

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED
AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA**

LIBRARY

U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

**By The
Georgia State Advisory Committee
To The
United States Commission on Civil Rights**

August 1967

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED
AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA

LIBRARY
U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

By The
Georgia State Advisory Committee
To The
United States Commission on Civil Rights

August 1967

GEORGIA STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE
UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

**Dr. Vivian W. Henderson, CHAIRMAN
Atlanta

Sam Massell, Jr., VICE CHAIRMAN
Atlanta

Mrs. William C. Pauley
Atlanta

Clarence A. Bacote, Ph.D.
Atlanta

Dr. Tilman C. Cothran
Atlanta

Rev. A. Nelson Daunt
Albany

*Burleigh Don Franks
Augusta

**Theodore Freedman
Atlanta

Rev. Charles S. Hamilton
Augusta

**Joseph M. Hendricks
Macon

Miss Johnnie Hilbun
Augusta

Rev. James L. Hooten, Sr.
Savannah

*John G. Joiner
Macon

**E. T. Kehrer
Atlanta

**Mrs. Carol R. King
Albany

Rev. J. Oscar McCloud
Atlanta

Arthur J. McClung
Columbus

Sylvan H. Meyer
Gainesville

Lorimer D. Milton
Atlanta

John H. Ruffin, Jr.
Augusta

*Monroe Schlactus
Atlanta

Morgan C. Stanford
Atlanta

Rev. E. C. Tillman
Brunswick

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John D. Toomey
Savannah

*Horace T. Ward
Atlanta

Mrs. P. Q. Yancey
Atlanta

*No longer a member of the Committee

**New member--appointed to the Committee since the meeting

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE	4
Inequality in the Employment, Assignment, and Conditions of Extension Workers	5
Inequality in Program Planning and Services	15
THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION	26
Loans and Services	27
Committees	31
Employment	32
CONCLUSIONS	33
RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR ACTION	34
TABLES	38

PREFACE

The United States Commission on Civil Rights

The United States Commission on Civil Rights is an independent agency of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957. By the terms of that Act, as amended by the Civil Rights Acts of 1960 and 1964, the Commission is charged with the following duties: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to denials of the equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting denials of the equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

The State Advisory Committees

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105 (c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as amended. The Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission upon matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters which the State Committee has studied; assist the Commission in matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference which the Commission may hold within the State.

This report was submitted to the United States Commission on Civil Rights by the Georgia State Advisory Committee. The conclusions and recommendations are based upon the Advisory Committee's evaluation of information received at its open meeting held in Macon on May 28, 1966. This report has been received by the Commission and will be considered by it in making its reports and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

INTRODUCTION

This is a report of a study and an open meeting conducted by the Georgia State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to examine the federally assisted agricultural programs in Georgia. The study was made prior to the open meeting which was held in Macon, Georgia, on May 28, 1966. Representatives of Negroes in Georgia directly affected by Government farm programs previously had submitted 23 complaints to the Committee which appeared to establish a pattern of discrimination in agricultural programs and which the Committee felt warranted further investigation. The State Advisory Committee was also interested in learning if any significant changes had taken place in the administration of federally assisted agricultural programs in Georgia since the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

A 1965 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs" documented many instances of discriminatory policies and practices in the administration of federally assisted farm programs and services to Southern rural Negro families, some of which were found to exist in Georgia. Soon after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, whose Title VI prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs, the Department of Agriculture issued regulations and instructions to administrative personnel to implement

that Title. For example, separate and segregated structures of administration which existed in the South in the Cooperative Extension Service were prohibited, as were separate extension offices and segregated facilities. The Georgia State Advisory Committee sought information that would indicate whether or not there was compliance with Federal nondiscrimination requirements in the programs of the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and the Farmers Home Administration (FHA) in the State of Georgia.

Information received at the meeting indicated that there was not.

The Committee learned that rural Negroes in Georgia do not receive the equal opportunity and equal treatment they are entitled to as beneficiaries of federally assisted agricultural programs. Indeed, this denial begins in childhood when they are excluded from 4-H Club work and continues in later life when they are excluded from programs of the Extension Service and from services of specialists in FHA and the Agricultural and Stabilization Conservation Service. From their formative school years through their productive years when they are denied needed services, including jobs with the agricultural programs for which they qualify, to the day they retire or die, Negro farmers in Georgia are relegated to the status of second-class citizens, the Committee was told.

Negroes in Georgia believe they are being phased out as farmers. Many suspect that the FHA and other lending institutions are encouraging them to dispose of rather than to develop

their land holdings and they believe that the Extension Service's policy of not providing equal services is hastening this process.

In some instances, citizens were unwilling to voice their complaints in open sessions because of fear of economic reprisals. Such complaints, therefore, were heard in executive sessions and private interviews.

The Committee is deeply concerned to find that agricultural agencies have not taken adequate steps to achieve compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to the administration of farm programs in Georgia. As Georgians, its members hope that this report will encourage the Department of Agriculture and its Georgia State offices to make certain that every citizen of the State has the opportunity to till his soil, build his home, receive equal services, and be employed in dignity.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Agricultural extension work was formally recognized as a function of the land-grant colleges in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture by the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914. Extension work was also authorized under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. The 1914 legislation authorized the Department of Agriculture to develop, in cooperation with the land-grant colleges, an educational system which would provide practical information to the American farmer on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics. The responsibilities of the Cooperative Extension Service were later expanded to provide educational assistance to the entire rural community and to promote social and economic growth and development in the community through the application of current knowledge and techniques. The Extension Service provides educational programs, including information on crop insurance, marketing orders, commodity programs, and community programs, and supplies information to rural residents concerning the programs of the Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, and Rural Electrification Administration.

State and county extension work is financed by Federal, State, and county funds. These funds are used within the States for the employment of county agents, home demonstration agents, 4-H Club agents, subject matter specialists from land-grant colleges, and others who conduct the joint educational programs adapted to local problems and conditions.

conce
servi
servi

INEQ
AND
Stat

posi
norm

Geor
prof
form
Negr
seve
Negr
meml

col
the
app
are

14. The Georgia State Advisory Committee was primarily concerned with equal protection of the laws with respect to the services and employment provided by the Cooperative Extension Service in Georgia.

INEQUALITY IN THE EMPLOYMENT, ASSIGNMENT,
AND CONDITIONS OF EXTENSION WORKERS

State Staff

e
ties State staff members are normally assigned to supervisory positions at the land-grant colleges. County staff members normally do extension work in an individual county.

According to records submitted to the Committee by the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, there are 130 professional employees on the State staff located at the formerly all-white land-grant college at Athens and the all-Negro land-grant college at Fort Valley. Of the 130, only seven are Negroes. The records revealed that none of the Negro staff members doing work comparable to the white staff members has been given the same title.

es
es Extension workers are generally graduates of agricultural colleges in the States in which they work. They are hired on the recommendation of the State extension director with the approval of the governing boards of the counties to which they are assigned.

State Staff Professional Employment By Race
Georgia Cooperative Extension Service as of January 1, 1966

<u>Job Assignment</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>
Agriculture	40	0
Agriculture (low income)	0	2
Home Economist	17	0
Home Economist (low income)	0	1
Community and Resources Development	6	1 ^{a/}
4-H	13	3 ^{b/}
Other	47	0

^{a/} Negro title "Extension Rural Area Development"; no such title for white staff.

^{b/} Negro title "Assistant 4-H Club Leader"; white title Assistant State 4-H Leader." Negro title "Special Assistant Agent"; no such title for white staff.

Salaries of Negroes on the State staff are generally lower than, or in some cases equal to, the lowest salaries of whites in each job category. The records also indicated that Negroes on the State staff have been on the job longer and/or hold higher academic degrees.

County Staff

Southern States with Negro agents have relegated those agents to subordinate positions of responsibility, despite the nondiscrimination requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As of 1966, none of the 424 counties in the United States where Negro extension workers were located had assigned the primary responsibility for the extension programs in a county to a Negro or given him a commensurate title and the authority to supervise white workers. ^{1/}

In Georgia, 61 Negro extension workers, 33 male and 28 female, are located in 41 counties throughout the State, except in the northern and certain south-central portions. In no county does a Negro hold the title of county agent or county extension home economist - titles which signify supervisory responsibility for extension programs. Of the 88 assistant or associate county agents in the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, 33 are Negro. Of the 62 assistant and associate county home economists, 28 are Negro.

^{1/}

In McIntosh County, Georgia, a Negro county extension home economist is the only extension worker for the county, yet her title is associate county extension home economist.

L. W. Eberhardt, State director of the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, indicated that there was no job description for the jobs performed by extension agents. He pointed out that, although new assignments had been made to staff members since October 1965, job descriptions are only now in the process of being developed. In response to a question from the Committee about the difference in the responsibilities between assistant and associate county agents and home economists, Eberhardt said that the county agent is responsible for the overall direction and leadership of the county extension program, and that the work of the assistant or associate county agents is very much the same as that of county agents. He added: "The differences in titles indicate tenure, performance, and recommendations from the supervisors."

Eberhardt admitted that he has never recommended a Negro as a county agent. Asked whether there were Negroes qualified to become county agents, he said: "I would seriously doubt it because of the lack...of training in agricultural technology..."

When asked about the qualifications for these positions, he said, "The requirement now for a 'new' assistant's position is that a person have a minimum of a B.S. degree and be accepted in the graduate school at the University of Georgia or other comparable land-grant colleges."

The director told the Committee that he did not consider Fort Valley State College comparable to the University of Georgia. When asked if graduates of Fort Valley had any difficulty in getting their degrees accepted as qualification

for graduate study at the University of Georgia, he said:
"We have got evidence that those at Fort Valley are not as well qualified technically in today's programs as the people coming out of the University of Georgia."

An examination of the Extension Service records indicates that there are many Negroes on the State and county staffs with masters' degrees, most of them earned at Georgia colleges but some at Tuskegee Institute, Florida A&M University, the University of Minnesota, Iowa State University, and Michigan State University. These graduate degrees are held in vocational education, animal husbandry, animal science, and other courses related to agriculture.

Assistant or Associate County Agents

The Committee learned that in the 33 counties to which both white and Negro agents were assigned, 22 of the Negro agents had served longer than whites but received lower salaries.* Fourteen Negro agents in these counties have academic degrees equal to those of the white agents and six have higher degrees. Three Negro agents are in the same or higher positions compared to whites doing comparable work in the same county, have a longer record of service, and comparable or higher academic degrees but receive lower salaries. One Negro agent is employed in a county where there is a vacancy

* See Tables 1 and 2.

in a comparable position at a higher salary.^{2/} Eleven are assigned to work with "lower income groups," a job category seemingly reserved for Negroes only.

Length of service for white associate county agents ranges from 6 to 12 years, but Negro associate county agents have served from 12 to 34 years. Length of service for white assistant county agents ranges from 1 to 7 years, but from 9 to 18 years for Negro assistant county agents.

It becomes abundantly clear to the Committee that insofar as Negro agents are concerned, educational achievement and length of service are not the decisive factors in the designation of county agents.

Salaries of county extension workers are drawn from three sources: Federal, State, and county. Salary differentials appear to be due almost entirely to differences in the contributions by the county which are generally in favor of white workers. Overall, white-Negro differentials in county contributions revealed an annual average of \$455 in favor of white assistant county agents and an average of \$1,130 in favor of white associate county agents.

The Committee was told of several cases which illustrated the fact that Negroes were denied equal employment opportunity. The Negro associate county agent in Thomas County, for example,

^{2/} Sumter County. The Negro associate county agent received a Masters' Degree in Education from Tuskegee Institute in 1952 and was appointed to extension work in the fall of that year. His salary is \$7,300 a year. A vacancy exists for an assistant county agent at \$8,100 a year.

has been employed by the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service for 16 years and assigned to that county for 10 years. When a vacancy occurred for the position of county agent he was by-passed for consideration. He told the Committee that he was interested in being promoted to county agent. However, the outgoing county agent did not recommend him for the vacancy nor did he even ask if he were interested in applying for the job. The Negro assistant county agent in Camden County told of a similar experience.

In Peach County the Negro associate county agent, a 28-year employee of the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service who holds a masters' degree from Tuskegee Institute, was not considered when a vacancy for county agent occurred. Instead, a white county agent in another county was assigned to the post. This county agent has a bachelors' degree from the University of Georgia and has been employed by the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service for 15 years.

In Chatham County the Negro associate county agent was hired by the Extension Service in May 1951. He earned a masters' degree in horticulture at Michigan State University in 1945. The white county agent received a bachelors' degree in animal husbandry at the University of Georgia in 1951. The annual salary differential in these positions is \$1,900.

In Meriwether County the Negro associate county agent was hired by the Extension Service in 1932. He earned a masters' degree from the University of Minnesota in 1946.

The white county agent, who was hired in 1961 and received a bachelors' degree in agriculture from the University of Georgia in 1952, earned \$1,400 a year more than the Negro associate county agent.

Assistant or Associate County Extension Home Economists

Twelve Negro home economists have comparable academic degrees and longer service than white home economists in the same counties, but they are assigned to subordinate positions and receive lower salaries. Four Negro home economists in positions comparable to or higher than those of whites in the same county have longer service and comparable or higher academic degrees but receive lower salaries.^{3/} Three other Negro home economists with longer service and comparable degrees received higher salaries than whites in the same county but were assigned to subordinate positions.

In Dodge County the Negro associate county home economist was hired in January 1952. She holds a bachelors' degree in home economics from Spelman College in Atlanta, awarded in 1940. The white Dodge County home economist was employed in July 1963 after receiving a bachelors' degree in home economics from the Georgia State College for Women in 1959. The Negro worker with 11 years more service and the same degree earned

^{3/} In Decatur County, the Negro assistant county extension home economist has been in service since 1948. Her white counterpart with the same title has been in service since 1964. Both have bachelors' degrees in home economics. As of 1966 the white worker received \$6,500 a year; the Negro \$6,000.

19 ye
posi-
Exter
exte
sepa
VI o
Exte
that
Exte
issu
sior
Stat
cou
ere
Ser
cou
or
Cou
cou
4/

19 years earlier than the white worker, has a subordinate position and earns \$900 a year less.

Extension Offices

Under the segregated system that existed in Southern State extension services prior to July 1964, many offices were separated according to the race of the extension workers. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent Federal Extension Service instructions to its personnel to implement that Title prohibit segregated offices. When the Federal Extension Service instructions implementing Title VI were issued in 1965, only five of the counties to which Negro extension workers were assigned in Georgia were considered by the State to be in compliance. By December 31, 1965, all but four counties--Decatur, Houston, Meriwether, and Harris--were considered to be in compliance by the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service. The delay in compliance by the remaining four counties was attributed by Georgia officials to remodeling or construction designed to accomplish integration of offices.^{4/}

When a member of the Commission staff visited Decatur County in May 1966, it was found that the relatively new county agricultural building was located on the outskirts of

^{4/} Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, "Report on Status of Compliance of State Extension Service Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as of December 31, 1965." The Georgia Cooperative Extension Service subsequently provided information indicating that in three other counties--Liberty, Sumter, and Thomas--white and Negro extension workers were housed on the same floor but in separate areas. In all other counties, offices were said to be integrated by function.

town. The Negro associate agent, however, was housed in what appeared to be the Negro section of town in a dingy office on the second floor of an old building. A visit to Thomas County disclosed that while the extension offices were in Federal buildings, the Negro workers were physically separated from the white workers.

Negro extension agents and home economists stated that they are not assigned clerical help in the same way as are white agents and home economists. In addition to handling their field responsibilities, Negro personnel explained that they must supply their own secretarial help either by doing it themselves or by paying out of their own pockets to have it done. In McIntosh County, a Negro home economist is the only extension worker assigned to the county. When she asked for clerical help, the county commissioners allotted her a clerk three days a month.

In one instance it was alleged that Negroes hired in a clerical capacity were told that they must address the white women who worked in the same offices as Mrs. or Miss, while, at the same time, the Negro clerks were addressed by their first names. When the Negroes questioned this practice, they were told that they would either comply with the rules or could find employment elsewhere.

INEQUALITY IN PROGRAM PLANNING AND SERVICES

Program Planning

In its March 1965 report, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights noted the following with regard to the planning of extension programs:

Negroes are involved in the planning process only in those communities with Negro extension workers, where separate white and Negro advisory committees make separate plans. In counties without Negro extension personnel, Negroes do not share in drawing up these plans... 5/

Georgia was one of the six Southern States about which this fact was documented by the Commission's 1965 Study.

As a result of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, county program development boards in Georgia were reconstituted and extension staff members were instructed to include on these boards representatives of all segments of present and potential clientele. Negroes now serve on such planning boards in all but nine Georgia counties. Of a total of 9,605 persons serving on these bodies in Georgia, 1,389, or 14.5 percent, are Negro.

But a farmer in Thomas County charged that some Negroes are appointed to boards without their knowledge and that they are seldom, if ever, included in official sessions of the committee. Among the Georgia counties which still exclude Negroes from the boards are Emanuel, Sumter, Newton, and Hancock.

5/ Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., 1965. pp. 38-39.

Services

The Advisory Committee questioned many extension personnel and farmers as to whether Negroes participate on an equal basis, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in the programs of the extension service. The answer was almost always in the negative. Jac Wasserman, field director of the National Sharecroppers Fund, said that the Commission on Civil Rights Report in 1965 was correct in noting that "...services to Negroes tend to be limited by the preconception expressed by Federal, State, and county extension service officials that Negroes as a class cannot succeed in agriculture or in productive ways of living... Many thousands of Negro farmers are denied access to services provided to white farmers which would help them to diversify, increase production, achieve adequate farming operations, or train for off-farm employment... The extension service as the educational arm of the Department of Agriculture...has failed the Negro farmers. On the whole, low-income Negro farmers are still denied service. ..." Wasserman continued: "One would think since this report has been accepted by all of the agencies, that there would be a massive effort on the part of the extension service as well as the other agencies of the Department of Agriculture to take corrective action and to, in some way, compensate for the lack of service during the last 100 years. I have seen no evidence or very little evidence that this is being done anywhere."

work
and
prim
stat
work
cate
In a
ano
the
to t
Negr
/but
/whi
cook
work
Work
beg
exte
nort
Geor
farr
Only
Neg

The Committee learned that the services of Negro extension workers in many instances were confined to the Negro population and that the services of white extension workers were confined primarily to the white population. In two cases, Negro agents stated at the open meeting that they considered themselves working "across the board." However, these agents also indicated that their primary responsibilities were with Negro farmers. In a closed session, the Committee received information from another extension worker: "They said /they were/ working across the board. This isn't true. They are giving personal services to the white race in addition to the regular service to the Negro farmers. They go out and treat a /white/ man's cow... /but/ the /white/ man wasn't anywhere around. They cut a /white/ man's lawn...spray his shrubbery. /Another/ is actually cooking for the member's local club... This isn't extension work."

Work With Low-Income Groups

A broad band of rural poverty stretches across Georgia beginning at the Southwest corner along the Alabama border, extending east about halfway across the State, then arching north. In 1959, the median farm family income of 78 of Georgia's 159 counties was below \$2,377 per family. (The median farm family income in the United States in 1959 was \$3,228.) Only nine of these poorest counties had less than 20 percent Negro population.

LIBRARY

U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The State Cooperative Extension Service has increasingly turned its attention to the needs of low-income groups in this poverty area. Twenty-four agents and home economists have been assigned to work with low-income groups in 17 Georgia counties. All are Negroes. In the northern counties with predominantly white populations, where 16 of the 26 counties had median farm family incomes of less than \$3,000 in 1959, there are no agents assigned to the low-income families. The poor whites are apparently not being served in Georgia.

When asked to describe the program developed for work with low-income groups, Augustus Hill, the State staff leader, responded that there were no job descriptions for low-income work. "No directions were given me as to specific work I am to do. However, I have worked along with agents who are assigned to work with low-income families."

Commenting on the difference between his present assignment and the work he was doing 2 1/2 years ago as Negro State leader for extension work, Hill said: "My job responsibility as State agent entailed a lot of responsibilities in terms of leadership. I worked with Negro agents and we performed regular extension duties, but now I might say it has been minimized to the point that I don't have too much to offer because I have not been given any directions in the new job. I was assigned to work with low-income folks. Up to this point, it has only been a verbal assignment."

In October 1965, according to Hill, he was asked to prepare an educational program for low-income farmers. "This idea was developed with the assistance of some of the subject matter specialists in the Athens office. This program was presented to all agents on an integrated basis...and we have not followed through with anything other than the presentation of this program since then. I have not heard anything from the assistant director's office or the director's office. I don't know of any other programs we have. None have been given me or called to my attention."

4-H Clubs*

As of January 1, 1966, there were 8,318 4-H Clubs in Georgia with a total enrollment of 151,782 young people. According to the official records of the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service submitted to the Commission, in April 1966, 2,159 of the total number of clubs are all-white, 1,023 are all-Negro, and 136 have both white and Negro memberships. Of the 8,628 young people belonging to integrated clubs, only 406, or 4.7, are Negro.

It was brought out in the open meeting by 4-H Club officials that the claim of 136 integrated clubs was not accurate. T. L. Walton, Jr., State director of 4-H work, stated that no firm figure for integrated clubs could be determined at that time because some of the counties might

* See Table 3.

have included 4-H Councils in their count of integrated 4-H Clubs. The county 4-H Council is an organization of 4-H Club officers and cannot be interpreted as a 4-H Club.^{6/} No Negroes attended 4-H Clubs with whites in 1964. Because of a lack of information, the Committee cannot determine the exact number of Negroes now enrolled in clubs with whites.

The county agent of Tift County told the Committee that there was a total of 389 Negro youngsters enrolled in four Negro 4-H Clubs in his county. Previously, 900 Negro youths in 27 clubs were served by 4-H personnel when a Negro agent worked with Negro youth in the county. The Negro agent left in September 1965. As of May 1966, there were three white extension workers in Tift County, two of whom had 4-H responsibility. There are now 17 4-H Clubs in Tift County: 13 white clubs, four Negro clubs and no integrated clubs. There are 1,237 white participants in Tift County 4-H Clubs and 389 Negro participants. Of 55 volunteer leaders, 10 are Negro.

6/

In Tift County the county agent indicated that he did not have an integrated 4-H Club but that the figure sent to the State of an integrated meeting reflected an integrated 4-H County Council. It was not possible to ascertain whether or not the 135 clubs in other counties were 4-H Clubs or county 4-H Councils. More often than not, "integrated" meant only a token number of Negro youngsters as in the case of four southwest Georgia counties which claimed four integrated clubs. They had only one Negro in each club.

The lack of involvement of Negro youngsters in 4-H work in Tift County appeared to follow a pattern which exists in other Georgia counties where only white extension agents are involved in 4-H work. According to statistics supplied by the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, there are 20 counties in Georgia with no Negroes enrolled in 4-H Clubs. A total of 7,424 Negro youngsters between the ages of 10 and 19 lived in these counties in 1960.^{7/} In McIntosh County no whites are enrolled in 4-H Clubs. The only extension agent in that county is a Negro home economist. According to the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, the agent in this county "has been instructed to include white participants but members of the white race have refused to serve on the planning committee."^{8/}

Another indication that the dual system still exists in Georgia in 4-H work is evident in the Cloverleaf, an official publication of the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, which deals primarily with 4-H activities and has a circulation of 7,000 to 8,000. Prior to 1966, no Negroes were included on the mailing list. The Commission staff was told by Mr. Walton

^{7/} Four of the 20 counties had no Negroes of 4-H Club age (between 10 and 19) in 1960 and two more had only 11 Negroes of 4-H Club age between them. Ten counties had more than 200 eligible Negroes and five counties had more than 600 eligible Negroes. One county, Dooly, had more than 1,500 eligible Negroes.

^{8/} Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, "Report on the Status of Compliance of State Extension Service Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as of December 31, 1965."

that there has been only one article published in this newsletter concerning Negroes involved in 4-H work in the State of Georgia in the past six years. That article appeared in the early spring of 1966. However, the State 4-H director told the Committee that there are plans to revise the circulation and content of the Cloverleaf.

Segregated summer camps for 4-H Club members in Georgia in 1966 were conducted in violation of Federal Extension Service instructions implementing Title VI. A "freedom of choice" system, which required 4-H Club members to designate on their application any of five camps they wished to attend, was instituted in 1966. The camps traditionally have been associated with members of one race exclusively. A survey of anticipated summer camp attendance conducted in 1966 by the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service estimated that out of 8,784 young people planning to attend summer camp, only 858 or 9.8 percent would be Negro.

Under the revised "freedom of choice" procedure, there is a February deadline for applications which one worker noted was very early. The early deadline tends to discourage participation by Negroes. When Negro applicants are required to state their intention to attend a formerly all-white camp so far in advance, it was alleged that they are exposed to threats and intimidation.

Awards

Prior to January 1966, a separate achievement award system for white and Negro 4-H members existed in 17 Southern and border States. In 1965, a total of 18,201 awards was given in Georgia. Of this number, 1,933, or 17.3 percent, were won by Negroes, although Negroes comprised 32 percent of the 4-H enrollment.

County, District, and State 4-H Achievement Awards By Race Georgia. 1965								
County			District			State		
<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>% Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>% Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>% Negro</u>
11,027	1,356	13.0	4,883	474	8.8	348	103	22.8

Home Economics Clubs

As of January 1, 1966, there were 1,391 Home Economics Clubs in Georgia with a total enrollment of 24,505 homemakers. Of this total, 21,450 are enrolled in all-white clubs, 2,445 are enrolled in all-Negro clubs, and 610 are enrolled in integrated clubs. Unlike the 4-H Clubs where total enrollment has gained in the last two years, enrollment in Home Economics Clubs in Georgia among both races has dropped markedly since 1964, especially for Negro homemakers.

The Committee was told that it is possible that the decline in enrollment was a response to the requirement that the clubs be desegregated. Furthermore, responsibility for working with Home Economics Clubs had been taken away from some Negro agents.

Home Economics Club Enrollment by Race Georgia 1964 and 1966			
	<u>1964</u>	<u>1966</u> ^{a/}	<u>Percent Loss</u>
Negro	3,855	2,445	36.6
White	23,705	21,450	9.5
^{a/} Does not include 610 homemakers in integrated clubs.			

There are Negro county extension home economists in 28 Georgia counties with Home Economics Clubs. They meet with integrated clubs in only two counties, Liberty and DeKalb.

There is a total of 8,221 Home Economics Club volunteer leaders reported by the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service. Of this number, 1,004, or 12.2 percent are Negroes. White volunteer leaders were reported to be serving integrated clubs in three counties. In only two counties, however, were white and Negro volunteer leaders reported to be serving the same Home Economics Clubs.

In 1965, 97 counties reported holding a total of 459 training meetings for home economics volunteer leaders. Only 21 of those meetings were integrated. By May 1966, 311 training meetings were held in 106 counties and 78 had been integrated.

THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The Farmers Home Administration is a direct Federal program of assistance administered from Washington through State and county offices staffed by Federal employees. At the county level, eligibility for assistance is determined by a committee of three local residents appointed by the State director. The State directors are also assisted by federally appointed committees of State residents who advise on policy and procedures.

The program is primarily one of loans to farmers combined with technical assistance to "help family farmers acquire the resources needed for successful operations that will bring these families up the economic ladder." ^{9/} To accomplish these objectives, loans, accompanied by technical assistance, are made to individual farmers for the acquisition or enlargement of farms, the acquisition of livestock or equipment, the purchase of seed and fertilizer or other annual operating costs, the refinancing of chattel debts, the improvement of farm buildings, and the construction or improvement of farm homes. To be eligible for such loans the applicant must establish to the satisfaction of the three-man county committee that he is of good character, capable of repaying the loan, and cannot secure credit on reasonable terms in the commercial market.

^{9/} Purpose Statement, 1965 Appropriations Hearings, pt.4, p.295

^{10/} USDA, FHA, Farmers Home Administration in Brief (PA 547, Feb. 1964)

In addition to its program of economic improvement for farmers, in recent years the FHA has given increasing emphasis to strengthening rural communities and furnishing leadership for rural programs to combat poverty. The agency has proposed to "ease the burden of poverty" through subsistence loans and housing grants for families "who are handicapped by age, color, education, physical and mental defects . . . and thereby unable to escape the poverty level."^{11/}

LOANS AND SERVICES

In its March 1965 report on farm programs,^{12/} the Commission on Civil Rights compared FHA loans in selected Southern counties and found that average loan sizes differed substantially for Negro and white borrowers. Analysis of more recent data for Georgia counties revealed that, except in the category of economic opportunity loans,^{13/} similar differentials in loan sizes between Negro and white homeowners still exist. There has been some increase in Negro participation in the FHA rural loan program for capital

^{11/} Purpose Statement, supra, note 12.

^{12/} Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C. (pp. 57-82) Counties studied in the Commission's Report did not include any in Georgia.

^{13/} Economic Opportunity Loans are authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Loans are available to rural families who need capital to improve their earnings but are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at reasonable rates and terms. Authority for administration of these loans is delegated to the Farmers Home Administration by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

investment purposes, but differentials remain in the average amounts of loans to white and Negro borrowers. Whereas in 1964 Negroes in Georgia received only 56 loans for rural housing and farm ownership purposes--4.1 percent and 5.1 percent respectively of all loans in those categories that year--in 1966 they received 170 loans for such purposes--13.3 percent and 11.4 percent of all loans in those respective categories.

Number and Average Amount of FHA Loans by Type of Loan and Race of Borrower Georgia, Fiscal Years 1964, 1965, and 1966 (through April)				
TYPE OF LOAN ^{14/}	NEGRO		WHITE	
	NUMBER OF LOANS	AVERAGE AMOUNT	NUMBER OF LOANS	AVERAGE AMOUNT
<u>FY 1964</u>				
Operating	422	\$2,574	2,547	\$4,692
Emergency	13	738	63	2,251
Rural Housing	27	8,196	6,639	10,007
Farm Ownership	29	9,120	536	12,093
<u>FY 1965</u>				
Operating	665	2,356	2,191	4,684
Emergency	91	1,669	420	4,756
Rural Housing	68	6,429	670	10,109
Farm Ownership	46	9,562	423	11,655
Economic Opportunity	259	1,705	233	1,974
<u>FY 1966</u>				
Operating	651	2,831	2,101	5,125
Emergency	4	913	3	5,270
Rural Housing	116	7,382	757	9,831
Farm Ownership	54	10,581	421	12,092
Economic Opportunity	343	1,720	289	1,777

^{14/} Operating and Emergency Loans are given for current operating expenses or to restore normal operations. Rural Housing and Farm Ownership Loans are given for building both farm and non-farm homes and to acquire or enlarge farms.

54
nd
y

Average differentials in loan sizes for Negro and white borrowers increased from approximately \$2,000 to \$2,500 in rural housing loans over the 2-year period, while differentials by loan size for farm ownership loans were reduced by one-half from approximately \$3,000 to \$1,500.

One of the primary jobs of FHA is the supervision and servicing of loans granted under this program. Some of the individuals who were interviewed by the Committee and Commission staff indicated that they felt that Negroes did not have access to the same financial assistance as white farmers. Some of them felt that they were exposed to undue pressures from county FHA supervisors when they attempted to get a loan.

One farmer in Thomas County said that he had twice applied to FHA for operational loans and was turned down both times. He said that he had owned his farm for three years and had worked for some time as a sharecropper with his brother-in-law, but was denied a loan by FHA due to a lack of "integrity and not having enough farming experience." He filed a formal complaint with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and an inspector from the Inspector General's office in Atlanta interviewed him.

The farmer said that the inspector reviewed his application "and did not see any reason why I couldn't get a loan, and he advised me to try and get an OEO loan of \$2,500 and put up a business. /He is an auto mechanic./ ... I wanted to

farm but I thought if I could get the OEO loan I would also be out on the farm and would not have to work in town. I applied and they turned me down again because I was making too much money to get the OEO loan."^{15/} In the course of the interview, it transpired that this man had an income of \$2,500 last year.

Hubert Thomas, Georgia field representative of the National Sharecroppers Fund, told the Committee that one of the main problems the Negro farmer encountered in obtaining loans was that loan qualifications were not broad enough to include the needs of the poor farmers. The Committee was told that Negro farmers in Georgia comprise a high percentage of the low-income farmers. Thomas said that when farmers fail to qualify for FHA loans, no effort is made by the agency to give them the technical assistance they need so they could secure operating capital. Many Negro farmers do not understand the FHA loan procedure and are not told about it.

During the meeting, allegations of discourteous treatment toward Negroes were made against FHA county officials. Thomas said that some Negro farmers do not go into the FHA office because they are kept waiting for long periods of time while whites who may have entered after the Negroes are helped first. He also stated that, for the most part, Negroes are not addressed by courtesy titles.

^{15/} This information was gathered in a taped interview by a staff member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on May 21, 1966.

COMMITTEES

According to records submitted to the Committee, only one Negro served as a regular FHA county committeeman in Georgia in 1964. Nine Negroes served as alternate committeemen. In April 1965, the Administrator of the FHA directed the State FHA directors of 11 States to appoint at least one Negro to FHA county committees in every county where 20 percent or more of the farmers are Negro.^{16/} As of April 1966, 53 Negroes out of the total membership of 253 FHA county and area committee members were serving on such committees.

Georgia FHA County and Area Committeemen by Race, July 1964 and April 1966				
	County Committee			
	July 1964		April 1966	
	White	Negro	White	Negro
Regular	204	0	173	31
Alternate	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	205	4	173	31
	Area Committee			
	July 1964		April 1966	
	White	Negro	White	Negro
Regular	101	1	80	22
Alternate	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	101	6	80	22

^{16/} Letter, Administrator, FHA to State FHA Directors (11 States), "County Committee Vacancies," April 13, 1965.

EMPLOYMENT

In July 1964, no Negro was employed in the Georgia State Office of the Farmers Home Administration and only one Negro was employed at the county level. However, the Georgia office of the FHA employed 168 persons on the State and county levels. In 1966, two of 34 FHA State employees and 13 of 172 county office employees were Negroes.

Georgia State and County Staff Employment by Race, July 1964 and April 1966				
	State Staff			
	July 1964		April 1966	
	White	Negro	White	Negro
Professional	24	0	24	1
Clerical	6	0	8	1
Total	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>2</u>
	County Staff			
Professional	75	1	87	9
Clerical	62	0	72	4
Total	<u>137</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>13</u>

In a statement made to the State Advisory Committee, S. L. Vanlandingham, State director of the Farmers Home Administration, said that with only a few exceptions the State office consisted of people who have come up through the ranks. According to the director, the promotion of county employees to the State level takes approximately 10 years. Vanlandingham said that he did not intend to take any additional steps to recruit Negroes for more professional jobs on the State staff.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the information resulting from staff investigations and from the statements of persons who appeared at the open meeting, the Georgia State Advisory Committee concludes that:

1. Although some progress has been made in desegregating the various agricultural programs in Georgia, patterns of segregation still exist which prevent Negro citizens of the State from receiving equal opportunity in farm programs.
2. Evidence of discrimination in the employment, assignment, and upgrading of Negro extension workers is found in the presentation of facts indicating that educational training, practical experience, and seniority are consistently ignored in selecting and maintaining staff.
3. Evidence of discrimination is found in the physical facilities and services of the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service.
4. Evidence is found that Negroes are being denied equal access to the programs of the 4-H and Homemakers Clubs in Georgia.
5. Discriminatory treatment is observed in the withholding of loans and other agricultural services to Negro farmers as well as in the failure to appoint Negroes to Farmers Home Administration Committees or to permit them to participate fully in the activities of such Committees if the gesture of appointment is made.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR ACTION

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Georgia State Advisory Committee recommends to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights that:

1. The Commission call to the attention of the U.S. Department of Agriculture those practices which result in discrimination in the employment, assignment, and upgrading of nonwhites in the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration. These include:
 - a. hiring practices which restrict employment opportunities ranging from outright exclusion in some departments to the relegation of Negroes to less desirable job categories.
 - b. restrictions on promotions for Negro employees which not only create a dead-end for the employee but also close entry-level jobs to young Negroes seeking jobs.
2. The Commission recommend to the U.S. Department of Agriculture that all employees of the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, as well as those of other State extension services, be incorporated into civil service or a standard merit system of employment to include written job descriptions and complaint procedures.

3. The Commission urge the U.S. Department of Agriculture to move swiftly to insure equal employment opportunities to Negroes on a State, district, and county level within the Cooperative Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration.
4. The Commission recommend to the U.S. Department of Agriculture that quarterly funds, allocated under the Smith-Lever Act, be deferred until the Federal Extension Service conducts a complete investigation to ascertain the status of Title VI compliance in Georgia, since evidence indicates areas of noncompliance.
5. The Commission recommend that the U.S. Department of Agriculture make certain that the services of the Cooperative Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration in Georgia are made accessible to all people on an equal basis.
6. The Commission request the U.S. Department of Agriculture to encourage the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service to utilize existing programs under the Office of Economic Opportunity as they pertain to rural poverty in the State of Georgia and to give special attention to all of the low-income farm families in the State.
7. The Commission make copies of this report available to local public and private organizations in Georgia so that the citizens and officials of the State may use it as a reference in organizing all of the

resources at their disposal to deal with the inequities reported.

SUGGESTIONS FOR ACTION

Although the Georgia State Advisory Committee recognizes the fact that Federal agencies have a major responsibility to implement Federal law, it also strongly believes that State agencies have a distinct obligation to carry out this law within their own spheres of influence. Therefore, the Georgia State Advisory Committee suggests to the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service:

1. that it begin immediately to develop a personnel system which will equalize Negro and white salaries by specifying minimum county contributions for all job titles and provide a written job description free of racial implications for each job title.
2. that it conduct an immediate review of personnel qualifications and appoint as county extension chairmen and county home economists those Negroes whose training and records warrant such appointment.
3. that it establish a training program in civil rights for all agents at State, district, and county levels.
4. that it appoint to the State office staff a civil rights coordinator who would be responsible for advising the State director on matters pertaining to equal opportunity in the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service.

5. that it require the integration of State, district, and county offices by function.
6. that it establish a program review and evaluation division with permanent responsibility for appraising the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service with respect to its effective implementation of programs, policies, and practices of equal opportunity.
7. that it request the Georgia Board of Regents to institute in all State schools of higher education the same minimum academic standards that are maintained at the University of Georgia, thereby allowing everyone an equal chance to receive the same quality training in the State school closest to his home.

TABLE 1*

COMPARISON OF NEGRO AND WHITE COUNTY AGENTS IN GEORGIA

<u>County</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Date of Appointment</u>	<u>Title 1966</u>	<u>Assignment</u>	<u>Degree and Subject</u>	<u>Salary</u>
Appling	N	1953	Asst. County Agent	Low-income	BS Agriculture	\$ 7,100
	W	1961	Asst. County Agent	4-H	BS Forestry	7,900
	W	1961	County Agent	Overall	BS Animal Husbandry	9,200
Baldwin	N	1957	Asst. County Agent	Low-income	BS Agric. Education	7,100
	W	1956	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	8,000
Bibb	N	1945	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,700
	W	1958	Assoc. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	9,200
	W	1948	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	11,700
Brooks	N	1948	Asst. County Agent	Low-income	BS Agriculture	7,400
	W	1958	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	10,200
Bulloch	N	1944	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	MS	8,100
	W	1961	County Agent	Overall	BS Animal Husbandry	9,000
	W	1964	Asst. County Agent	4-H	BS Agric. Economics	7,300
Burke	N	1948	Assoc. County Agent	Low-income	MS Agriculture	7,400
	W	1955	Assoc. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	8,100
	W	1959	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	10,600
Camden	W	1956	Asst. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agric. Education	6,800
	W	1950	County Agent	Overall	BS Animal Husbandry	8,200
Chatham	N	1951	Assoc. County Agent	4-H & Low-income	MS Horticulture	8,000
	W	1960	Assoc. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	8,500
	S	1952	County Agent	Overall	BS Animal Husbandry	10,900

Table 1 - Continued

County Race Date of Appointment Title 1966 Assignment Degree and

Table 1 - Continued

<u>County</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Date of Appointment</u>	<u>Title 1966</u>	<u>Assignment</u>	<u>Degree and Subject</u>	<u>Salary</u>
Clarke	N	1955	Asst. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	\$ 7,700
	W	1956	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	12,200
	W	1963	Asst. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	6,500
	W	1964	Asst. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	5,500
Decatur	N	1955	Asst. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,000
	W	1960	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	9,500
DeKalb	N	1957	Asst. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,700
	W	1958	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture	BS Agriculture	8,600
Emanuel	N	1955	Asst. County Agent	Agric. & Low-inc.	BS Agriculture	7,000
	W	1956	Assoc. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	8,700
Glynn	N	1949	Asst. County Agent	4-H & Low-income	BS Agriculture	8,022
	W	1963	Asst. County Agent	4-H	MS Agriculture	7,327
Grady	N	1948	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H		7,500
	W	1962	Asst. County Agent	Agriculture	BS Agriculture	7,500
	W	1942	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	9,100
Hancock	N	1963	Asst. County Agent	Low-income	BS Agriculture	7,000
	W	1956	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	9,600
Harris	N	1950	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,400
	W	1951	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	9,400
Henry	N	1951	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,700
	W	1958	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	9,400
Jenkins	N	1956	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,350
	W	1956	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	10,100

TABLE 1 - Continued

<u>County</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Date of Appointment</u>	<u>Title 1966</u>	<u>Assignment</u>	<u>Degree and Subject</u>	<u>Salary</u>
Lamar	N	1955	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	\$ 7,100
	W	1960	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	8,400
Laurens	N	1945	Assoc. County Agent	Low-income	BS Agriculture	7,500
	W	1960	Assoc. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	7,800
Liberty	N	1949	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,225
	W	1958	County Agent	Overall	BS Animal Husbandry	8,425
Lowndes	N	1950	Assoc. County Agent	Low-income	BS Agriculture	8,400
	W	1961	Asst. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	9,200
Meriwether	N	1932	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	MS Agriculture	8,000
	W	1961	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	9,400
Morgan	N	1959	Asst. County Agent	Low-income	MS Agriculture	7,300
	W	1942	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	9,800
Newton	N	1935	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,300
	W	1955	County Agent	Overall	MS Agriculture	9,400
Peach	N	1938	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	MS Education	8,000
	W	1951	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	10,000
Screven	N	1954	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,600
	W	1964	Asst. County Agent	4-H	MS Agric. Economics	6,500
Spalding	N	1949	Asst. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	6,800
	W	1963	Asst. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	7,900
	W	1954	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	10,500

TABLE 1 - Continued

<u>County</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Date of Appointment</u>	<u>Title 1966</u>	<u>Assignment</u>	<u>Degree and Subject</u>	<u>Salary</u>
Sumter	N	1952	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	MS Education	\$ 7,300
	W	1947	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	10,200
	VACANT					8,100
Thomas	N	1950	Assoc. County Agent	Low-income	BS Agriculture	7,900
	W	1957	Assoc. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	9,600
Troup	N	1952	Assoc. County Agent	Agriculture & 4-H	BS Agriculture	7,300
	W	1965	Asst. County Agent	4-H	MS Agriculture	7,200
Walton	N	1954	Assoc. County Agent	Low-income	BS Agriculture	7,300
	W	1963	Asst. County Agent	4-H	MS Agric. Education	8,200
	W	1954	County Agent	Overall	BS Agric. Ed. & Engineering	10,800
Washington	N	1957	Asst. County Agent	Low-income	BS Agriculture	7,560
	W	1955	Assoc. County Agent	4-H	BS Agriculture	9,900
	W	1938	County Agent	Overall	BS Agriculture	12,800

*This table does not include all white county agents. It includes only those from counties that also employ Negro agents and those with backgrounds most similar to the academic and employment backgrounds of their Negro colleagues.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF SOURCE* OF ASSISTANT COUNTY AGENTS** SALARIES
BY RACE AND LENGTH OF SERVICE

<u>Years of Service</u>	<u>Federal and State Contribution</u>		<u>County Contribution</u>	
	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>White</u>
1		5,140		2,448
		4,800		2,300
		4,700		2,196
		4,635		1,800
		4,300		1,560
		4,110		1,500
		3,858		1,480
	2		5,832	
		5,500		1,468
		5,100		1,200
		4,835		1,200
		4,800		0
3	5,800	6,500	1,200	2,886
		5,580		1,920
		5,580		1,620
		5,014		0
4		8,000		2,460
		6,008		2,100
		5,640		1,860
		5,200		1,392
		3,840		0
5	5,612	6,600	2,410	4,108
		6,194		3,046
		5,092		1,300
6		5,460		1,440
		6,492		2,309
		6,191		1,308
7		5,680		3,420
8		5,055		3,545
9	6,300		1,610	
	6,090		1,260	
	5,900		1,200	
10	5,600	7,400	1,200	2,640
	6,150	6,635	1,200	2,065
		6,160		1,500

TABLE 2 - Continued

Years of Service	Federal and State Contribution		County Contribution	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
11	6,020	7,286	1,680	3,900
	5,800	7,080	1,200	2,820
	5,800	6,780	1,200	2,114
	5,840	5,700	1,260	1,320
12	6,400	5,800	1,200	2,400
	6,100	5,594	1,200	3,046
13	5,900		1,200	
14	5,890		1,410	
15	6,500	6,200	1,200	1,200
16	6,200		2,403	
	5,970		2,010	
	5,890		1,200	
17	5,600		1,200	
	5,900		1,325	
18	6,200		1,200	
20		5,727		4,673
21	6,240		2,056	
	5,644		1,260	
31	5,980		1,320	
34	6,800		1,200	

*Salaries are made up of Federal, State, and county contributions

**Table limited to agents with B.S. degrees

TABLE 3

4-H CLUBS IN SELECTED GEORGIA COUNTIES
WHERE NO NEGRO PERSONNEL ARE ASSIGNED TO 4-H WORK

COUNTY	<u>WHITE</u> <u>4-H CLUBS</u>		<u>NEGRO</u> <u>4-H CLUBS</u>		<u>WHITE</u> <u>ENROLLMENT</u>		<u>NEGRO</u> <u>ENROLLMENT</u>		<u>NEGRO PERCENT</u> <u>OF COUNTY</u> <u>POPULATION</u>
	1964	1966	1964	1966	1964	1966	1964	1966	1960
Baker	6	5	0	2	141	107	0	86	58.9
Ben Hill	5	5	0	0	267	302	0	0	33.4
Brantley	8	7	0	0	657	607	0	0	13.1
Butts	18	5	11	0	387	230	451	0	46.6
Calhoun	8	8	0	2	396	226	0	56	65.1
Charlton	6	7	0	1	171	265	0	67	32.0
Chatooga	14	9	0	0	794	539	0	0	9.3
Cherokee	16	16	0	0	1,135	1,096	0	0	4.0
Clinch	6	6	0	1	407	365	0	144	38.0
Colquitt	18	16	0	1	1,143	986	0	35	24.2
Coweta	20	20	0	1	635	761	0	17	36.2
Crawford	5	4	0	2	217	220	0	91	57.8
Crisp	18	17	0	4	895	666	0	300	42.9
Douglas	12	13	0	0	892	803	0	0	14.9
Early	10	11	0	2	261	343	0	120	51.9
Evans	5	5	0	0	433	358	0	0	37.2
Fayette	7	7	0	0	206	378	0	0	29.6
Fulton	55	57	10	10	2,108	2,060	406	443	34.8
GlascocK	6	0	0	0	195	0	0	0	28.6
Hall	33	25	0	0	1,896	1,542	0	0	10.8
Hart	15	32	0	0	815	824	0	0	24.5
Jackson	16	11	0	0	767	597	0	0	12.8

TABLE 3 - Continued

COUNTY	WHITE 4-H CLUBS		NEGRO 4-H CLUBS		WHITE ENROLLMENT		NEGRO ENROLLMENT		NEGRO PERCENT OF COUNTY POPULATION
	1964	1966	1964	1966	1964	1966	1964	1966	1960
Johnson	6	6	0	0	345	343	0	0	33.2
Lee	5	3	0	1	191	239	0	192	62.7
Marion	9	9	0	2	221	220	0	78	60.1
Miller	4	4	0	1	305	345	0	49	29.4
Monroe	5	5	0	1	318	253	0	45	48.4
Montgomery	5	5	0	0	207	169	0	0	40.6
Muscogee	30	28	0	1	1,074	929	0	44	24.2
Oconee	6	6	0	1	388	386	0	39	22.1
Ogelthorpe	6	10	0	4	293	341	0	127	44.9
Pierce	13	11	0	0	534	523	0	0	22.1
Pike	8	8	0	3	331	302	0	78	44.8
Pulaski	6	6	0	0	217	200	0	0	43.4
Putnam	8	9	0	4	320	291	0	128	54.0
Quitman	2	2	0	1	79	83	0	31	64.1
Schley	5	4	0	1	113	154	0	84	56.5
Stewart	12	12	0	4	175	181	0	93	70.7
Talbot	5	5	0	1	242	170	0	49	69.8
Taylor	8	8	0	1	507	457	0	102	48.3
Terrell	11	4	0	1	286	185	0	28	64.4
Toombs	11	9	0	0	845	235	0	0	68.1
Treutlen	4	5	0	0	253	296	0	0	33.1
Wilcox	22	18	0	6	685	702	0	190	33.4
Wilkes	7	13	0	8	296	375	0	46	51.3

1960
58.9
33.4
13.1
46.6
65.1
32.0
9.3
4.0
38.0
24.2
36.2
57.8
42.9
4.9
11.9
7.2
9.6
4.8
8.6
0.8
4.5
2.8