students
and faculty were working on projects in diverse locations across Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

By the end of the decade, the transitions had been made to a new, dynamic university president, Frank H. T. Rhodes, and a new dean of the college, David L. Call. Their predecessors had served well and left behind a fine legacy upon which to build. W. Keith Kennedy resigned as dean of the college to become provost of the university in 1978 as part of President Rhodes’s new leadership team. Dave Call moved from his position as director of extension to accept the challenges of the dean’s office the same year. He had already established excellent relationships across the state in his brief, but successful tenure as director. He was well known by the faculty of the college, making the transition accordingly smooth, and his appointment was given quick and solid support. At the close of the decade, expectations for the years ahead were high with strong, vigorous leadership already in evidence for both the university and the college.

**REFERENCES**

Chayat, M., O. D. Forker, and D. I. Padberg. 1974. *An econometric determination of the welfare impact of giving bargaining power to farmers: A case study of the egg industry*. Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Search, no. 4.


The university gained strength through the 1970s with strong leadership in the central administration and in the college. The national economy weathered a number of difficult storms during these years. The creation of OPEC and its impact on petroleum supplies and prices resulted in gas lines in 1973–1974 and enhanced public awareness of national dependence on international supply and demand conditions for energy and their attendant effects on the national economy. Trying to “manage” the ups and downs of the domestic economy was not a great success. The Nixon, Ford, and Carter years saw both recession and inflation. Cornell’s Alfred E. Kahn moved to Washington and received unsought publicity as Carter’s “inflation” fighter. The CPI more than doubled between 1970 and 1980; the energy component of the CPI more than tripled.

The Reagan years began in 1981 with the prime rate for interest still moving skyward to its peak well above 15 percent in 1982. The national economy was much in the public eye at the start of the 1980s.

The Department of Agricultural Economics started the decade with 36 tenure-track faculty members and 13 additional full-time professionals, including extension or research associates and lecturers, to carry out its teaching, research, extension, and public service commitments. The teaching responsibilities had grown substantially in the previous decade at the expense of research and extension efforts, and student interest in courses taught in the department continued unabated throughout the decade. This was a decade where funding from the traditional, assured sources, such as the SUNY budget for the college, the USDA’s Hatch and regional research funds, and cooperative extension money, declined in both relative and, finally, absolute terms. To carry out new research and extension initiatives, faculty set about writing more proposals. Both graduate students and faculty gained skills in the art of “grantsmanship.”

In the years following World War II, fewer of the efforts of faculty in the department were centered on finding solutions to the problems of farmers and rural people as their numbers as a proportion of the state’s population decreased. The agricultural component of the state’s economy was substantial-
ly smaller in the 1980s than it had been in 1940. More emphasis instead was placed on working with the food industry as a whole. International agricultural development became an important area of research and graduate study. Successful teaching in business management attracted increasing numbers of students and the substantial resources necessary to maintain high standards of instruction. A growing commitment was also made to the study of the economic use of our scarce natural resources.

**RESOURCE ECONOMICS**

The department’s faculty had been concerned with the wise use of natural resources from its earliest years. After all, farmers are primary users of natural resources, and their conservation and sustainable use are fundamental to farmers’ business success. George F. Warren wrote and lectured about the unfortunate waste that had occurred in the nineteenth century, as forests were cleared for farming, which then could hardly support the families that felled the trees on the steep and rocky hillsides common to much of the state. He suggested a return of abandoned farmland to forestry in his first book on farm management and in the bulletin summarizing the first Tompkins County survey. The economics of land use was also a central concern for both Myers and Hill in their early years at Cornell. The major effort to construct land class maps for each of the counties of the state from the 1930s forward was directed to help individuals make improved decisions in the purchase and subsequent use of the state’s land resources.

George Lauman taught courses in rural economy at the turn of the century centered on people, land, and the use of community resources. A formal course with the title Land Economics was taught for the first time in 1936 by George Wehrwein, a visiting professor from Wisconsin. This course continued until the 1960s, when the title was broadened to Resource Economics. A new course, Agricultural Geography, was introduced by Herrell DeGraff after his year at the University of Chicago in 1941. This course, based on the economic principles used in making choices on the use of natural resources in agriculture, attracted and sustained the interest of an increasing number of students. From 1946, it became the introductory course for most students in the college.

Following World War II, research and extension activities in the use of our land and water resources were given renewed priority. The gradual shift to the use of the term “resource economics,” instead of “land economics,” occurred naturally in our profession, as the work of faculty and students began to more fully reflect the expanded interest by the public in the policies associated with the wise use of all of our natural resources. The list of research projects assembled under the heading “resource economics and public policy” for a departmental review in 1982 is indicative of faculty and student interests and activities in this field and the interdepartmental nature of their work.
New York became a Sea Grant university in the 1970s and Jon Conrad became directly associated with that program in 1980. The foregoing list of titles reflects his interests and the incorporation of that additional focus in the department’s work and responsibilities. The longstanding concerns with land use, water, and local government are also clearly evident, as are concerns about the interface between rural and urban interests in the use of land for farming, recreation, and private enjoyment.

An important research initiative related to energy economics was started in the mid-1970s by Duane Chapman and Timothy Mount and their students. The titles of three theses completed in 1977–1978 are indicative:

Funding for new work in resource economics increasingly came as a result of grant and research proposals to federal and state agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, New York’s Public Service Commission, the National Science Foundation, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Office of Technology Assessment. Again, titles of theses completed in 1981–1982 give a flavor of student and faculty interests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title of Thesis/Dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considine, T. J.</td>
<td>A Regional Analysis of Energy Pricing and Taxation Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeBlanc, M. R.</td>
<td>A Behavioral Model of New York Electrical Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Brian P.</td>
<td>Land Values and Disamenities: The Case of Hazardous Waste Disposal Facilities and Landfills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coughlin, R. M.</td>
<td>An Analysis of How Higher Fuel Prices Affect the Cost of Living of Different Types of Families in the Northeastern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixell, D. S.</td>
<td>Energy Conservation in Rental Housing: Space Heating and the Implications of the Metering System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slott, M.</td>
<td>Economic Aspects of Wood-Fuel Use in New York State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velluntini, R. S.</td>
<td>Forecasting with Expectations Models: An Analysis of Electric Utilities’ Forecasts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the end of the decade, the importance of Cornell’s Sea Grant status and the broadening of work in natural resources is reflected in thesis titles for research completed in 1988 and 1989.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title of Thesis/Dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muse, B.</td>
<td>U.S. Fresh Market Haddock Markets and Haddock Imports from Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartz, C. E.</td>
<td>An Economic History of the Sea Otter with Special Reference to the Aleutian and Commander Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, D. A.</td>
<td>Property Tax Relief for Farmland: A Comparative Study of Savings Under Use-Value Assessment and Circuit-Breaker Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the preceding titles do not cover the full range of work in which faculty and students were engaged, they provide a flavor of the growing importance of resource economics in the department’s research and graduate programs.

During the decade, two books growing out of work by faculty members were also published. Duane Chapman wrote *Energy Resources and Energy Corporations*, and Jon Conrad and Colin W. Clark were the authors of *Natural Resource Economics: Notes and Problems*. In addition, a steady stream of articles in journals and publications in department series were issued.

### EVALUATION OF GENERIC COMMODITY ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION

In the early 1970s, the department, with Olan Forker taking leadership, was asked by the New York Milk Promotion Advisory Board to help determine whether the board’s promotion programs created positive economic benefits to New York dairy farmers. The state’s dairy farmers had been providing funds on a voluntary basis through their cooperatives for both promotion and research for a number of years. When New York adopted a mandatory check-off program to support its promotion programs in 1971, the board sought a
more systematic way to find out which programs were most successful and whether there was a payoff for these expenditures. Forker discussed possible approaches with the board and then proposed and directed a substantial research program to help the advisory board evaluate returns to its promotion efforts. Funds for a full-time research associate to work with Forker were provided by the board in the late 1970s.

Stavins and Forker summarized the work at Cornell and that of others in *Dairy Promotion in New York State, 1963–1979*. Two other key research publications were those of S. R. Thompson and D. A. Eiler, “Determinants of Milk Advertising Effectiveness” and Thompson, Eiler, and Forker, *An Econometric Analysis of Sales Response to Generic Milk Advertising in New York State*.

By the 1980s, Forker and the staff at Cornell had established a nationally recognized program in the evaluation of generic commodity promotion and advertising programs. Henry W. Kinnucan (Ph.D., Minnesota) joined the department as a research associate in 1980, and a steady flow of research reports and journal articles continued. Several industry leaders give credit to this research as an important reason for the success and continuation of the mandatory check-off program for the New York dairy industry and other commodity promotion and check-off programs nationwide. The New York Milk Promotion Board has provided annual funding for this research since 1972.

The program also had an important extension and public service component from its earliest days. Together with others in the department, the program sponsored a national conference, *Increasing Milk Product Consumption: Issues for the 1980s*, in Syracuse in 1983, bringing together industry and faculty leaders concerned with surpluses and the quality of products, as well as those concerned with promotion and evaluation.

In 1987, Janelle Tauer and Olan Forker published *Dairy Promotion in the United States, 1979–1986*, a 314-page summary of programs across the country with special reference to New York State. The authors reviewed dairy promotion programs and their funding from 1915 (National Dairy Council) forward, including the formation of the United Dairy Industry Association (UDIA) in 1971, and the first national dairy product promotion program to be funded by a mandatory assessment on all U.S. dairy producers in 1984. The 40 publications issued by this program between 1979 and 1986 were listed as one appendix. These included 16 department reports, 10 articles in magazines, 5 articles in the proceedings of regional or national meetings, 3 theses, and 6 journal articles.

Henry Kinnucan joined the faculty at Auburn University in 1984 as an assistant professor, but remained closely associated with evaluation research at Cornell and with other commodities. Donald Liu (Ph.D., Minnesota) came to work in the Cornell program in 1985 as a research associate. Commonly, two full-time professionals worked with Forker during the second half of the decade evaluating promotion programs primarily for dairy products, but often nationally as well as for the Northeast.
A regional research committee, NEC 63, was organized in 1985 by Forker, Walt Armbruster, Les Myers, and John Nichols. This regional project became the national research organization around which the evaluation of generic advertising and promotion for the full range of agricultural commodities is organized. In 1991, Hurst and Forker published *Annotated Bibliography of Generic Commodity Promotion Research (Revised)* as an NEC 63 report. This comprehensive report summarized the important research efforts in this field of research internationally. As an acknowledgment of the value and quality of the research conducted at Cornell and by others involved in the efforts of NEC 63, Congress funded the establishment of the National Institute of Commodity Promotion and Research Evaluation (NICPRE) at Cornell in the early 1990s.

**EVALUATION OF BIOTECHNOLOGY**

In a collegiate dictionary printed in 1967, “biotechnology” was not a word to be found. By the middle of the 1970s, the concept behind this word was a part of popular conversations as the “green revolution” had become a reality in Asia and the international research centers gave promise of great change in the developing as well as the industrialized world. A center for biotechnology was established on the Cornell campus in the early 1980s, and faculty in the sciences and engineering in a range of disciplines were actively involved in the many and varied aspects of this rapidly emerging focus of scholarship and research.

One of the early interests of faculty in Agricultural Economics at Cornell was the potential impact of the research of Dale Bauman, Department of Animal Science, with the bovine growth hormone (bGH). His experimental work suggested the possibility of substantial increases in milk production from high-producing cows injected with this hormone. Recombinant production of bGH seemed possible from a commercial supplier by the late 1980s.

A project led by Robert Kalter was organized with the active cooperation of Professors Milligan, Lesser, Tauer, and Bauman to investigate the potential impact of the use of bGH in commercial dairy herds. This group issued a substantive report in December 1985 entitled *Biotechnology and the Dairy Industry: Production Costs, Commercial Potential, and the Economic Impact of the Bovine Growth Hormone*. The authors concluded, “If approved by the Food and Drug Administration, bovine growth hormone is a viable commercial product for increasing milk production from dairy cows and improving short-term dairy farm profitability. . . . Surveys of New York dairymen indicate the strong probability of this rapid adoption and further suggest that large herds will most rapidly implement this new approach to increasing milk production.”
In the second half of the 1980s, the potential impacts of biotechnology on production agriculture were examined on a substantial number of different fronts. The titles of some of the articles published by department faculty document the range of topics, for which serious work was completed, and provide a sense of what was done:

Lesser, W. H., W. B. Magrath, and R. J. Kalter, “Projecting Adoption Rates: Application of an Ex Ante Procedure to Biotechnology Products”

Love, John, and Loren W. Tauer, “Biotechnology and the Economics of Reducing Disease Losses in U.S. Potato and Tomato Production”

Kalter, Robert J., “The New Biotech Agriculture: Unforeseen Economic Consequences”

Tauer, Loren W., “Economic Changes from the Use of Biotechnology in Production Agriculture”

Tauer, Loren W., “The Potential Economic Impact of Herbicide-Resistant Corn in the USA”

Tauer, Loren W., “Economic Impact of Future Biological Nitrogen Fixation Technologies on United States Agriculture”


While the evaluation of new technology for production agriculture had always been an important commitment for faculty in the department, recombinant DNA and its potential products were of great interest to the general public as well as farmers and agricultural scientists. The initial studies were directly concerned with how farmers and the agricultural industry would respond to the possibilities of the new biotechnology as it became available for use. Only later would come the sometimes negative consumer responses in the late 1990s and the new century about the consumption of foods and feeds as they were influenced and altered by the new biotechnologies.

**Intellectual Property Rights**

At the same time that Bill Lesser was working on the potential impact of bovine somatotropin (bGH), he joined Robert Masson, Department of Economics, in a study published by its sponsor, the American Seed Trade Association, *An Economic Analysis of the Plant Variety Protection Act, 1985.*
This study considered, “(1) the potential impact of the Act on incentives for private investment in plant breeding and (2) the potential deleterious impact of the Act . . . Overall, after an extensive evaluation of the available evidence, the authors consider the PVPA to have a decidedly beneficial effect on social welfare.” Necessarily, their study considered patents and intellectual property rights as they related to the seed industry and what might happen as open pollinated seeds became “patentable” in September 1985.

Lesser prepared a second publication in January 1986, *Patenting Seeds: What to Expect*, which drew a number of conclusions, subject of course to the eventual legal interpretations, that should be expected over time. Because of the laws involved, which are extensively quoted in the manuscript, only tentative estimates of the future could be made. The intent was to help people in the industry and the general public gain an understanding of the law and what might occur with patented seeds. In the next four years, Lesser published eight articles concerned with intellectual property rights in North American and European journals, such as “Grace Periods in First to File Countries” and “Animal Patents in the USA: Are the Concerns Justified?” He had quickly become one of the best-informed economists in this new area of special interest and concern.

The importance of faculty collaboration with scientists in other departments in making evaluations of new technology is clearly evident. Opportunities for applied economists to participate in studying the potential effects of new technology on business, natural resources, and society are an important part of the work and mission of the department.

**Extension Initiatives**

Because of the success of the project *Toward the Year 1985* and the usefulness of its summary publications, a new project, *New York Agriculture 2000*, was undertaken with the strong support of the governor’s office and the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets. The director of the project was Donald G. Butcher, president of SUNY-Morrisville. Most of the materials for the project were developed and presented by faculty in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, with leadership taken by this department. Olan Forker was the coordinator of the efforts in Warren Hall, with 23 faculty and staff providing the bulk of the materials presented in the final volume of 254 pages, *New York Agriculture 2000*.

A governor’s conference was held in Albany on November 28–30, 1984, to present the 13 sections of the report and discuss them with industry leaders. Governor Mario Cuomo was an active participant in the conference. Jim Shaffer of Michigan State and Luther Tweeten of Oklahoma State served
on a reactor panel, along with a group of New York industry leaders, in the final sessions of the conference. The conference was successful in focusing public attention on agriculture and the food industry, and bringing together its leaders in a positive setting at a time when the emerging issues associated with biotechnology were first being realized by participants in the industry itself. The final publication, effectively illustrated with pictures, tables, and charts, was well received, a tribute to the efforts of all of its authors and this statewide effort.

NY FarmNet was established in 1986 as a direct result of recommendations made by a task force on farm families in financial stress meeting at Cornell University. John Brake had a pivotal role in working with the task force and gaining funding for this new program from the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets. NY FarmNet seeks to provide personalized, timely assistance to farm families in times of financial stress with a hotline open for their calls. A series of financial consultants were recruited and trained to work with these farm families, who were often in desperate circumstances, to assess their farm business situations and consider their options and alternatives. The initial successes of this program in helping families make often painful decisions quickly gained active support from farm creditors, cooperatives, and the rural community in the state.

A professional staff was established in Warren Hall to handle calls from those needing assistance and to train the consultants located across the state who worked with the farm families. The program now benefits from a broadly based board of directors that includes bankers, agricultural business leaders, and farmers. This ongoing program based in Warren Hall responded to 2,035 calls on its hotline in 2000. Follow-up consultations were made with 501 farm families in examining alternatives for solving their personal and business problems.

Pro-Dairy was launched by faculty throughout the college in the 1980s in response to the apparent slippage of New York as one of the nation’s leaders in milk production per cow. To improve the ability of the state’s dairy producers to compete in the national marketplace, faculty concentrated their efforts on the educational needs of commercial dairymen. New funding was obtained to prepare and present teaching materials on human resource management, with emphasis on planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling business operations. Schools to teach these concepts, along with the latest results from research in dairy nutrition, milking management, and the evaluation of new technology, were held across the state.

Andrew Novakovic and Robert Milligan were key figures in developing the concepts for and leading this new extension effort. Milligan was the initial director of this focused program. Its success in bringing together managers
of dairy farms to work on “management science,” as well as the latest technical information in dairy production, ensured the continuing funding of this statewide effort. At the start of the twenty-first century, Pro-Dairy remains one of the college’s highly regarded programs by participating dairy farmers and industry leaders.

While the new initiatives just reviewed had become an integral part of the department’s extension efforts, the long-standing schools and programs that were well-established continued to receive high priority. The Bankers’ School of Agriculture was held each summer in association with the New York State Bankers’ Association along with the Graduate Bankers’ Agricultural Seminar under the direction of George Conneman and Eddy LaDue, respectively. Bruce Anderson was the director of the workshop for CEOs of cooperatives. The annual Agribusiness Economic Outlook Conference was held each December at the time that the New York Economic Handbook for the current year was completed and widely distributed throughout the state. The Cornell Farm Income Tax Schools, led by Stuart Smith and George Casler, were held across the state in the late fall as they had been since the 1950s. These schools were held in 10 locations with over 1,600 tax preparers and accountants in attendance in 1984. The two-week Food Executive Program, under the directorship of Gene German and Ed McLaughlin, was also held each summer.

**Home Study Program in Food Industry Management**

By the end of the 1980s, the Home Study Program had completed 25 years of operations. Initiated with the strong support of the National Association of Food Chains, the program had grown to serve increasingly larger numbers of students working in the food industry in the United States and abroad. As stated in the program’s 1990 catalog, “Since 1964, the staff of the Home Study Program, working with experts in the food industry and related fields, has developed and offered at various times 59 different courses. Over 200,000 people have studied one or more of these courses. Food companies throughout the United States and Canada support the Cornell program by actively encouraging their employees to enroll on an individual basis or to attend company-sponsored workshops based on the home study courses. A great many of these companies offer full or partial tuition refunds to any of their people who receive certificates showing successful completion of the courses they have taken.”
The courses during the 1980s were divided into three different series: the Food Industry Management Series included courses directed toward students primarily concerned with food retail businesses; the Distribution Management Series targeted people working in food distribution centers; and the Foodservice Distribution Management Series was designed for individuals working with the distribution of products to foodservice establishments. The Food Industry Management Series continues to offer the most courses and accounts for the largest number of students. The modest enrollment fee (in 2001, the fee was only $70 for most courses) covers the cost of all course materials and instruction: textbook, study guide, grading, counseling, and certificate of completion. Video workshops were also developed to complement course programs to allow workshop leaders to enhance the learning process.

During the 1980s, George S. “Bud” Hayward served as the program director and Robert C. Nolan was the assistant program director. In addition, a staff of seven professionals operated this busy office in Warren Hall. The Home Study Program was one of the early and major employers of staff at Challenge Industries in handling and mailing books and study materials, making an important additional contribution to the local community.

**Undergraduate Teaching**

Course enrollments in Agricultural Economics doubled in the 1970s. Nothing so dramatic is likely to ever occur again. The 1980s, however, was a decade of learning how to manage this substantial undergraduate program and to find more effective ways for students to meet with their advisors and faculty outside of class. Enrollments in Introduction to Business Management peaked at 818 in 1987–1988, with Dick Aplin providing two sets of lectures in the Call Auditorium. Marge Hubbert’s Financial Accounting course included 616 students in 1986–1987, with two lecture sections along with the many necessary laboratories and discussion sections. The peak year for Introduction to Marketing, 1988–1989, provided 514 students for Gene German. Dan Sisler introduced 662 students to agricultural economics in his course in 1983–1984. All of these large courses required impressive management skills on the part of their respective teachers. Students flocked to these courses because of the fine teaching environments established. There were well-informed teaching assistants to answer questions during scheduled office hours; an atmosphere conducive to learning had been established throughout the department.

Two key additions to the teaching faculty were made in the early 1980s. Dale Grossman was appointed a lecturer in business law in 1980 and became a key person in both teaching and under-
graduate advising. Marge Hubbert became a lecturer in business management and accounting in 1983 and quickly established herself as an effective teacher and student advisor. Both Grossman and Hubbert would subsequently be chosen by the seniors of the college as Professors of Merit. Because of their professionalism and the quality of their lectures, they often served as role models for students considering careers in law and accounting, and counseled many students each year about these fields. Another lecturer, Cindy van Es (Ph.D., Statistics, Iowa State) joined the faculty in 1988. She immediately gave the introductory course in statistics a sense of excitement along with solid content. She, too, would subsequently be chosen by the students in the 1990s as their Professor of Merit.

Reflecting the extraordinary excellence of teaching in the department, Dick Aplin received the SUNY Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching in 1980 and then won the AAEA’s award for distinguished teaching in 1983. Gene German was selected by the students of the college as their Professor of Merit in 1984. Recognizing his lifetime effort as teacher and advisor, Dana Goodrich was selected for the Edgerton Career Teaching Award in 1986; Ken Robinson was chosen for the Edgerton Award in 1987. In 1988, Ed McLaughlin was chosen by the students of the college as their Professor of Merit. In the same year, both McLaughlin and Hubbert were designated as “distinguished advisors” in the university-wide Presidential Scholars Program. Students and faculty across the university recognized that something special was happening in Warren Hall and it was much appreciated, especially by students and their families.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PROFESSION

Perhaps the largest single effort of the decade came with the hosting of the AAEA meetings in 1984. As mentioned, that week was warm and humid, but a good spirit prevailed despite the less than comfortable sleeping facilities for many in the dorms. The attendance was large. Wayne Knoblauch survived as chairman of local arrangements, and the faculty and graduate students proved to be excellent hosts.
In 1981, Bill Tomek’s article, “Price Behavior on a Declining Terminal Market,” was selected by the editors of the *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* as the best published in 1980. Tomek began, “Thin markets may create problems in pricing farm products. One concern is that a small volume of trading at a central market place can result in behavior not warranted by economic conditions. Moreover, deliberate manipulation of prices is more feasible with a small volume.” He then studied the prices of choice steers in the Omaha and Denver markets in 1967 and 1968. Subsequently, the Denver market was closed. His definition of “thin markets” has been widely accepted.


Besides recognition for his outstanding journal article, Tomek was also honored by the AAEA in 1989 for writing a publication of “enduring quality” with Roger Gray in 1970, “Temporal Relationships Among Prices on Commodity Futures Markets: Their Allocative and Stabilizing Roles.” Perhaps of even great importance was Tomek’s election as president of the AAEA in 1985. His presidential address, “Limits on Price Analysis,” began, “The general objective of price analyses is to make forecasts and simulations that assist private and public decision makers. Progress has been made toward this general goal, but limitations clearly exist to obtaining precise forecasts and useful simulations. This paper is about the progress that has been made and the limitations that exist.” His concluding remarks after reviewing a number of studies were, “Clearly pushing back the limits on price analysis is a difficult challenge. This challenge can be met best when we are agricultural economists, not just technicians. Breakthroughs in research will come from imagination and judgment based on a sound knowledge of the agricultural
Four former or current faculty members were selected to become Fellows of the AAEA during the 1980s, recognizing their contributions and service over their lifetimes. In 1980, John W. Mellor was selected, recognizing particularly his research and teaching in international agricultural development. His citation concluded, “John Mellor has made an important impact on teaching, research, and scholarship in international agriculture. He has a strong allegiance and concern for rural people and their key role in the development process. His interest in policy and his analyses reflect a respect for original data and the need for firsthand knowledge from the field.”

Bernard F. Stanton was chosen as a Fellow of the AAEA in 1983 after serving as its president in 1979. His citation ended, “Bernard Stanton’s career is characterized by unselfish service to his department, university, and profession; by the high standards he sets, not only for himself but for the organizations he serves; and by his ability to choose sound goals and appropriate means for achieving them. Agricultural economics at Cornell, within the United States, and around the world has benefited greatly from his dedication to improving the profession.”

Daniel G. Sisler became a Fellow of the AAEA in 1987. His citation begins, “Daniel G. Sisler has left a unique mark on the profession of agricultural economics. His scholarship is evidenced by his award-winning Ph.D. thesis, his published papers, and the three AAEA thesis awards received by his students. Sisler has served in a wide variety of counseling, committee, and extension roles as well. Most of all, Dan Sisler is known as a master teacher, both in and out of the classroom.” The citation concludes, “His students and colleagues would quickly nominate him as one of the ‘most unforgettable academics’ they have ever met. This gifted agricultural economist has won a special place for his work in our profession.”

William G. Tomek became a Fellow in 1989 and was honored for his many contributions as author, researcher, editor of the American Journal of Agricultural Economics, and president of the AAEA. His citation concluded, “Few agricultural economists have given so unselfishly of their time and talent to the profession. Our journals are richer because of his scholarship and skills as a writer. His classes have provided students not only with technical information, but an object lesson of what careful preparation and continuous study can bring to the classroom. He has left his unique mark on his colleagues, his students, and the profession.”
In 1989, Olan Forker was elected president of the board of directors of the AAEA Foundation after serving on the board the previous two years. John Brake was elected to serve on the board for three years starting in 1990.

A Fund for the International Conference of Agricultural Economists was established in the United States to help bring young agricultural economists from developing countries to participate in these conferences every three years. W. I. Myers and F. F. Hill were early members of the board for this fund. B. F. Stanton was invited to be a member in 1970 and then served as vice president of the board from 1973–1981 and president of the board until the end of the century. He was elected vice president for program of the IAAE in 1988 and developed the program for the IAAE meeting in Tokyo in 1991.

CHANGES IN THE FACULTY

As in previous decades, the faces of the faculty continued to change as new challenges and opportunities came to its members. In 1980, Paul Barkley returned to Washington State after only one year at Cornell to accept an endowed professorship, and Bob Story opted for early retirement. George Conneman accepted the position of director of instruction for the college in 1981; he nevertheless continued to teach a course in appraisal and was advisor to a group of our students. Robert Herdt, Rockefeller Foundation, was made an adjunct professor and continued to work with Randy Barker on their book, *The Rice Economy of Asia*.

Two new assistant professors joined the department in 1981. William Lazarus (Ph.D., Illinois) was appointed in farm business management with major responsibilities for extension programs. David Lee (Ph.D., Wisconsin) was appointed to work in interregional competition and international trade. In September 1982, Robert Boynton (Ph. D., Michigan State) was persuaded to leave Purdue to work here with the group in dairy marketing. In 1983, Edward McLaughlin (Ph.D., Michigan State) came to fill a vacancy in food marketing and Christine Ranney (Ph.D., University of California, Davis) accepted an appointment as an assistant professor in rural development and policy. These additions to the faculty closely followed the retirements of Howard Conklin in 1982 and Max Brunk in 1983.

In 1983, David Allee was elected a Fellow of the American Water Resources Association and in 1985 received its Icko Iben award for his work in promoting communication among different disciplines seeking to solve water resource problems. Stuart Smith received an award from Epsilon Sigma Phi for distinguished service in extension in 1983. Jan Sweeney resigned to accept a position as a professor at CUNY’s
Baruch College, and Margaret J. Hubbert began her distinguished service as a lecturer in accounting. It was also in 1983 that Joe Bugliari was elected dean of the faculty, a position he held with distinction until 1988.

In 1984, Olan Forker was elected a faculty trustee at Cornell and, on April 1, 1985, he had completed nine years as department chairman. His years of leadership and service were much appreciated by the faculty and staff, and they understood and accepted his desire to return to his professorship and the leadership of work on the evaluation of dairy promotion and advertising. Robert J. Kalter was appointed department chairman for a three-year term by Dean Call. It was also in this period that personal computers appeared on nearly every faculty member’s desk through Kalter’s strong initiatives. Warren 160 became a dedicated microcomputer classroom, and the potential of having a personal computer available for daily work began to be realized by the department’s students, faculty, and staff in the second half of the 1980s.

In 1985–1986, Wendell Earle continued his active engagement, while in retirement, in supporting department programs. He served that spring as the first lecturer in what was to become the Personal Enterprise and Small Business Management Program for undergraduate students in the department. Special funding was obtained to bring Eric Oesterle from Purdue as a visiting professor to teach a junior-senior course in 1987 and 1988, and work with students on projects arising out of this initiative. An endowment for the Bruce Failing, Sr., Chair in Personal Enterprise and Small Business Management was established in 1989 to carry on this program in the college.

In 1985, Nelson Bills (Ph.D., Washington State) was appointed associate professor with tenure in resource economics. He had held a courtesy appointment previously as an ERS/USDA employee located at Cornell. Other new faculty appointments in 1985 included Deborah Streeter (Ph.D., Wisconsin) to work in management information systems and Harry Kaiser (Ph.D., Minnesota) to work in dairy marketing. Robert Boynton resigned in 1985 to become executive director of the California Dairy Institute. Lana Hall also resigned to work at the Institute of Current World Affairs in New Hampshire.

With the retirements of Dana Goodrich and Brian How in 1986, Ken Robinson and Don Freebairn in 1987, and Lee Day in 1988, another set of faculty appointments was made in the second half of the decade. Enrique Figueroa (Ph.D., University of California, Davis) joined the department to work in horticultural eco-
nomics and marketing in 1986. Harry de Gorter (Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley) came in 1987 to work in agricultural policy and trade, and Lois Willett (Ph. D., University of California, Davis) was appointed to a position in price analysis and marketing. In 1988, Steven Kyle (Ph.D., Harvard) accepted a position in agricultural development and James Pratt (Ph. D., Michigan State) joined the dairy marketing group.

Bob Kalter completed his three-year term as department chairman in 1988 and returned to regular faculty status. Bill Tomek was persuaded to take leadership for department activities by Dean Call with the strong support from his faculty colleagues.

**Faculty Honors, Awards, Activities**

Faculty involvement continued in many interesting projects both within and outside the country. John Brake was appointed by Congress to a national commission on agricultural finance, the only academic on this committee. Randy Barker served on a commission appointed by the National Academy of Sciences that examined a national strategy for biotechnology in agriculture; Bob Kalter served on the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) national committee on biotechnology. Randy Barker became a member of the board of directors of the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture located in Ibadan, Nigeria. In 1989, Barker also became the director of Cornell’s Southeast Asia Program. Timothy Mount served during much of the decade as the associate director of the Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research (CISER) and then as its director in 1990. Bill Lesser started his term as director of the Western Societies Program in 1990.

Sabbatical leaves were taken overseas by Anderson (Sweden), Blandford (France), Forker (England), German (Japan), Hall (Austria), Lesser (France), McLaughlin (Netherlands School of Business), Mount (London School of Economics), Stanton (Belgium), Tomek (University of New England), and White (Germany). The department was further enriched by the two to three visiting fellows or faculty each year from a wide range of countries, as well as scholars from the United States and Canada.

Overseas research was funded for a number of Ph.D. students in the decade, with projects completed using original data collected in 17 different countries: Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, and Upper Volta. In many cases, the chairman of
the student’s committee was able to visit the research site or was aided in supervision by a Cornell Ph.D. working in that country or the staff of one of the international research centers. These research projects and the seminars and research reports flowing from them provided the department a continuing window into the development process, its problems and successes.

Among the noteworthy achievements in the decade was the AAEA Distinguished Extension Award in 1984 to the milk diversion program committee, comprised of Knoblach, Lazarus, Milligan, Novakovic, Tauer, and Wasserman. This award was again granted in 1987 to the national program on the dairy herd buyout, with special recognition made to Novakovic, Knoblauch, Casler, Kaiser, LaDue, and Smith for their contributions to this effort. Both of these programs are examples of “grassroots” department initiatives that ultimately led to the creation of the National Institute for Livestock and Dairy Policy in 1988, with funding from the U. S. Congress.


Richard Aplin received the University of Vermont’s Alumni Award (1986) for distinguished achievement and Dan Sisler was chosen by the Cornell University Board of Trustees as their “Trustee’s Fellow” to serve on their executive committee in 1988. Sisler was also honored by the National Association of County Agents with their award for service to American and world agriculture.

Andrew M. Novakovic was appointed to the E. V. Baker Chair in Agricultural Economics in 1989 by Dean Call in recognition of his leadership nationally in dairy markets and policy and his role in preparing federal dairy legislation in the 1980s.

Loren Tauer was appointed the editor of the Northeastern Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics for the period 1990–1992.

**FACULTY RETIREMENTS**

The expansion in programs and student numbers led to a number of additional faculty appointments in the years after World War II. Not surprisingly, then, the number of retirements during the 1980s was larger than in any pre-
vious decade. Most of the retirees had been Cornell employees during most of their professional years.

Robert P. Story opted for early retirement after 28 years (1952–1980) as professor of dairy marketing. Bob was a Vermonter and completed his first two degrees at UVM. He served as an instructor of farm management there before coming to Cornell for his doctorate with G. W. Hedlund. Story’s career centered on the economics of the dairy industry and the organizations and businesses in the Northeast that brought milk from farms to retailers. He led the department’s extension programs in milk marketing and knew all the principals among dairy leaders, cooperative managers, and representatives of the industry’s processors and manufacturers. Bob was a good listener and an effective communicator. He brought people together, always reminding them of the economic realities that everyone faced. He and Dr. Spencer made a fine team in their years of work together. Bob was greatly missed by all his industry and academic colleagues in the region, and much appreciated for all his years of service.

Howard E. Conklin, professor of land economics, grew up in Cuba, New York, and obtained his B.S. (1937) and Ph.D. (1948) at Cornell. He completed his M.S. at the University of California, Berkeley, before World War II and served in the U.S. Army from 1943–1946. He took leadership for the land classification work in the postwar years, recognized the pulls of urban influences on agricultural lands, and developed the concept of “agricultural districts” that has been widely adopted in many northeastern states, including New York. He introduced area-sampling methodology to the department in collecting primary data for farm management and other studies in the field. He worked effectively with legislators on the conservation of natural resources and lands well adapted to commercial agriculture. He is fondly remembered as both an able academician and a champion of farmers. He retired in 1982 after 35 years on the faculty.

Max E. Brunk retired in 1983 after 36 years as professor of marketing. Born in New Mexico and raised in Florida, he completed his B.S. and M.S. degrees there and then worked for the University of Florida until 1945. He completed his Ph.D. at Cornell in 1947 and then joined the faculty, starting pioneering work in marketing and merchandising studies with a group of able graduate students and assistance from Walt Federer in Biometrics. The Latin square and more sophisticated experimental designs that they developed and tested for new methods of merchandizing perishable fruits, vegetables, flowers, and ornamentals in retail outlets became industry standards in a relatively short period. Max was a national and international leader in marketing. He received numerous awards from the fruit and vegetable industries, the American Farm Bureau, the American Meat Institute, and the Netherlands Bulb Growers. He traveled widely, lecturing in Australia, Canada, and Western Europe. He established a business, Eastern Market Research, as a base for his consult-
ing work. He and his wife Letta were hosts for department outings at their “retreat” in Berkshire at the start of the fall semester for many years, where as many as 200 gathered for a chicken barbecue and wonderful dishes prepared by all who came. Max was a practical joker, a quick study, and a man of many ideas. He is one of the more memorable characters to grace Warren Hall in the twentieth century.

Joseph F. Metz, Jr., joined the faculty in 1956 after completing his doctorate with Max Brunk and two degrees earlier at the University of Vermont. His initial appointment in marketing included work in floriculture and ornamental horticulture. Metz worked well with everyone in the department and in industry. His skills as an administrator of research projects and extension programs with retailers and industry personnel were quickly recognized. He was appointed an assistant director of research for the college in 1960. In 1967, he went to the Philippines as director of the University of the Philippines-Cornell graduate education project and returned in 1969 as associate director of the Cornell Experiment Station. He was director of the International Agriculture Program for the college from 1977–1982 and then led another university enrichment program at a college in Leyte, Philippines, for two years. He retired in 1984. Joe served the college well as an effective problem-solver, internationalist, and steward of scarce resources. He always found a way to get complex jobs done with a smile and to provide encouragement to all involved.

R. Brian How joined the faculty as associate professor of marketing in 1956 after four years on the faculty at the University of Saskatchewan and two at the Ontario College of Agriculture at Guelph. Brian graduated from McGill in 1939 and served in the Canadian army in World War II. He obtained his Ph.D. at Cornell in 1950. Brian took leadership for research and extension programs in marketing vegetables and horticultural products. He worked effectively with extension agents and produce managers in the retail food industry in expediting the revolution in the way fresh produce moved from farm to market. He also took leadership in suggesting profitable mechanisms for the direct marketing of fresh produce as interest in this approach grew. He worked with Bill Frank (School of Industrial and Labor Relations) in establishing an extension program in farm labor and was a pioneer in using linear and mathematical programming in both research and teaching in the department. His 357-page book, *Marketing Fresh Fruits and Vegetables*, published in 1991, provides a fine summary of scholarship in his field, in which he was one of the leaders.

Dana C. Goodrich, professor of marketing and master teacher of both marketing and accounting, retired in 1986 after 28 productive years on the faculty. Reared in New Jersey and a graduate of Rutgers in 1954, he completed
two degrees at Cornell under the direction of L. B. Darrah and then became his close associate in their work in poultry marketing. He was a leader in merchandising studies for poultry and eggs and a frequent collaborator with faculty in Poultry Science in new product research. His upbeat presentations were popular with farm and industry audiences. He was a popular teacher of introductory marketing, keeping his lectures alive with demonstrations and surprises. He directed undergraduate programs and advising for the department for many years with quiet efficiency and infinite patience with often demanding students. A heart condition forced early retirement to Florida when he was only 58 years old. Students and staff all missed his upbeat contributions to life in Warren Hall.

Donald K. Freebairn joined the faculty in 1964 as an associate professor after working as an economist at the Rockefeller Foundation in Mexico City for eight years. Don is a native of Illinois and completed his B.S. and M.S. at the University of Illinois. He came to Cornell for his Ph.D. in farm management with Lou Cunningham, which he completed in 1956. While working in Mexico and Latin America for Rockefeller, Don became fluent in Spanish and gained substantial knowledge of agricultural conditions and working relationships in these settings. His appointment was in international agricultural development. In his years here, he regularly taught a graduate seminar on the development process and agricultural land reform, and took a turn in teaching the undergraduate course in agricultural development. He served as the university’s director for the Latin American Studies Program for three different periods and was associate editor of the American Journal of Agricultural Economics from 1975–1977. He retired in 1987 after 23 years on the faculty.

Kenneth L. Robinson retired in 1987 after 36 years of distinguished service as a professor. Growing up on a fruit farm in Washington, he did an undergraduate degree at Oregon State before his military service in the Pacific, including some time in China at the end of the war. He came east to Cornell for his M.S. (1947) and completed his Ph.D. at Harvard (1951). Frosty Hill persuaded him to come to Cornell, where he became a widely heralded master teacher of students: graduate, undergraduate, extension agents, and the general public. His lectures in the classroom and out in the state were enthusiastic, insightful, and full of information. He set high standards for himself and helped his associates in their efforts to reach higher standards as well. His former students have won acclaim for their theses, writing, and professional achievements. This history records a part of the justly deserved
honors he brought to the department and university. In retirement, he con-
tinues his work and service as a community volunteer.

Lee M. Day received an appointment as a professor of agricultural
economics when he became director of the Northeast Regional Center of
Rural Development in 1975, located at Cornell University. Lee came to this
appointment from Pennsylvania State University, where he had been head
of the department from 1969–1975. Lee is a native of Iowa and completed
his B.S. and M.S. at Iowa State. He obtained his Ph.D. at Minnesota and
worked at the USDA from 1953–1969. His final position in Washington was
as an economist in the office of the secretary of agriculture before moving to
Penn State. He served as president of the Northeast Agricultural Economics
Council in 1983–1984 and was named both a distinguished and honorary
life member of this professional association. When the regional center was
no longer funded in the mid-1980s, Lee closed out his professional career in
the department working on rural development and land use policy issues. He
loved to play golf and retired to Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, in 1988.

Kenneth Gardner, senior extension associate, retired
in 1989 after 25 years at Cornell working in commu-
nity development and land use policy. Ken, a native of
Pennsylvania, completed an A.B. at Gettysburg College
in 1952 and an M.S. at Cornell in 1954. After work-
ing in Pennsylvania until 1964, he joined Cooperative
Extension in New York as a community resource devel-
opment specialist. He came to the department in 1976 to
work statewide on land use issues, agricultural districts,
and equalization and assessment problems. His work
was most closely associated with that of Conklin, Bills,
Boisvert, and Allee. He communicated well both in Albany and with exten-
sion staff across the state.

DEATHS

During the decade, a number of emeritus faculty died and their lives and
contributions were celebrated in the university’s annual statements of necro-
logy written by their close associates. Brief quotations from these statements
follow in recognition of their years of service to the department and the uni-
versity community over their years in Ithaca and at Cornell University.

M. SLADE KENDRICK (1894–1980), PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC FINANCE

“Few persons more closely exemplified the scholarly gentleman of principle
than did M. Slade Kendrick during his long career at Cornell. Toward students
he was warm, friendly, and helpful, almost always optimistic and happy, but
also gently insistent upon good work. He was a contemplative, introspective
intellectual, calm of spirit, who read and wrote widely, enjoyed poetry, and appreciated philosophy.”

**Whiton Powell (1903–1980), Professor of Business Management and College Librarian**

“Pete Powell had an infectious smile, an ever-present, positive outlook on life, an ability to see things realistically and get things done in an orderly and systematic manner, and the faculty of enjoying whatever he undertook. His life was dedicated to the service of the university and the community. He and his wife contributed generously of their time, talents, and money for the betterment of humanity.” The Whiton Powell Periodical Room is located in Mann Library. The Jeannette G. Powell Building is part of the Ithaca BOCES campus. She spent nine years on the BOCES board and five years as president.

**Frank A. Pearson II (1887–1981), Professor of Prices**

“He was an inspiring teacher, particularly of graduate students. He chaired over 50 graduate committees and served as a minor member for over 100 others. His classes in prices and statistics for advanced undergraduates and graduate students were a special experience for several thousand students... They recognized that the teaching materials were reflecting the ideas of an original and forceful mind.” A 1956 quote from Pearson in *Farm Economics* reads: “There is nothing wrong with the rule that the race is to the swift and to the victor belongs the spoils—a higher standard of living.”

**Lowell C. Cunningham (1903–1983), Professor of Farm Management**

“Lou Cunningham was a person of great drive, energy, and enthusiasm; high standards of performance; and a dedication to serving mankind. He was committed to seeking out all the relevant facts and then presenting and defending them in the best way he knew how. His impact on the dairy industry and the agriculture of New York State and the nation will be felt for a long time.”

**Herrell F. DeGraff (1908–1986), First H. E. Babcock Professor of Food Economics**

“For 10 years, his course in Agricultural Geography provided incoming freshmen with a broad, worldwide perspective of agriculture. He was a dynamic teacher and tireless leader in the agricultural community, highly sought after as a speaker at both state and national meetings. He was the second person to be voted the Professor of Merit by the college seniors and for several years the faculty representative on the Cornell Board of Trustees.”
EDWARD A. LUTZ (1910–1987), PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

“With the death of Edward A. Lutz, the university and the state lost a respected scholar and a leader in community affairs. His professional life was devoted to the systematic analysis of social problems and to the improvement of schools and local government. He was an educator in the broadest sense and was known throughout the state for his innovative programs to aid local administration.” He was also a fine horticulturist, known widely for his collection of azaleas and rhododendrons.

FORREST F. HILL (1900–1988), PROFESSOR OF LAND ECONOMICS AND UNIVERSITY PROVOST

“Frosty’s influence extended well beyond his tenure as a professor at Cornell. . . . Few individuals have been able to achieve success in so many different areas, including teaching, administration, and innovation in international research. He will be remembered as a great conversationalist and a delightful companion.”

LELAND SPENCER (1896–1990), PROFESSOR OF MARKETING

“Dr. Spencer’s careful and painstaking work was to be a model for later research and gained him the respect of industry leaders. His personal character contributed to that respect. He was meticulous in dress, speech, and personal habits; careful and kindly, but strong in convictions and moral principles. He opened many doors in the dairy industry that helped others, particularly graduate students, to obtain needed statistical data to carry on their research work.”

WENDELL G. EARLE (1923–1990), PROFESSOR OF MARKETING

“The faculty in the Department of Agricultural Economics, the college, and university lost one of its strong contributors and supporters in the passing of Wendell G. Earle. He was an innovator in teaching, a developer of new university programs, an effective fund-raiser, and an active leader and worker in the university community. We have all learned from his timely counsel, his quick wit, and his selfless commitment to higher education for students of all ages.”

OVERVIEW

At the close of the decade, the department still had 39 professorial positions, of which three were held by college administrators (Call, Conneman, Wing). It was also home to three full-time lecturers (Grossman, Hubbert, van Es); four senior extension associates (Hayward, Smith, Wasserman, Wilcox); and
six research or extension associates. There were also 15 emeritus professors, of whom about two-thirds spent most of the year in the Ithaca area.

During the decade, funding from the state of New York and the USDA for work in the department continued to decline as a proportion of the total. Support staff were fewer in number. The days of having a secretary or clerk in every faculty office had disappeared. The number of graduate assistantships provided by the state necessarily decreased and entrepreneurship on the part of the faculty in securing funding for research was important.

Increasingly, the need to seek and fund endowments to carry on the work of the department was essential. The first major endowment, the W. I. Myers Chair in Agricultural Finance, was obtained in 1979. During the 1980s, a start toward similar efforts in other areas of department work was made. Obtaining a fully funded endowment takes substantial time and effort from interested faculty, as well as the interest and help from college administrators. The work of Wendell Earle, alumnus Sam Seltzer (1948), and Dean Call led to funding the Personal Enterprise and Small Business Management Program in 1985, which was fully endowed in 1990 as the Bruce F. Failing, Sr., Professorship.

Another important effort was the creation of the Stanley W. Warren Teaching Endowment Fund [initially $400,000]. This was an effort to honor a much beloved undergraduate teacher by his former students with resources “to support excellence in undergraduate teaching programs in farm and business management.” Unlike many endowments, the bulk of these funds came in modest amounts from almost 1,000 individuals and businesses. This effort led by Robert S. Smith, professor emeritus, provides a lasting tribute to a great teacher as well as enrichment to a fine undergraduate teaching program.

The effort to seek and obtain endowments to support department programs continues. In 1992, the K. L. Robinson Professorship in Agricultural Economics and Public Policy was funded by John Dyson in honor of his former teacher and advisor. The current holder of the chair is William Schulze (Ph.D., University of California, Riverside). The T. H. Lee Professorship of World Affairs became available to the university in the mid-1990s in large part through the efforts of Randy Barker. The
professorship honoring Lee (Ph.D., 1969) is not located permanently in Agricultural Economics, but the first holder of the chair, Ravi Kanbur (D.Phil., Oxford), is situated in Warren Hall. The Robert G. Tobin Professor of Marketing was established at the end of the 1990s in recognition of the high quality of work in our Food Industry Management Program. Ed McLaughlin is the current holder of this chair.

As the department moved forward into the last decade of the century, it was favored with strong leadership. University President Frank H. T. Rhodes was well established as a national leader and widely heralded as one of our more popular presidents. David L. Call as dean provided the college and the state’s agriculture with a dynamic presence and the ability to communicate with its several publics in an open, yet effective manner. Bill Tomek, as chairman, was an established scholar and leader in agricultural economics, well respected at home and nationally.

The department had a strong foundation on which to build. The tradition of service to the people of the state was strong and of long-standing. There remained the strong commitment to research based on solid economic data, carefully obtained, reviewed, and analyzed. Access to excellent computing facilities and respected faculty colleagues in related disciplines provided a fine atmosphere for graduate study and advanced work. The high quality of undergraduates with majors in our programs provided both a challenge and an inspiration to their teachers. The 1980s was a decade for which the department could take substantial pride. But substantial challenges remained for the years ahead.
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Getting Work Done
in Warren Hall

No story of agricultural economics at Cornell University could be told without paying tribute to the many people who have worked tirelessly with faculty and staff to make possible the teaching, research, and extension efforts that flowed from the department over the years. The names and faces are mostly lost over time. Viewed from the beginning of the twenty-first century, one cannot help but think of the early workers adding columns of figures on adding machines and doing statistics with comptometers, paper and pencil, and slide rules. Pause and remember again the frustrations of typing theses using carbon paper, and duplicating materials with mimeograph machines and blue stencils! The equipment to help get the work done has changed tremendously over time, but the importance of the people running the machines has not. The loyal, dedicated workers associated with the Department of Agricultural Economics over the decades made possible the bulletins, classwork, and speeches for which the professors gained acclaim.

The records maintained by the department over its life are amazingly complete and detailed. They have made possible much of the material summarized in this publication. Unfortunately, these records include few pictures of the early staff who kept the records and typed the pages produced by famous people like Warren, Pearson, Myers, and Hill. For example, the author never met Nina Bush, who evidently “ran” the department in the 1930s and 1940s. But she certainly was remembered and talked about by all of the faculty, graduate students, and staff who worked with and for her. Nina ran the ship with an iron hand and a tight fist, or so we are told. Clearly the department heads approved of her efforts to economize and get things done in the years of the Great Depression and afterward.

Over the years, a sense of community and goodwill has grown among those who worked for the department—especially once the staff was brought together in Warren Hall. Certainly, during the second half of the twentieth century, Warren Hall has been looked upon within the university community as one of the best places in which to work.
One of the more memorable people to work in Warren Hall was Antonia “Onnie” Zaharis Papas. Onnie started her career in the department immediately after graduation from Groton High School in the 1940s. She began as a clerk for F. A. Pearson, but shortly thereafter was chosen by F. F. Hill to work in the “main office” when he became department head. When Nina Bush retired as the key person handling accounts and personnel for the department, Onnie took over for Nina. Frosty Hill and Onnie got on famously. He delegated lots of responsibility to her and she loved it. There was no one she worked for of whom she thought more highly. And that personal respect was returned.

In many respects, Onnie, of the flashing eyes and quick tongue, made the welfare of the department and its faculty and staff the center of her life until her marriage to Peter Papas in 1967. She and her mother brought new graduate students and faculty home to dinner. She made sure there was a party each year for the janitors. She always found a way to honor staff when they received service pins or had gained recognition. But Onnie demanded that things be done her way, usually for the benefit of the department as a whole and at a high standard.

Onnie’s tenure as “boss” in the main office extended from the late 1940s until July 1979. The department heads and chairmen, whose signatures she learned to reproduce exactly, included Hill, Hedlund, Stanton, and Forker. The author watched her reproduce Hill’s and Hedlund’s signatures, and he is sure she did the same for him when she felt it appropriate. She learned to work with all of us, and we learned to appreciate her and all she brought to the department. Most of the former graduate students from those years, when reading this history, will probably remember Onnie more clearly than most of the faculty.

Many of the pictures that are available for this book were taken because she took them or asked others, like Joe Baldwin, to take them. The more formal photos of the faculty as a group were partly her doing and that of Professor Hedlund. Many of the snapshots that have been copied and reproduced here came from her personal collection, turned over by her niece to the department after her death. Some were also taken from a scrapbook presented to Onnie at her retirement. This section of the book in many respects is a tribute to her caring and contributions to the life of the department.
Two of the “fixtures” of the department from 1950 forward were Grace Whitman and Lois Plimpton. Grace worked for Glenn Hedlund when he returned to Cornell after World War II. When Hedlund moved down the hall to become department head, Grace came with him to manage his affairs and those of the department. Grace kept things on an even keel in a quiet, cheerful way and always kept the priorities for the department straight. She was in charge in 102 Warren until her retirement in the 1970s and met all her deadlines, even when that meant not leaving work until the job was done.

Lois Plimpton completed her B.S. in agricultural economics at Cornell at the end of the 1940s and never left Warren Hall. She worked in the Local Government Program, initially with Professor Lutz, but soon became a resource person for faculty and students when seeking agricultural and economic statistics from the census and the USDA. She regularly worked with the staff in Mann Library and learned how to find publications when others could not. She helped write statistical publications and found cheerful ways to solve problems when others were frustrated with data problems. The quality of many a publication was improved because of Lois’s efforts and careful review.

The main office was a busy place, always filled with piles of paper, forms, and requisitions in some stage of completion from the faculty and staff who came in to solve problems, turn in expense accounts, or find out how much money was left in an account. Usually interruptions were met cheerfully. There was plenty to do. Three of the long-time main office faithful include MaryEllen Rapalee, who worked first with Onnie for a number of years and then with Carolyn McGory when she came to run the office. Penny Rose worked on accounts quietly and efficiently until her untimely death.
For many years, the extension leader for the department and a substantial amount of the work with farm records and accounts were centered on the fourth floor of Warren Hall. The following pictures of the fourth floor staff were taken between 1950 and 1980.

Mary Rinckas, extension records

Anna Chandler cutting her cake, with Edith Lapham (far left), Angie Torchia, and Mary Rinckas.

Cooperatives and Farm Management: Bruce Anderson, Cindy Farrell, and Stuart Smith.

Edith Sleights in accounting.

Angie Torchia and Art Bratton in the extension leader’s office.

Extension Farm Records: Beverly Carcelli and Wayne Knoblauch.
STAFF ACTIVITIES ON THE FOURTH FLOOR

Electronic Farm Records: Austin Lowry and Carol Calkins.

Myrtle Voorheis, farm accounts

Cost Accounts Staff: Mary Chaffee, Florence Blodgett, Oneta Shipe, Darwin Snyder, and Barbara Wilcox.

Virginia Greenwood, farm records

Oneta Shipe, cost accounts
THE HOME STUDY PROGRAM AND FOOD INDUSTRY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Home Study Program operated from a number of different locations in the building, but usually were quite closely associated with the offices of Gene German and Wendell Earle. As the amount of work and the number of participants in the programs grew, space was always a limitation. The directors were often on the road, but operations here in Ithaca always moved forward.

Directors of the Home Study Program: Bud Hayward (left) and Bob Nolan.

Home Study staff members (left to right): Suzanne Corbin, Gloria Pidduck, a temporary worker, and Judy Neno.

Sharon Wyllie, secretary

Betty Edds, Home Study editor
Operations in the basement were important to everyone in the building. This is where publications were reproduced, handouts for classes were prepared, and computing was done. The equipment made substantial changes over the years. The pictures shown here of people at work with their machines bring back memories of how it was a few years ago.
CUSTODIANS AND BUILDING MAINTENANCE

When Warren Hall opened in the 1930s, the department hired its own custodial staff and they, like all the other employees, reported to the main office on the first floor. Their salaries were funded by New York State. In the 1950s, when the author joined the faculty, Sarge was the senior custodian and the leader of that team. Pictures featured here date from the days when that staff worked for Agricultural Economics. Now, the custodial staff in Warren Hall works for Cornell and is supervised centrally. As a result, individuals come and go more rapidly, and personal relationships have become somewhat different.
OTHER FACES FROM THE PAST THAT BRING BACK MEMORIES

The pictures here do not begin to include all of the important people who have worked in Warren Hall and have helped to carry out its work in the second half of the twentieth century.

They do include a number who spent much of their professional life in Warren Hall, making the department more interesting and productive.

Dick Boisvert and Nancy Trencansky in front of some of Dick’s books.

Jean Gustafson, who worked for Ken Carpenter, Joe Bugliari, and Dale Grossman.

Wayne Marzolf, farm management specialist.

June Ploss, who worked for Spencer, Story, and Novakovic.

Dan Sisler and Alice Humerez, who worked together until Alice retired.

Doreen Doty, who worked for Stanton and then moved to Nutrition at Dave Call’s invitation.
Cherie Morse worked at Warren until she retired from her Graduate Program Assistant position.

Nancy Brown started on the fourth floor, worked for Robinson and Tomek in the basement, and then returned to the fourth floor.

Al Fox, in his days as research associate after graduate school.

Onnie Papas and Ben Williams on Cornell’s airplane, “Far Above.”

Bob Linton, graduate student and then research associate.

Main Office staff, 2001 [from left]: Linda Morehouse, Gloria Aagaard, Elizabeth Rightmire, Marge Arcangeli, Judy Neno, and Jon Hughes.
THE U.S. ECONOMY HAS SEEN MANY CHANGES in the years since Cornell was founded and a professor of agriculture was chosen to be a member of its first faculty. Many people who have not visited New York State think of it as an urban land area filled largely with houses and people. A fellow graduate student at Minnesota from Saskatchewan came home to Albany County with the author on a train at Christmas in 1950 and was quite surprised to find this land of farms, lakes, and open vistas. We went to the big city, of course, but he came away with a new perception that we too continued to have a vibrant rural economy.

A brief review of some simple statistics for New York State may be useful in providing a more general perspective of how change occurred.

**Table 1. Percent of Population, Urban vs. Rural, New York State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Urban %</th>
<th>Rural %</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>1,373,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>3,097,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>5,083,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>9,114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>13,479,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18,237,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>18,680,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 charts the urbanization of New York. Despite the fact that New York City was already the largest city in the United States in 1820, New York people were largely living in the countryside. By the time Cornell University was attracting a few students in 1880, the urban nature of the state was well established. Still, about 2.2 million people were living on farms and in the rural hamlets of New York, where the horse was the main source of power on farms and the primary means of local transportation.

It was in this setting that Roberts and Bailey set about providing the beginnings of agricultural education at Cornell. It was to these farm families and rural people that they directed their efforts. By providing improved standards of education and better information, they hoped to raise the standards of living and the quality of rural life. And they and those that followed them succeeded.
in this great exercise, which when viewed from the perspective of the twenty-first century, exceeded their wildest dreams.

**THE IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY: NATIONALLY AND IN NEW YORK**

A brief review of the changing landscape of New York agriculture is also useful, both in looking back at what has happened and thinking about what may occur in the future. As shown in Table 2, the peak census year for both farm numbers and land in farms was 1880, when 75 percent of the land area of the state was included in farms. Average farm size in those days was a little less than 100 acres. Farm numbers and land in farms began declining when horses began to be replaced by tractors and trucks in the 1910s and 1920s. During the post–World War II years, between 1950 and 1970, the state saw great declines in farm numbers as new technology was applied and power from gasoline engines and electricity made it possible for one worker to do so much more. Land on steep hillsides and poorly drained soils, where agriculture could no longer compete, reverted to brush and trees.

**Table 2. Number Of Farms and Land In Farms in New York, 1850–1997**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farm Numbers</th>
<th>Land in Farms (million acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>197,000</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>241,100</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>226,200</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>193,200</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>153,200</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>82,400</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>43,100</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land area of New York = 30.6 million acres.

Over the twentieth century, the net product from commercial agriculture in New York increased in terms of farm output in the form of such major products as milk, apples, and vegetables. Major commercial crops of the nineteenth century, such as hay and oats for the state’s horses and wheat, for which New York was the country’s major supplier in 1850, declined both in terms of areas harvested and importance. Commercial agriculture had increased output per worker so rapidly that society now took agricultural productivity for granted. Improvements in transportation and a developed market economy within the free trade boundaries of this country meant that
New York farmers must compete in an international market. At the end of the twentieth century, commercial agriculture was still an important contributor to the state’s economy but provided much, much less of the state’s GDP in percentage terms than 100 years earlier.

**Agricultural Economics in a Changing Setting**

When agricultural economics became a recognized academic discipline early in the twentieth century, the central interest and concern of faculty members was about farmers and the rural economy. Farm management was a major part of the discipline in its earliest years, but faculty soon started work on issues associated with marketing, prices, finance, and land use. Funding for this additional work at the land grant colleges came because the early work in research, teaching and extension had been so well received and helpful to the people who lived on the land. Agricultural economists were important figures in the debates about farm prices and federal programs to help solve the “farm problem” in the late 1920s and the 1930s. Research and extension efforts centered on providing accurate and timely information as the farm economy and most industries struggled for survival.

In the years following World War II, especially from 1950 to 1970, farm numbers fell dramatically and the number of people making their livelihood from the countryside decreased even more markedly. During the 1940s, many farm people joined the war effort as members of the armed forces or as production workers in factories turning out the supplies that made possible final victory. Most never returned to make their living on farms.

This quiet agricultural revolution occurred with little fanfare. Often this transition was psychologically difficult, but jobs in urbanizing America offered better opportunity than life on many of the farms. In a state like New York, it was often possible to live in the community where one grew up, often in the same house, and commute to work. And so a major transition in many farming communities transpired; tillable acres from small farms were incorporated into larger ones; former pastures and hayfields reverted to the forests from which they had been wrought only a few generations earlier. As a result, agricultural economists became more concerned with issues of farm structure, rural development, and resource economics as the policy issues associated with these changes demanded attention and fuller understanding.

Over time, agriculture and farming, around which the discipline was focused in its first half century, claimed less and less of the central attention of professionals known as agricultural economists. The skills of these well-trained applied economists were widely appreciated in business, government, and industry. The problems and interests of sectors closely allied to agriculture and the food industry naturally became a part of the research and extension efforts of agricultural economists. Major issues, such as the conservation of natural resources, water policy, environmental questions, and community development problems, claimed more and more of the time of able figures in
the discipline. Funding to study and work on these issues of general public interest was often more readily available than that for traditional work centered on commercial agriculture and marketing. The horizons and interests of agricultural economists broadened accordingly. In this setting, the college changed its name in 1969 to reflect its broadened programs and became the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. At the start of the twenty-first century, the department changed its name within the college framework to Applied Economics and Management.

While the problems of commercial agriculture remain very real, both in New York State and around the world, and deserve study, research, and extension efforts from able agricultural economists, the setting for work has certainly changed. Farm families now take for granted many of the services Roberts, Bailey, and Warren worked so hard to make possible. Timely, accurate information about prices and markets is readily available to all. The same public services, available in towns and villages, are now in use on most farms. Living in the countryside is viewed as a desirable option by many living in an urban environment. Rural people are no longer viewed as disadvantaged because of where they live.

Agricultural economists will continue to adapt to the needs of society and will continue to work on trying to solve problems that are the important concerns of rural America and those who live on the land and use its resources. Farmers remain one of the primary users of land in this state. Nationally they remain central to most land- and water-use decisions. Certainly an important group of those who have called themselves “agricultural economists” will continue to have management, marketing, and agricultural policy and trade as the central focus of their work. The food industry in all its dimensions will command attention. International agriculture and the development process may well become a larger focus if environmental problems and disease become even larger issues in densely populated, poorer regions of the world. Resource and environmental economists, already important groups in many departments, may become integral parts of research groups in the applied biological sciences seeking answers to complex problems with major economic implications. Funding for work from our traditional agricultural base may well continue to decline in percentage terms, but will remain important, at least in the near future.

The Department’s Unique Heritage

In this summary statement, it is natural to look back at the work of the agricultural economists at Cornell in the twentieth century and try to list some of the achievements that have made work in this field, at this location, deserving of special note. Without much discussion or supporting evidence, the following generalizations seem worthy of mention.

1. A concern and commitment to the rural people of New York State. From its beginnings, the college and department centered
its work on solving the very real problems of farms and rural communities. The college was funded by the state because farmers lobbied effectively for that funding. It received continuing support because that initial priority was not forgotten. The department’s faculty worked with governors and legislators, regardless of political party, to get things done for the betterment of life throughout the state.

2. Obtaining, understanding, and analyzing economic data. Starting with Roberts, Hunt, and Warren, data were collected from farmers for use in teaching, research, and extension. Factual evidence obtained from farmers, in markets, and at processing plants and rural businesses was collected to learn how these businesses worked and how the agricultural economy functioned. Understanding data and what they really represented, whether collected by survey or from the statistics of a government agency, was fundamental to work by Warren and Pearson in the early years, and by Tomek, Robinson, and Mount, and their colleagues more recently.

3. Preparing publications that were understandable and quickly available. From the earliest years, Bailey and Warren set a high standard for their fellow workers. Results from research and economic data were made available in a variety of forms: at Farm & Home Week, using special trains, and in farmers’ bulletins. Farmers knew their personal data would be treated as confidential, but what had been learned from their records would be made available to them and their neighbors. Out of this tradition came Farm Economics, the A.E. mimeographed series, and the department’s commitment to return results from studies to those who provided the data as well as to the general public.

4. Senior authorship given to the primary research worker. From the earliest years, graduate students became single authors of experiment station bulletins based on their thesis research. The leadership of the department sought publication and pride of place for those who did most of the work.

5. Commitment to the profession and it support. Warren was a leader in organizing the American Farm Management Association in 1910 and the change in name in 1919 to the American Farm Economics Association. The department has provided three secretary-treasurers for 19 of the 91 years of the life of the AFEA and its predecessor organizations, as well as 6 of its presidents.
The beginnings of the International Association of Agricultural Economists (IAAE) were closely related to Elmhirst’s years at Cornell and his close relationships with Warren and Ladd. The first two meetings in 1929 at Dartington, United Kingdom, and in 1930 at Cornell were a success because of their personal relationships with Taylor and other leaders in the profession in America and abroad.

6. An international dimension to study and outreach. Foreign students enriched university life from its beginnings. Study and service abroad are hallmarks of the college and its faculty. The work by faculty and graduate students in China in the 1930s and the decades of work in the Philippines following World War II reflected this commitment by Warren, Myers, Hill, and the department to reach out, study, learn, and serve. Graduate study and research overseas is an integral part of the department’s work.

7. Benefits from working across disciplines and with other organizations. Agricultural scientists quickly recognized that there is an important economic dimension associated with the production and distribution of crops and livestock products. In the years before World War II, many of the department’s contributions were in helping people understand the costs and returns associated with individual commodities. Assisting with the evaluation of new technology and establishing methodology for merchandising alternatives involved direct work with scientists in both research design and their applications. Associations across disciplines in the international centers, such as the International Rice Research Institute and the International Center for Research on Maize and Wheat (CIMMY), continue to be important to both faculty and graduate students.

8. The tradition of “freedom and responsibility.” Carl Becker writes about coming to Cornell as a new faculty member in history and asking about “what he must do.” He learned that he was largely free to do what he wanted, but also responsible for the choices he made. Over the years, the tradition of freedom and responsibility has been discussed and maintained to a large degree in the department. Clearly individuals are recruited for a general area of work, but substantial freedom remains to be creative for students and staff alike. With the freedom goes the responsibility, and for most it is wonderful.
9. Access to the resources of the university and the community. The university library system is a great resource and its librarians want faculty and students to use its facilities. Being part of an Ivy League university brings with it able students and strong academic departments, as well as access to able colleagues in economics, statistics, computing, and all the agricultural and biological sciences. The Finger Lakes, the surrounding park system, and the community make Ithaca a fine place to live, work, and study.

10. An orientation to business, the food industry, and agriculture as a contributor to the economy. Roberts, Hunt, and Warren saw farming primarily as a business, not a way of life. Cooperatives and markets succeeded or failed as businesses. There was a business orientation to teaching and research from the beginnings of the department and it persists. The undergraduate teaching program and its success reflect that tradition.

A Final Comment

One cannot help but wonder if agricultural economics will exist as a discipline after another hundred years. The same forces that helped it become an important part of colleges of agriculture across the world 100 years ago have changed dramatically in the industrialized world. But there is a combination of skills that agricultural economists are trained to apply which are too important and useful for this heritage to disappear from sight, in a world where so many people are dependent on an agricultural economy for their livelihood.

Agricultural economists have made important contributions because they have worked on real problems, sought factual data to study and analyze, and then used the tools of economics, statistics, and related disciplines, and cooperating scientists to seek solutions. It is a discipline of applied economics that works on problems, gets its hands dirty in the field working with people, and knows that suggested solutions may not work initially.

There will always be a demand for people trained in the tradition of agricultural economics as it developed in the twentieth century, whatever the name of the academic department, because of that underlying commitment to people and finding solutions to economic problems. We have every reason to be proud of this heritage and the accomplishments that grew out of it.
TIMELINE

Agricultural Economics at Cornell: 1874–1999

1800s  THE AGRICULTURAL HERITAGE

1874  Isaac P. Roberts becomes professor of agriculture, Cornell from the Iowa College of Agriculture.

1879  Roberts publishes first farmers’ bulletin. Roberts Barn erected on site of present-day agriculture quadrangle.

1887  Hatch Act passed providing federal funding for experiment station in every state; New York’s located at Cornell with Roberts as director.

1889  Liberty Hyde Bailey joins faculty from Michigan Agriculture College as professor of horticulture.

1893  First building for agriculture, the Dairy Building (now north end of Goldwin Smith Hall). Professor Henry Wing publishes *Silk Production*, one of first such studies in the U.S.

1894–95  Course in political economy required for all four-year students in agriculture.

1896–97  Agriculture faculty listed as separate college, Roberts as dean.

1899  George N. Lauman appointed instructor; teaches course on history of agriculture.

1900–1909  FARM MANAGEMENT AND RURAL ECONOMY

1901  Lauman teaches course titled Economics of Agriculture as well as history course.

1903  Bailey appointed dean when Roberts retires after 30 years of service. Lauman appointed instructor of rural economy and secretary of the college.

1903  Governor signs legislation establishing the New York State College of Agriculture. Thomas F. Hunt appointed professor of agronomy and manager of university farms; teaches first course in farm management.

1905  Groundbreaking for new buildings for College of

1906 Hunt defines concept of “labor income” and starts Tompkins County survey; Lauman appointed assistant professor of rural economy.

1907 Warren appointed assistant professor of agronomy and head of Department of Farm Crops at Cornell when Hunt resigns to become dean at Penn State.

1908 Tompkins County farm management survey completed under Warren’s direction.

1909 Warren promoted to professor of farm crops and farm management. Lauman promoted to professor of rural economy; Department of Rural Economy created with Lauman as sole member.

1910–1919 **AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS BECOMES A DISCIPLINE**

1910 American Farm Management Association organized with G. F. Warren as its first secretary.

1911 A separate Department of Farm Management created with Warren as head. Bulletin 295, based on Tompkins County survey, published.


1914 Federal funding for Cooperative Extension is provided with passage of Smith-Lever Act.

1915 Gad P. Scoville appointed to work in extension farm management with county agent staff. He joins Warren, Livermore, and Thompson in the department.

1916 Albert R. Mann is named dean of the college when Beverly T. Galloway resigns after two years in the post, following Bailey.
1917 Milk strike in New York; “Warren formula” based on cost of production studies is used to raise prices in manner accepted by farmers, dealers, and consumers; Warren argues strongly against setting price ceilings in Washington on wheat and feed grains.

1917 Resolution at AFMA to change name to American Farm Economics Association proposed by Peck, Warren, and Cox.


1919 Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management created by Dean Mann with three faculty from Rural Economy absorbed in new department, with Warren as head. Its faculty has 13 members and 31 graduate students.

1920–1929 NEW SPECIALIZATIONS AND THE AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION

1920 W. I. Myers made assistant professor with new state funds.

1921 At request of Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, Warren prepares, Prices of Farm Products in the United States, USDA Bulletin 999.


1923 The department’s extension publication, Farm Economics, is launched with six or more issues per year sent free to all subscribers; Warren regular author of lead article with Pearson.

1923–29 Land use studies begin in counties where farmland has been abandoned in increasing amounts. Studies in Chenango and Chautauqua Counties led to State Reforestation Law in 1929 authorizing the state to acquire lands for reforestation.

1924 Ladd appointed director of extension after serving as extension professor of farm management starting in 1920.
1924 Myers appointed professor of farm finance; first farmer-banker conference organized in Ithaca.

1925 First experiment station bulletins on marketing milk and potatoes issued by Leland Spencer and M. P. Rasmussen and their students.

1926 M. Slade Kendrick initiates studies of local government operations and real estate taxes in providing services to local communities.

1927–31 Myers serves as secretary of AFEA.


1929 First International Conference of Agricultural Economists held at Dartington Hall in United Kingdom; Ladd and Warren key figures in its organization.

1929 Governor-elect Roosevelt establishes Agricultural Advisory Commission; Warren is key member.

1930–1939 THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN AGRICULTURE AND THE GREAT DEPRESSION

1930 Second International Conference of Agricultural Economists held at Willard Straight Hall, Cornell.

1930 Governor Roosevelt signs bill providing funds for new building for rural social sciences at Cornell, handing pen to Warren.

1930–33 Land utilization studies; concept of land class maps by counties developed by F. F. Hill and A. B. Lewis.

1931 Carl E. Ladd becomes dean of the college when Mann is made provost of Cornell.


1932 Cornerstone for new building, Warren Hall, laid on May 23, 1932, by Cornell President Farrand.

1933 W. I. Myers becomes deputy governor and then governor of the Farm Credit Administration when Henry Morgenthau becomes secretary of the U.S. Treasury.

1933 Warren serves as advisor to President Roosevelt on monetary policy; encourages Bank Holiday, suspension of gold standard.

1934 Warren Hall completed and occupied; Warren in Washington primarily as advisor to Morgenthau.

1934 William I. Myers serves as president of AFEA.

1934 F. F. Hill goes to Washington to work with Myers as deputy governor of the Farm Credit Administration (FCA).

1934 Warren presents lead paper at ICAE meeting in Bad Eilsen, Germany, “International Policies Relating to Agriculture.”

1935 *Gold and Prices* published by Warren and Pearson summarizing their arguments for a managed currency and staying off the “gold standard.”


1938 G. F. Warren and James Boyle die. W. I. Myers appointed department head.

1940–1949 **THE IMPACTS OF WORLD WAR II AND NEW TECHNOLOGY**

1940 F. F. Hill returns to Cornell from Washington as professor of farm finance.

1941 G. W. Hedlund resigns to become department head at Penn State.

1941–42 Entry in World War II calls some faculty into uniform. M. P. Catherwood becomes commissioner of commerce and T. N. Hurd is made Farm Manpower director in Albany. Rasmussen goes to Washington to serve on War Production Board.

1943 Dean Ladd dies at 55; William I. Myers chosen as dean of college; F. F. Hill is chosen as department head.

1944 Student numbers in department courses at low point; 311 compared with 2,074 in 1939.
1944 George N. Lauman dies shortly after his retirement in 1942.

1945–46 Faculty and students return at end of war. Hedlund returns to faculty from Penn State.

1946–47 New federal funding provides money for research and extension programs in marketing. Max E. Brunk and Lawrence B. Darrah appointed assistant professors after completing doctoral programs.

1947 Whiton Powell named college librarian; plans for new library at east end of ag quadrangle completed; construction begins in 1950.

1947 Stanley W. Warren serves as vice president of AFEA.

1948 Howard E. Conklin appointed assistant professor and takes leadership for land utilization efforts.

1948 A new cooperative extension program, Food Marketing for Consumers, is funded with offices in Ithaca and New York City and under the general direction of M. C. Bond.

1950–1959 Expanded Work with the Food Industry

1950–54 Research on handling and merchandizing perishable products, primarily fruits and vegetables, was given priority with leadership from Brunk, Darrah, and Rasmussen; they establish successful experimental methods with W. Federer in Biometrics that are widely adopted across the country.

1951 F. F. Hill serves as president of AFEA

1952 Dean Myers becomes chairman of Secretary of Agriculture Benson’s Agricultural Advisory Committee.

1952 F. F. Hill becomes provost of Cornell; G. W. Hedlund is appointed acting department head.

1952 Dean Myers signs contract for technical assistance between colleges of agriculture at Cornell and in the Philippines. C. A. Bratton leaves for Los Baños on first two-year assignment.

1953 Gad P. Scoville retires after 39 years on the faculty.

1954 Maurice C. Bond is appointed director of extension; C. A. Bratton becomes department extension leader.
1954  Glenn W. Hedlund appointed department head. C. D. Kearl goes to the Philippines, replacing Bratton, to be followed by Hedlund, Darrah, and Lutz.

1954  Cornell hosts national conference of American Institute of Cooperation with Dean Myers and G. W. Hedlund cochairmen of arrangements.

1955  F. F. Hill resigns as provost to become vice president of the Ford Foundation.

1957  F. A. Pearson retires after 37 years on the faculty. He uses final issues of *Farm Economics* to write a summary of the life of George F. Warren. E. G. Misner also retires.

1958  Food Distribution Program is launched with support from National Association of Food Chains. Wendell G. Earle is director with 25 students enrolled its first year.

1958  W. I. Myers becomes a Fellow of AFEA.

1958  T. Norman Hurd resigns to become director of the budget for Governor Nelson Rockefeller.

1959  Cornell hosts annual meeting of American Farm Economics Association; C. D. Kearl becomes secretary-treasurer of AFEA, serving for 11 years.

1959  W. I. Myers retires as dean; Charles E. Palm is named to replace him.

1959  V. B. Hart and M. P. Rasmussen retire after 40 and 38 years, respectively, on the faculty.

1960–1969  **International Agricultural Development**

1960  Monthly *Current Economic Situation* sent to revised mailing list of *Farm Economics*.

1960  John Mellor offers new course, Economics of Agricultural Development.

1961  Governor Rockefeller appoints Special Committee on Milk Marketing with G. W. Hedlund, chairman, and Aplin, Cunningham, Spencer, and Story as members, along with 3 faculty from other colleges. Its final report is issued in 1964 and widely accepted by farmers and industry.
1961–62 Ford Foundation provides grant to the college to expand international research and teaching in the rural social sciences. Three new faculty positions in agricultural economics are funded: John W. Mellor, Solon Barraclough, and Thomas E. Poleman.

1962 M. C. Bond and M. Slade Kendrick retire after 35 and 37 years of service, respectively.

1963 College establishes a program in International Agricultural Development with K. L. Turk as director.

1964 Leland Spencer retires after 44 years, from instructor to professor emeritus.

1963–72 Ford Foundation supports second phase of cooperative agreement with College of Agriculture at Los Baños to develop graduate programs and research. Randolph Barker is first to go to Philippines.

1964 Home Study Program launched as part of Food Distribution Program, with sponsorship from NAFC.

1966 F. F. Hill is made a Fellow of AFEA.

1967 K. L. Robinson serves as vice president of AFEA.

1967 Kendall S. Carpenter dies due to a heart attack at 51.

1968 Glenn W. Hedlund completes 16 years as department head and turns over the position to B. F. Stanton on April Fools’ Day.

1969 L. C. Cunningham retires after 37 years of service.

1969 Campus unrest leads to unwanted national publicity; Dale Corson becomes university president.

1970–1979 INCREASES IN COMPUTING

1970 A set of 14 publications, titled Toward the Year 1985, is completed under the leadership of Olan Forker and George Casler, and widely distributed.

1970 Position of judicial administrator for the university is established; Joe Bugliari accepts post while continuing full teaching load.

1971 The college changes its name to the New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

1971 Bennett A. Dominick, Jr., dies unexpectedly at age 50.

1972 Charles E. Palm steps down as dean; W. Keith Kennedy, an agronomist, is named to replace him.
1972  Stanley W. Warren retires after 40 years of teaching
tfarm management; special retirement party brings
back students from each of his classes.
1973  David L. Call is appointed director of extension.
1974  W. G. Tomek accepts editorship of *American Journal
    of Agricultural Economics*, with Donald Freebairn and
    Richard Boisvert as associate editors.
1974  Glenn W. Hedlund retires 38 years after completing
    his doctorate here.
1975  Clifton W. Loomis opts for early retirement after 20
    years at Cornell.
1975  Olan Forker takes leadership for program to evaluate
generic commodity advertising and promotion for
milk.
1976  Olan Forker appointed department chairman;
    B. F. Stanton returns to regular appointment after 8
    years in the post.
1976  Edward A. Lutz retires after 30 years of faculty
    service.
1977  John W. Mellor resigns from faculty to become
director of the International Food Policy Research
    Institute.
1977  Wendell G. Earle and Robert S. Smith opt for early
    retirement at ages 55 and 57, respectively; both
    remain active in department and college programs.
1978  David L. Call becomes dean of the college when
    W. Keith Kennedy is chosen as university provost.
    Development*, wins AAEA’s Publication of Enduring
    Quality Award 12 years after it is issued.
1979  Funding for the endowment for the W. I. Myers Chair
    in Agricultural Finance is completed; Robert S. Smith,
a key figure in its funding, is appointed to chair on a
    part-time basis.
1979  Kenneth L. Robinson is named a Fellow of AAEA.
1979  Bernard F. Stanton serves as president of AAEA.
1979  C. A. Bratton retires from faculty after 42 years at
    Cornell.
1979  Earl Brown resigns to become dean at the University
    of Maryland.
1979  Dan Sisler elected to the Cornell Board of Trustees representing the university faculty.

1979  Howard Conklin recognized by AAEA for Distinguished Policy Contribution for work on agricultural districts.

1979  Paul Barkley joins faculty as professor of local government but returns to Washington State University to new endowed chair one year later.

1980–1989  RESOURCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS

1980  Full-time research associate funded by industry to work with Forker on study of impacts of generic advertising on sales; research continues at end of century.

1980  Robert Story retires after 28 years in milk marketing.

1980  John W. Mellor is named a Fellow of AAEA.

1981  John Brake named W. I. Myers Professor of Agricultural Finance.

1981  F. A. Pearson dies; Mann Library Fund established as memorial; George Conneman appointed college’s director of instruction; W. G. Tomek’s article, “Price Behavior on a Declining Terminal Market,” chosen as top American Journal of Agricultural Economics article.

1981  B. F. Stanton named president of Fund for International Conference of Agricultural Economists, on which he had served since 1970.

1982  Howard E. Conklin retires after 35 years on the faculty.

1983  Max E. Brunk retires after 37 years on the faculty.


1983  First laboratory-classroom of microcomputers established in Warren 160.

1983  Joe Bugliari named dean of faculty and serves until 1988.

1984  Olan D. Forker elected faculty trustee, Cornell Board of Trustees.

1985  Robert J. Kalter named chairman of department; Forker steps down after 9 years in position.
1985  Personal Enterprise and Small Business Management Program started under leadership and funding generated by Wendell G. Earle.

1985  W. G. Tomek serves as president of AAEA.

1986  Herrell DeGraff dies (first H. E. Babcock Professor of Food Economics).

1986  Dana Goodrich recipient of first Edgerton Career Teaching Award; R. Brian How retires after 30 years on faculty.

1987  Warren 60 is second laboratory classroom committed to microcomputers.

1987  All Ph.D. students committed to passing microeconomics written exam prepared by the Department of Economics.

1987  K. L. Robinson retires after 36 years on faculty, receives Edgerton Career Teaching Award; Donald K. Freebairn retires after serving 32 years.

1987  Dan Sisler named Fellow of AAEA.

1988  William G. Tomek named chairman of department; R. J. Kalter returns to regular faculty status.

1988  Lee Day retires after 13 years here, most as an administrator in college administration.

1988  Dan Sisler elected to the Cornell Board of Trustees as a “Trustee’s Fellow.”

1987  Andrew M. Novakovic appointed to the E. V. Baker Chair in Agricultural Economics.


1989  Randolph Barker serves a director of Cornell’s Southeast Asia Program.

1989  Olan Forker serves as president of AAEA Foundation.

1990–1999  TOWARD A NEW CENTURY

1990  Bruce F. Failing, Sr., Chair of Personal Enterprise and Small Business Management is established; Michael Hudson from Illinois appointed program director.


1990  William Lesser is appointed director of Cornell’s Western Societies Program.
1990  Loren Tauer is named editor of *Northeastern Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* for three years.

1990  Richard D. Aplin receives Edgerton Career Teaching Award.

1992  B. F. Stanton and Joseph Bugliari retire after 39 and 30 years of service, respectively; Walt Wasserman retires as statewide extension specialist in milk marketing.

1992  The K. L. Robinson Chair in Agricultural Economics and Public Policy is established by an endowment from John Dyson to honor his former advisor and professor.

1992  Dan Sisler receives the Edgerton Career Teaching Award.

1992  Ralph Christy serves as president of the Southern Agricultural Economics Association.

1992  Randolph Barker is elected chairman of the board of trustees of the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA).

1993  Andrew M. Novakovic named department chairman; W. G. Tomek returns to regular faculty status after five years in the post.

1993  Name of department is changed to Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics.

1994  Deborah Streeter and William Schulze named to the Bruce Failing and K. L. Robinson professorships, respectively.

1994  B. F. Stanton is made honorary life member of IAAE.

1995  The T. H. Lee Professorship of World Affairs at Cornell is endowed by friends of President Lee in Taiwan. The first appointment at Cornell is to be in agricultural economics recognizing Lee’s Ph.D. here in 1969.

1995  Richard D. Aplin, Randolph Barker, George L. Casler, Olan D. Forker, and Daniel G. Sisler retire from the faculty.

1995  David L. Call passes the dean’s hat to Daryl Lund, a food scientist who moved to the position from Rutgers. Call moves to Warren Hall and then retires from the faculty.
1996 John Brake retires as W. I. Myers professor after 15 years at Cornell; Eddy LaDue is appointed to this chair in agricultural finance. Also retiring are George Hayward, Stuart Smith, and Duane Wilcox, all senior extension associates.

1996 David Lee serves as president of the Northeastern Agricultural and Resource Economics Association (NAREA).

1997 Ralph Christy serves as president of AAEA.

1997 Robert J. Kalter retires after 31 years at Cornell.

1997 The Robert G. Tobin Professorship of Marketing is established and Gene A. German is named the first holder of the professorship.

1997 Ravi Kanbur (D.Phil., Oxford) is appointed first T. H. Lee Professor of World Affairs.

1998 Harry M. Kaiser becomes editor of Agricultural and Resource Economics Review, the journal of the NAREA, for three years.

1999 Gene German retires after completing 34 years at Cornell; Edward McLaughlin becomes the Robert G. Tobin Professor.

1999 G. J. Conneman, T. T. Poleman, and W. G. Tomek retire after 43, 36, and 37 years of service, respectively.
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