

A STUDY OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL  
CONSERVATION SERVICE DISTRICT

A research problem submitted to  
The Graduate Faculty of Austin Peay State College

in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

1953

by

Mabel Thomas  
B. S., Austin Peay State College, 1951

AUSTIN PEAY  
STATE COLLEGE  
CLARKSVILLE  
TENN

To the Graduate Council:

We are submitting hewewith a research problem written by Mrs. Mabel Thomas entitled, "A Study of the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District." We recommend that it be accepted for three quarter hours' credit in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree under Plan 1B for the degree of Master of Arts with a major in education and a minor in a distributive content area.

J. G. Woodward  
Director of Graduate Study

Willie Stevens  
Major Professor

Harry L. Law  
Minor Professor

# ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express her appreciation for the guidance given her by Mr. Harry Law and Miss Willie Stevens in the preparation of this research study.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY . . . . .	1
Organization of the Study. . . . .	2
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	3
Soil Erosion as a World Problem. . . . .	5
The Soil Conservation Movement . . . . .	5
III. ORGANIZATION AND WORK OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT . . . . .	12
Future Plans of This District . . . . .	30
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. . . . .	32
Some Conclusions . . . . .	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	37
APPENDIX . . . . .	39
A. Tables 1 - 6 of Accomplishments of the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District for the Years 1945, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952. . . . .	39
B. Resource People Used in the Study . . . . .	45
C. Directors of the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District, 1953 . . . . .	46
D. Some Correspondence in Regard to Establishing the Montgomery County Conservation Unit . . . . .	47



## CHAPTER I

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to determine the need for and the work of the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District.

It is the belief of the writer that such a study may reveal ways in which the service of this agency can be made to reach our young people more widely and effectively. It is the young people who will be the citizens of tomorrow. It is they who are to be the next stewards of this land we now possess and who must then pass it on to their offspring. They will be the ones to cultivate the soil. They will also be the business and professional people who must receive their food, clothing, and much of their raw materials from this same soil.

Soil conservation has become a big business in our country, affording excellent opportunities and pleasant work for many of our people. Many of these places for well trained people go unfilled or are filled by people who are not properly trained. As Russell Lord says, "But it is necessary and proper now to advertise this new calling -- soil healing -- and its needs to young people who are wondering what to do with their lives. There is work for you, if you will get the training. It will support you, and it is real, vital and absorbing work."<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Ayers Brinser and Ward Shepard, Our Use of the Land, p. xiii. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939.

Much of the soil of Montgomery County as well as that of the entire nation has been badly treated in the past.

The ever increasing problem of erosion and the diminishing fertility of the soil demanded and still demands attention.

### Organization of the Study

The first chapter of this report includes the statement of the problem, the importance of the study and the organization of the study.

The second chapter deals with related literature in the field.

The third chapter presents the organization, work and future plans of the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District.

The fourth chapter summarizes the findings of the study and draws conclusions based on these findings.



## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Literature in the field of conservation has appeared in quantity only within approximately the last forty years. Before this time the average man had taken for granted that our resources were unlimited.

In 1910 President Van Hise of the University of Wisconsin published a volume entitled The Conservation of Natural Resources in the United States. It was the first popular presentation of the subject that had been made. For the first time this all important topic was presented to the public in so clear and concise a manner that its true significance could be grasped.

In Conservation in the United States by Gustafson, Guise, Hamilton, and Ries we find the following:

The serious problems of soil loss through water and wind erosion and exhaustion of soil fertility through improper agricultural practices have long been recognized by soil scientists. But it was not until the great dust storms of the southwest occurred in 1934 that the general public sensed the vital need of immediate constructive action. In 1935 a federal law, the Soil Conservation Act, was passed. To administer the provisions of this act, the Soil Conservation Service was established in the Department of Agriculture. As a result of later legislation in 1940, the functions of the Soil Conservation Service in dealing with lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior were transferred to that department. The Soil Conservation Act was of great importance in the Conservation movement. It has resulted in an active program aimed to halt the depletion of the soils of



the nation.<sup>1</sup>

today as never before the American people are realizing the seriousness of soil erosion. According to J. Russell Whitaker and Edward A. Ackerman in American Resources:

Land erosion has so damaged millions of acres of land as to make them unfit for cultivation and has greatly lowered the productivity of even larger areas. In the United States, according to estimates of the Soil Conservation Service, fifty million acres of once productive crop land have been ruined for any immediate further cultivation, and another fifty million acres have been damaged so severely that intensive conservational measures must be applied soon if this acreage is to continue to produce worth-while crops. Still another one hundred million acres have lost at least half of their topsoil. The human loss from the abandonment of farm land is obvious, but one less commonly recognized result of soil erosion is lowered productivity of lands still in use. Even slight erosion brings a loss of some of the best soil. The evidence of damaged land is not always as striking as that noted by an elderly farmer in central Kentucky in 1907. He pointed to a hillside almost barren of soil from which men were blasting bed-rock. "When I was a boy," he said, "that field would grow sixty bushels of corn to the acre." Loss shows in many other ways. A farm in eastern Kansas was valued at more than \$200 an acre in the 1920's but it could not find a buyer in the 1940's when farm prices were even higher than they had been twenty years before. The drop in value was due mainly to damage done to the farm by erosion. Within ten years the evaluation of a Wisconsin farm for tax purposes dropped from \$40,000 to \$4,000 because of the growth of a vast system of gullies which divided the formerly smooth fields into small pieces difficult to farm.

When fertility drops, either the quality of products drops or a change to a less intensive type of land use is made. Cotton from eroded land has less strength than that from uneroded lands

---

1. A. F. Gustafson and Others, Conservation in the United States, pp. 24-25. New York: Comstock Publishing Company, 1949.



and the seed contain considerably less oil.<sup>2</sup>

## Soil Erosion as a World Problem

We have referred to soil erosion so frequently and in connection with so many places in this and other countries that the impression has surely been created that it is widely distributed over the earth. That is precisely the case. As Aldo Leopold has put it, "We know that the dispersion of potential erosion is as universal as the dispersion of cultivation, grazing, slope, and rain."<sup>3</sup>

H. H. Bennett, a world authority on soil conservation, tells us:

The best estimates indicate that from two-thirds to three-fourths of the world's immediately available crop land is subject to impoverishment or outright ruin by soil erosion.<sup>4</sup>

The Soil Conservation Service has estimated that there are about 460 million acres of really good land for crops and plowable pasture in the United States, and that all but about one hundred million acres are subject to soil erosion.<sup>5</sup>

## The Soil Conservation Movement

From Brinster and Shepard's, Our Use of the Land, we are told that:

---

2. J. Russell Whitaker and Edward A. Ackerman, American Resources, pp.68-69. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1951.

3. Aldo Leopold, "Conservation Economics," Journal of Forestry, 32 (May, 1934), 539.

4. H. H. Bennett, "Adjustment of Agriculture to Its Environment," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 43 (December, 1943), 167.

5. H. H. Bennett, Elements of Soil Conservation, p. 2. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1947.



Early in the 1930's the farmers of the Piedmont Region of Alabama decided to pool their resources and buy the equipment necessary to stop erosion on their land. They organized terracing clubs which raised the money to buy bulldozers and terracers and other machinery which is used in building terraces to hold back the flow of water down hillsides. The idea spread to Georgia and other states.

The Department of Agriculture took up this idea of land use planning within the states shortly after the Supreme Court decision against the first Agricultural Adjustment Act had checked federal land-use control plans. With this new idea as a beginning, the Department of Agriculture developed the Soil Conservation District plan. The Department drew up a model law based on this plan for the states to consider and adopt. This was the Standard State Soil Conservation District Law.

Briefly this is how the law operates. Twenty-five or more occupiers of land may petition the State Soil Conservation Committee for the formation of a Soil Conservation District. After hearings are conducted the land occupiers of the proposed district vote on whether they want to form such a district. Before a district can be set up, a majority must vote for it.

The Soil Conservation District has its elected supervisors who are in charge of the land use program in that district. They may provide the farmers with technical or financial assistance in carrying out a soil conservation program. The supervisors may propose land use regulations and set up penalties if they are violated. The regulations cannot be put into effect however, until a majority of the land occupiers in the district vote in favor of them.

With this power to force people to carry out a land use plan there is a section of the Act which enables land occupiers to appeal to a board of adjustment and even to the state courts, if they feel that the regulations of the district cause them unnecessary hardships. The district may be discontinued upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the land occupiers.

There are two important things to notice in this law. The first is that a majority of the people in a district can work out a solution of their land use problems. At the same time the rights of a minority in such a district are protected. The second is that in about one-half the states where soil conservation district laws have been passed, tenants have equal voting rights with land-owners. In other states, however, only owners of land may vote



Once it has been set up, the Soil Conservation District becomes a unit of government just as a county is a unit of government.<sup>6</sup>

The conservation movement as a government agency had a slow but sound beginning. Farmers at first were slow to enlist its services. but once it got started, it grew rapidly. A good description of its beginnings, organization, and growth is found in the following article which appeared in the April, 1953, issue of Country Gentleman:

The Soil Conservation Act was passed by Congress in 1935. But more than this act was required to put conservation into operation. Farmers do not look with favor on Federal agencies that try to tell them what to do with their own land, and how to do it. So they stood on the side lines, taking the measure of the Soil Conservation Service. Yet the more progressive among them realized that they needed assistance in fighting the destructive forces that nature can array against them. In due time, some of these men sat down with the conservationists to talk things over. Out of this came the concept of soil conservation districts, operating under state rather than Federal laws, with farmer supervisors, sometimes called directors or commissioners, to direct their activities.

A little experience with this type of joint enterprise soon convinced farmers that there were real opportunities for community accomplishment. The soil conservation districts became going agencies, and some 2400 of them are now in operation. Each of these districts is supervised by from three to five farmers, who are in a position to render tremendously valuable service to the people of their communities. In a way, they are working for themselves. But they are also working for their neighbors in developing improved farm practices that are designed to maintain

---

6. Ayers Brinser, Ward Shepard, Our Use of the Land, pp. 79-80. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939.



the land in a high state of productivity. And they are also working for the nation as a whole, for when the activities of all these districts are pieced together they cover a very large part of our total land resources. What we are dealing with here is a highly enlightened type of selfishness for all the people everywhere.

Just what is the job of the conservation district supervisors? Their district may be a valley, a watershed, a county, or several counties joined together. Their functions are fourfold - to promote conservation among their neighbors, to bring their communities together to consider the land problems they have in common, to enlist the aid of not only the Soil Conservation Service but all the other Federal, state, county and local agencies that can lend a hand, and finally, to govern their districts, not by compulsion but by persuasion. They initiate, supervise and control always keeping in mind the attitudes of the local people. Sometimes group interest may be in lime, drainage, ponds, land leveling, better pastures, building terraces, planting trees, or planning strip cropping. Whatever it is, this is the starting point out of which an all-over conservation program is gradually -- sometimes very quickly -- developed. The aim is to get farmers together on a group basis, to work with them in accord with their immediate interests, and then develop a complete program for every farm in the district. Often there is need for heavy machines that are too large for individual farmers to own. Sometimes the Conservation Service can supply these machines. At other times they may be purchased, either cooperatively or by use of borrowed funds that are repaid by service charges. The modern tendency is to enlist the aid of contractors, who soon become skilled at such work and speed progress by selling their own services.

Some district supervisors fall far short of fulfilling their obligations. Others who have caught the spirit of conservation, are accomplishing remarkable things in their communities. The most active groups of supervisors are joining forces in their respective states, and these state groups are united into a national organization under the highly constructive leadership of Waters J. Davis, Jr.

This is democracy from the ground up. These men are elected by their neighbors or they are appointed by their district conservation committees. They have no political motivation. Their purpose is to protect their own communities against the ravages of wind and water and against misuse of land. They are building a better America out in the open country, not for themselves alone, but for all the people of this vast nation. They



represent one of the most constructive democratic movements we have ever had. They merit our support and encouragement. But whether they get it or not, they are on their way to better things for their districts, states, and the nation. As our population grows, we shall have ever greater need for the services of these public-spirited citizens, who live on, by, and with the land. They constitute our first line of defense against national decay.<sup>7</sup>

It has been suggested that all farm programs be headed by one office as it is confusing to have such organizations as Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration under separate management and in separate locations.

Walter S. Davis, Jr., President of National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, has stated the case well in his article appearing in the May, 1953, issue of Country Gentleman entitled "I Believe." The article follows:

The people of America decided a long time ago that soil conservation was much too important to turn over to Government hired hands.

There are 12,574 Soil Conservation District Supervisors, Commissioners and directors scattered around the country and, believe me, no Government Agency whether it be the Extension Service, the Forest Service or the Bureau of Missing Topsoil is going to dominate, intimidate, coerce or boss these people.

The reason I say this is because practically all these folks are working free. They are volunteers. Most of us shell a good piece of change out of our own pockets each year to make doubly sure that our Districts are kept independent.

Early this year a questionnaire was sent to every Soil

---

7. Firman E. Bear, "I Believe," Country Gentleman, 123 (April, 1953), 12-13.



Conservation District Supervisor, Commissioner, and Director. One of our questions asked specifically if they would approve a proposal to have all technical help on soil conservation handled by county agents. The vote was 4594 to 573 against the idea.

Personally, I do not interpret that vote as any lack of confidence in our county agents. They are doing and have done for a number of years, a magnificent job in a specialized field - education. In most states they have done a job of helping Soil Conservation Districts with educational work.

But the fact that our county agents are conscientious, hard working members of our soil conservation team, is no reason to believe they would make good "bosses" of all the many other Government "hired hands" who are helping too.

On the contrary, I do not believe our Land Grant Colleges and Extension Services can successfully administer the soil conservation program.

The Soil Conservation Service is an action agency whose technicians spend their time in the fields and pastures planning with the land operator how best to use every acre. Our Soil Conservation Service has the finest bunch of land doctors in the world.

Another thing we in the districts like about the Soil Conservation Service is its policy of helping build local leadership and its willingness to be bossed by the local people. That is a policy unique in all history.

And lets not kid ourselves about state bureaucracies being any less domineering or dangerous than the Federal breed. It's no secret that Soil Conservation Districts have their greatest difficulties where local state bureaucracies are most firmly entrenched.

I'll grant that the 12,574 farmers and ranchers who are now serving as volunteer officials of Soil Conservation Districts need to show more leadership and initiative. Soil Conservation District Officials are discovering every day that if they do not do their job some Government Agency will.

Along with more initiative and leadership, Soil Conservation Districts also need vigilance. They now hold something very precious in their hands - the right to prove that local, self-

government can save the soil of our country and of our liberty as well.

Chancellor R. G. Gustavson of the University of Nebraska speaking at our national Soil Conservation Districts Convention in Omaha this year said, "There is no time for .... Extension Services and the Soil Conservation Service to quarrel. ... It will take all the energy and enthusiasm of both agencies to meet the great problem (soil conservation)."

Amen, Doctor Gustavson! And that's one more reason why I say it is high time Government agencies quit bickering and recognize that soil conservation is the people's problem and that the people are going to be "boss" in their Soil Conservation Districts.<sup>7a</sup>

Supervisors were elected. They were: Chairman J. W. Hickory Point, Tennessee, First Vice-chairman, Banks, Tennessee, Second Vice-chairman, S. C. Dunbar, Tennessee, Secretary and Treasurer, C. P. Tiffany, Tennessee.

Program was started by one farm planning technician of one conservation aid and one farmer aid.

Meetings were held quarterly with additional ones when

total of ten meetings were held in 1945.

During the spring of 1945 approximately twenty-five farmers

county visited farms in Robertson County to

being done by the conservation unit in that

must impressed with the work they saw.

---

<sup>7a</sup> Waters S. Davis, "I Believe," Country Gentleman, 123 (May, 1953), 12-13.



### CHAPTER III

#### ORGANIZATION AND WORK OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

As a result of surveys, investigations and observations among the land owners and farmers of Montgomery County, Tennessee, a need for further measures to conserve and improve the use of land was clearly shown. Based upon these results the Montgomery County soil conservation district was organized January 15, 1945 with its office in the Post Office Building.

Four supervisors were elected. They were: Chairman J. W. Cross, Jr., Hickory Point, Tennessee, First Vice-chairman, Banks Batson, Cunningham, Tennessee, Second Vice-chairman, S. C. Dunbar, Dotsonville, Tennessee, Secretary and Treasurer, C. P. Tiffany, Hampton Station, Tennessee.

The program was started by one farm planning technician with the help of one conservation aid and one farmer aid.

Meetings were held quarterly with additional ones when necessary. A total of ten meetings were held in 1945.

In the spring of 1945 approximately twenty-five farmers from Montgomery County visited farms in Robertson County to observe the work being done by the conservation unit in that county. They were much impressed with the work they saw.

Other agencies that cooperated with the Soil Conservation Service were: County Agents, Home Agents, F.S.A. personnel, First



National Bank, Farm Bureau, County Planning Board, and local implement dealers.

During the first year, in addition to routine work, two things worthy of note were done. Terrace demonstrations were held on McGregor Brothers' farm and Batson Brothers' farm. They were well attended and many farmers used the methods shown them to construct terraces on their individual farms. A miniature farm showing the conservation practices was displayed at the county fair.

The supervisors were well pleased with the way farmers responded to their programs. The majority of the applications were made by the farmers on their own initiative after they had seen some work planned or established on their neighbors' farm. During the year 1945 applications for conservation work were made much more rapidly than they could be taken care of. This emphasized the need of additional equipment and personnel.<sup>1</sup>

In the year 1946 the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District established 2,585 acres of approved rotations, 2,219 acres to contour farming, 1,168 acres of permanent pastures, and 121 miles of terraces. These practices indicate the growth and interest in the conservation unit.

The outstanding accomplishment during the year 1946

---

1. "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1945."

over and above the usual amount of terracing, construction of ponds and Sericea and Kudzu plantings, was the introduction of Ladino clover in combination with grasses such as Orchard Grass, Kentucky Fescue Grass, Rye Grass, Red Top and Timothy. This shows that in addition to the usual soil conserving practices on the better land areas the need for permanent pastures was stressed.

Due to the lack of equipment the board borrowed money and bought equipment to supplement the efforts of individual farmers in building terraces and waterways, constructing ponds, doing drainage work and various practices suggested by the technical staff as outlined in the program of work.<sup>2</sup>

During the year 1947 plans for sixty farms of Montgomery County were prepared. These plans ranked anywhere from complete overhauling of farms to minor corrections and included 10,466 acres. To give the reader an idea of the work done in 1947 by the Soil Conservation District the following statistics are presented:

648 acres of cover crops were added to the lands.

3,700 acres have been changed from the old style of straight row cultivation to contour cultivation.

90 miles of terraces have been constructed to care for 1,305 acres.

---

2. "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1946."



70 acres of waterways have been built. of terraces and  
 Pasture improvement has been started on 1,839 acres. with  
 647 acres of Kudzu, Sericea, Lespedeza, and Alfalfa grass  
 mixture has been planted.

40 farm ponds have been built.

3 wildlife areas have been established.

The policy of work areas was determined on the community  
 basis. Therefore, farmer groups received more assistance because  
 of travel time saved for the technicians and also in the movement  
 of equipment. Communities from which group assistance has been  
 requested are Peachers Mill, Kirkwood-Rossvie, St. Bethlehem,  
 Palmyra, Port Royal, Sango, Salem, Hickory Point, and Louise,  
 Creek Watershed.

Many farms not participating in this Soil Conservation  
 Service are rapidly making use of better conservation practices  
 such as land use changes, longer and better rotations, more  
 permanent pastures and hay crops, better use of lime and fertilizer,  
 improving woodland stands, using contour cultivation, constructing  
 livestock and fish ponds, building broad base terraces and making  
 use of bottom land to relieve upland from the toil of producing  
 row crops.

It is the policy of the district program that the farm  
 plan cover the entire needs of each farm, and that the establish-  
 ment of those practices be done during the normal operation of

farming. An example would be the constructing of terraces and waterways during the spring and fall seasons in conjunction with plowing and seed bed preparation. The usual farm machinery has proven to be adequate in most cases.

In addition to the farmers' equipment for dirt moving, privately owned machinery and the district machinery have rendered much needed assistance to the farmers during the year.

A demonstration of the use of explosives in making drainage ditches was given. This practice lends itself advantageously in poorly drained areas where machinery would be inadequate.

The increased use of farmer constructed terraces and waterways using farm equipment, which is economical, practical, and highly commendable, is becoming widespread in the district. This movement instilled a confidence in individuals to the extent of a fuller appreciation for more conservation measures.

The 161 farm plans established, which comprise 37,225 acres, is active evidence of growth and progress of conservation practices that are being established. During the year the Soil Conservation Service supplied two full time employees as equipment operators, and help in the form of a bulldozer. The Soil Conservation Service State Office in Nashville gave some technical assistance and equipment.<sup>3</sup>

---

3. "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Report, 1947."



During the year of 1948 the scope of activity of the Soil Conservation District has multiplied in the various communities over the district. The farmers are rapidly becoming concerned about their soil losses through erosion and are anxious to do something about this growing menace. Work has been done on the community basis which has made it possible to render more assistance to the farmers in the establishment of soil conservation practices.

In addition to amount of time saved, greater results from using soil conserving practices within a concentrated area have provided positive proof of their value to the land and to the individual farm operators.

Many farmers have reported a marked increase in crop yields caused by the use of combined soil conserving practices.

As an example of this work more farmers are learning how to use their regular farm equipment in doing their terrace and waterway construction. In the spring or fall season just prior to breaking land for a crop, terraces and waterways are constructed during the normal operations of farming. In this way terraces are being plowed using only a minimum amount of time to establish this soil and water conservation practice. The other operations of seed bed preparation are then done on the contour using terraces as guides. So this second soil and water conservation practice becomes also a part of the normal operation. A great number of

cooperators will have all their cropland terraced by the completion of the crop rotation period by following this system.

During the month of April, 1948, a complete soil and water conservation program was staged on the 160-acre farm of Tandy Richardson in the Sango community. All the work of establishing the practice was done by G.I. trainee farmers and others throughout the country using regular farm equipment; the exceptions were the heavy work of fence row clearing, pond digging, etc. which was done by bulldozers. This demonstration proved that standard farm equipment is the most practical and economical way of establishing conservation practices. This complete demonstration staged during one day further proved that an individual farm could be completed in a similar manner, requiring of course, a longer period of establishment. To accomplish this, a complete soil and water conservation plan is necessary to serve as a guide for each unit.

In connection with the land use needs of the district, the farmers made great strides. During the year 1948, 2,892 acres of pasture land was seeded to mixtures of Kentucky 31 Fescue Grass and Ladino Clover, Alfalfa and Smooth Brome Grass, Sericea, Lespedeza and Kudzu.

Mr. F. E. Reding in the Kirkwood community adopted a program of grass and clover farming, producing pastures for forage



consuming livestock and also seed crops. Other farmers throughout the district increased their pasture crops many times in the year 1948. Many farmers produced seed of Orchard Grass, Kentucky Fescue grass, and Ladino, Red and button clover in addition to the usual harvesting of Lespedeza, Crimson clover and others. the following

The greater number of acres of pasture enabled the farmers to increase the number of dairy and beef cattle causing many sheds to be built on to the barns and some surplus tobacco barns changed to shelter for livestock. Supplementing this pasture acreage are various types of silos for winter feeding. Silos have been used during this year on the farms of John W. Ross, St. Bethlehem; J. H. Kennedy, George Sisk and Son, M. W. Pressler, Robert Menees, and Norris Pace, Kirkwood; J. W. Cross, Jr., and Arthur Marks, Hickory Point; Horace Lisenbee, Woodlawn; S. C. Dunbar, Dotsonville; Roscoe Pickering and Tandy Richardson, Sango. Also supplementing the pastures on the C. P. Tiffany farm, Kirkwood community, a hay drier is being used to cure his alfalfa and sericea lespedeza hays.

With pasture programs being established on a large number of farms, fish and livestock ponds were constructed impounding water from a number of small watersheds. Many of the ponds were equipped with waterline and troughs. They were fenced to exclude livestock, thus improving the sanitary conditions favorable for fish production as well as furnishing clean, disease free water

for all livestock on the farm.

In cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service the District furnished fish fingerlings for stocking farm ponds where proper methods of construction were followed.

During the year the District was visited by the following groups interested in observing the soil conservation programs:

1. Soil Conservation Supervisors and bankers from Louisiana.
2. Carthage bankers and Smith County farmers.
3. Soil Conservation Service representatives from the Washington and other field stations.
4. Neighboring states and county groups including Extension Service Vocational Agriculture instructors, and Soil Conservation Service personnel.

Tours and field demonstrations were held throughout the District to spread information of soil conservation to other farmers of this area.

Supplementing these field studies an exhibit was made at the County Fair showing on a miniature scale the Face Lifting Farm of Tandy Richardson. The before and after program of conservation farming was shown. A number of sample squares from pasture and hay fields showing the mixtures of legumes and grasses with rates and dates of seeding of each combination was also used. This proved very interesting to a large number of farmers, because the



actual mixtures of these crops were being observed while studying them.<sup>4</sup>

During the year of 1949 the scope of soil conservation work increased steadily, radiating from community centers. It has been very encouraging to watch the interest in soil conservation work spread from farm to adjoining farms. It has been observed that a neighbor farmer can sometimes explain the value of conservation practices better than any one else.

The outstanding phase of work, in the opinion of the supervisors, is the procedure used by the farmer cooperators in establishing their conservation practices. The Soil Conservation Service technicians impress each land owner with the necessity of a complete farm plan in order that the needed conservation practices may be done along with normal operations of farming. For example, if terraces and waterways are planned, then sodded, natural drains may be used for terrace waterways. In case of terrace construction farmers are taught to construct broad base terraces with regular farm equipment. This operation is done in the fall or spring season at the time of plowing the land. Therefore, it is very desirable for farm planning to be such that the establishment of needed practices be dove-tailed into the normal

---

4. "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1948."

operations of farming.

In order to obtain this objective, the procedure has been emphasized in as many ways as possible.

The local press and radio have been most cooperative in making it possible for our conservationists to present farmer activities concerning the establishment of soil conserving practices. During the past year weekly articles have appeared in the newspapers illustrating with pictures and detailed directions how various conservation practices were being established on local farms. The weekly radio discussions are conducted on the basis of interviewing different cooperators who have successfully established practices of their soil and water conservation program.

The field studies conducted on farms where practices were observed and discussed in detail with the farmer who did the work have been very helpful and informative to those attending. During the month of January field studies covering ten communities and running for five successive days were conducted. This study was made on about thirty different farms emphasizing the following subjects:

1. The establishment of pasture crops on the correct land use.
2. Studying the pasture mixture most suitable for the land and fertility conditions.



3. The seeding dates and methods of establishment.
4. The importance of having seed plots for production of home grown and home used seeds.

5. Proper soil amendments - primarily liming and fertilizing

On July 29, a tour was conducted on the J. W. Cross, Jr. farm, in Hickory Point community, to study the conservation practices in use on his rotation and pasture land; also to study the demonstrational work of minor element fertilizers used on corn, tobacco and hay crops. The corn development was the most obvious, which later was verified by measurement to show beneficial results.

On August 2, the District personnel were hosts to Soil Conservation Service personnel from Soil Conservation Districts of nearby counties - Robertson, Cheatham, Sumner, Smith, Trousdale, and Macon. Also personnel from the State office - W. M. Hardy, State Conservationist, and Verne Davidson and L. D. Worley of the Regional Office - who conducted the studies. The one day study course was primarily to acquaint the conservationists with recent progress on the use of new vegetation useful for soil conservation purposes and to serve as cover and food supply for wildlife.

The construction and management of farm ponds for livestock use and fish production was also discussed. It was pointed out that proper stocking and fertilization of waters was a must to have profitable yields of fish.

During the year a small supply of Multiflora Rose cuttings was received from the Soil Conservation Service Nursery. They were used for wildlife habitat and fences for separating pastures and crop fields.

A good supply of lespedeza bicolor seedlings was made available through the cooperation of the Soil Conservation Service and State Department of Conservation, Division of Fish and Game. These seedlings were used for establishing wildlife habitats and for erosion control purposes.

During the year a complete farm plan was made on 300 farms totaling 65,000 acres.

Mr. Marvin Grant of the Sango community was elected as the fifth supervisor. Until this time the District had only four supervisors.<sup>5</sup>

There are approximately 268,000 acres in farms in Montgomery County. At the end of the year 1950, of this total 75,000 acres are owned by farmers cooperating with the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District. Each of these acres has been planned for proper land use - that is, this land is planned to be used according to its capabilities, and treated according to its needs.

---

5. "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1949."



It is interesting to note that the pasture seeding done during 1950, a total of 6,050 acres, is nearly double the contour farming of 3,486 acres. This figure of contour farming represents most of the row crops grown on these farms. This being true, the fast swing to grassland conservation farming is obvious and very encouraging. In addition to the pasture seeding accomplishment, the farmers are working hard to maintain the pasture fields they have previously established. They did pastures improvement work consisting of liming, fertilizing and clipping on 5,909 acres. The land use change from row crops to sod crops is permitting the proper use to be made of our land. It is, at the same time, increasing the farmers' income and strengthening their farm program.

Another interesting trend noted during the year 1950 deals with the acreage of sericea lespedeza and alfalfa established. There were 571 acres of sericea lespedeza established and only 95 acres of alfalfa. Both have important places in farm programs. But the lower cost of establishment and maintenance of sericea along with its long life and usefulness as a hay plant may show a marked increase of its use in the years to come.<sup>6</sup>

---

6. "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1950."

During the year 1951 the vegetative program was enlarged over the previous years. Primarily this enlargement came about through the increase acreage of pastures, waterways and hays. More farmers are striving for year around grazing by making plans to have seasonal grazing for each season of the year.

There has been an increase in acreage of perennial grasses and legumes. The two leading grasses are fescue and orchard grass and the leading legumes are ladino clover and sericea lespedeza. Many farmers are utilizing these crops for either pastures or hays. The sericea is proving to be the most desirable plant for both uses.

Many farmers are looking upon the practice of vegetated waterways as an asset. In years past farmers had the idea that too much area was being used for this purpose. Today they are thinking differently. Farmers are building these waterways in advance of the construction of terraces on their land, thereby insuring themselves against damage to their cropland.

The trend toward grassland farming has brought about an increase in beef and dairy cattle.

To compliment the grassland program, adequate water supply for livestock, fish production, recreation and erosion control purposes has been provided by construction of ponds. More and more emphasis will be made to properly construct these ponds and



equip them with watering facilities to provide sanitary water.

The wildlife plantings of bicolor lespedeza and forestry plantings showed an increase over the previous years.

An exhibit was set up at the county fair, the theme being "Grassland Farming Is Conservation Farming."<sup>7</sup>

In the spring and early summer of 1952, fine pasture crops looked promising. A bumper small grain crop was harvested. As time marched on, showers of moisture became fewer and fewer, until an extended drought had taken its toll on the pastures that looked so promising in the spring, and damaged other crops such as tobacco and corn.

A new problem had been presented to the farmer. Heretofore, excessive rainfall caused damage to the land, and specific erosion practices were needed. But in 1952 the opposite condition occurred and practices to overcome these problems were needed. The ingenuity of the farmers brought them through in fair condition.

The land use program of using deep rooted legumes and grasses on land subject to both heavy rainfall and no rainfall has paid well under these extreme conditions.

The combinations of grasses and legumes best suited to the way. The good results obtained from silage

---

7. "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1951."

land capability offer the best protection to the land under all conditions, and produces a forage crop which may be used for pasture, hay or silage. During the year 1952, sericea lespedeza, annual lespedezas and kudzu were the legumes; and fescue, orchard and bermuda grass were the grasses that stood the test. Another legume that looks promising is Birdsfoot Trefoil. A number of farmers have made initial seedings of this clover and are well pleased.

Likewise, establishment of kudzu from sowing the seed proved successful during 1952. It is a legume plant. And as well as being good protection to the land, it serves as a reserve forage feed in the dry summer months.

Another plant that is receiving wide acclaim is button clover. It is best adapted to land areas that are suited to intensive cropping thereby relieving other lands more vulnerable to erosion from the growing of forage crops.

The accomplishments of the farmers were not limited to the establishment of the above crops. The crops that were unable to mature because of the lack of moisture were converted into silage. A wide variety of grain and forage crops were utilized in this way. The good results obtained from silage during the year offers greater opportunities to livestock and grassland farming in the future. The thinking among a goodly



number is that of using silage during the summer months as a relief to pastures as well as to have a food supply during the winter months. This plan of feeding, plus the use of drought resistant legumes of sericea lespedeza and kudzu will certainly return greater profits and extend the life and productivity of pastures.

For the past several years, plans and observation tours of irrigation set-ups have been made. During the year 1952 the use of impounded water or water from creeks became a reality. The small number of farmers that pioneered this work were well pleased and this practice will increase as time moves on. The entire county is well supplied with flowing streams. The Cumberland and Red Rivers with their tributaries are accessible to supply a large quantity of water for irrigation purposes. To supplement the water in the streams, a large number of ponds were built in the upper watersheds of these drainage areas to supply livestock water, fish production, and water for irrigation.

During the year the combined use of mechanical erosion control measures with a vegetative program became widespread among the farmers. Prior to this period too many terraces were built without adequate waterways. Many farmers establish a good waterway before building terraces. They build terraces with wide channels and broad ridges. This type of terrace offers maximum

protection to the land and affords better machining operations. The use and management of these waterways or meadow strips are receiving much greater attention than in the past. In addition to easing off the surplus water from the field, they are producing good grazing and high yields of forage for hay or silage. Many farmers are using these waterways as seed plots.

The large acreage of idle land of the district was reduced considerably due to land use change to pasture and tree land. Small acreage was put to crop land. A large percent that was established to pasture is a combination of sericea lespedeza and fescue or orchard grass.

An exhibit was set up at the county fair. The theme was "Grassland Farming Is Conservation Farming."<sup>8</sup>

#### Future Plans of This District

The program of work for the future will be similar to the one that has been pursued for the last few years. An outline of the program is as follows:

1. Land use - Using the land according to its capability and treating in accordance with its needs.
2. Liming and Fertilizing - Applying the needed materials

---

8. "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1952."



to meet the requirements for adequate land cover and high yielding crops.

3. Legumes and Grasses - On all land use areas of permanent pastures hays and rotation use a combination of legumes and grasses that will afford greater protection to the land as well as yield better crops.

4. Rotation - Longer rotation that furnishes maximum protection to the land using deep rooted legumes and perennial grasses in the meadows and pastures.

5. Level Farming - Constructing terraces on all crop land for contour cultivation and supporting the above practices.

6. Livestock and Crop Enterprises - This diversification of farming is necessary to make maximum and correct use of the land in conservation farming.

Living conditions for our farm folks is determined to the extent of the productivity of the farm. By taking care of the land, it will take care of its users.

The productivity of the soil. The productivity of the soil depends on the use made of it. The practices mentioned in this study fall into the following categories: (1) Land use (2) Liming and fertilizing (3) Legumes and grasses (4) Longer rotations (5) Level farming (6) Livestock and crop enterprises.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study has been to determine the need for and the work of the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District through an examination of related literature in the field and the Soil Conservation program.

An effort has been made to show the need of conservation practices and to give an analysis of the work being done by the Soil Conservation District in Montgomery County.

Soil is the nation's as well as the county's most important resource and it can be exhausted.

Today professional and business people as well as farmers are concerned about productive soil. It has been realized as never before that this basic resource is linked directly to our future prosperity.

Land is our base - everything we do, all we share and what we amount to as a county, state, and nation depends upon the productivity of the soil. The productivity of the soil depends largely upon the use made of it.

The practices mentioned in this study fall into the general categories of: (1) Land use (2) Liming and fertilizing (3) Legumes and grasses (4) Longer rotations (5) Level farming (6) Livestock and crop enterprises.



It was necessary to read related literature in the field of conservation to determine what some authorities have to say about erosion and conservation.

The chief sources of information were: reading of related literature in the field, annual reports made by the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Supervisors, materials from Lester Solomon, Soil Conservationist of Montgomery County, Paul Horton, Agricultural Agent of Montgomery County, and Harry Law, Professor of Geography, Austin Peay State College.

A summary of the more significant findings of the review of related literature follows:

The choice of the use of the soil is one of the most important in soil management. This choice determines the need for other practices for best soil conservation. It is best to use soils for the crops to which they are well adapted, and this will greatly reduce the hazard of crop failure.

Commercial fertilizer is essential for continued high crop production. Every crop harvested for grain, forage or other use removes plant food from the soil. Soils under continuous cropping systems coupled with erosion lose their plant nutrients faster than they can be replaced by nature. If this loss is allowed to continue, it will not only result in lower crop yields but will also affect the physical condition of the soil.

Lime is essential on acid soils for proper growth of many crop and pasture plants. To promote this desired growth, sufficient lime should be applied to change the acid condition to a near neutral point. Under most conditions the addition of lime to the soil also provides calcium for plant growth.

Sods of legumes and grasses serve several purposes. The roots of these plants aid in improving soil structure, add organic matter, prevent excessive soil losses and increase the amount of rainfall absorbed into the soil.

A good crop rotation utilizes crops that are adapted to the farm and farming system. The fertility of the soil, its tilth, drainage, reaction, slope, the temperature, rainfall, weeds, plant diseases, and insect pests determine certain limitations to the kinds and proportions of crops to be grown.

Level lands lend themselves readily to a wide choice of rotations, but as either slope, erosion or stoniness, alone or in combination, increase, the range of adopted crops is lessened and rotations narrowed.

The combination of crops and livestock which provide, on an efficient basis the fullest use of the land, labor and equipment should give the greatest net return. Such a combination requires the use of those crops and livestock that are best suited to the soil, climate and available markets.



A summary of the information collected by the annual reports of the supervisors reveals that in general the plan followed for conservation farming by the Montgomery Soil Conservation District is as follows:

1. Land Use - Using each acre in accordance to its capability.
2. Liming and Fertilizing - Applying the needed minerals in accordance with crop needs.
3. Legumes and Grasses - Select the combination for soil conditions.
4. Longer Rotation - Kind or rotation for each land use.
5. Level Farming - Contouring terraces with adequate waterways.
6. Livestock and Crop Enterprises - Best utilization of the land.
7. Living Conditions - Results of Conservation Farming.

#### Some Conclusions

This study has revealed a very fine piece of work being done by the Montgomery County Soil Conservation Service. The director, Mr. Lester Solomon, and his entire staff are to be commended for the good work accomplished. We know the staff has had hearty cooperation from the people at large in almost every case. Results of the work of this group are becoming more

evident each year. The people being served are deeply appreciative of the help and advice they are receiving.

However, even those most concerned would freely admit that they would welcome any increase in the amount, efficiency, and strength of this service. With this in mind and with no idea of in any way taking from this group, or their work, any credit to which they are entitled, but with the idea of suggesting some things which might improve the service of this group both now and in the future, we would offer some minor suggestions. (May, 1953).

We believe that the selection of younger men for more places of responsibility would be an encouragement to the younger farmers to work harder and study more in connection with proper use and cultivation of the soil. We realize that the older people are valuable for their wisdom and experience. Young people are valuable for their enthusiasm and vigor. A happy combination of the two classes is ideal.

The message of soil conservation and land use might be carried more effectively to the younger boys by a closer cooperation between the conservation district, 4-H Club and Future Farmer Organizations. Boys would be more convinced of the necessity of conservation practices if they were encouraged in some way to have many demonstration plots of land. This could be done very easily through the 4-H Clubs.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bear, Fireman E. "I Believe," Country Gentleman, 123 (April, 1953), 12-13.
- Bennett, H. H. "Adjustment of Agriculture to Its Environment," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 43 (December, 1943), 167.
- Bennett, H. H. Elements of Soil Conservation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1947. Pp. xvii / 993.
- Brinster, Ayers and Shepard, Ward. Our Use of the Land. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939. Pp. xvi / 303.
- Davis, Waters S. "I Believe," Country Gentleman, 123 (May, 1953), 12-13.
- Gustafson, A. F., and Others. Conservation in the United States. New York: Comstock Publishing Co., 1949. Pp. ix / 534.
- Leopold, Aldo. "Conservation Economics," Journal of Forestry, 32 (May, 1934), 539.
- Mickey, Karl B. Man and the Soil. Chicago: International Harvester Company, 1945. Pp. 110.
- "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1945." Pp. 3.
- "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1946." Pp. 3.
- "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1947." Pp. 2.
- "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1948." Pp. 35.
- "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1949." Pp. 39.
- "Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1950." Pp. 43.

"Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report,  
1951." Pp. 48.

"Montgomery County Soil Conservation District Annual Report,  
1952." Pp. 40.

Van Hise, Charles Richard. The Conservation of Natural Resources  
in the United States. New York: The Macmillan Company,  
1910. Pp. xvii / 551.

Whitaker, J. Russell and Ackerman, Edward A. American Resources.  
New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1951. Pp.x / 497.



## APPENDIX A

TABLE 1

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR THE YEAR 1945<sup>a</sup>

Practices	Planned	Applied
Crop Rotations	6,856 Acres	1,000 Acres
Kudzu	114 "	26 "
Sericea	105 "	0 "
Alfalfa	449 "	54 "
Terraces & Waterways	556 Miles	26 Miles
Pasture Improvement	2,937 Acres	221 Acres
Farm Ponds	54 Each	14 Each
Fish Ponds	3 "	0 "
Farm Drainage	146 Acres	0 Acres
Woodland Improvement	778 "	0 "
Contour Cultivation	4,509 "	300 "

a. Annual Report for 1945.

## APPENDIX A

TABLE 2

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR THE YEAR 1948<sup>b</sup>

Practices	Planned	Applied
Contour Farming	22,211 Acres	16,515 Acres
Cover Cropping	10,607 "	7,710 "
Pasture Improvement	10,767 "	9,418 "
Seeding of Pasture	3,024 "	2,112 "
Wild Life Area	154 "	34 "
Woodland Management		
Farm Ponds	170 "	170 "
Farm Drainage	1,520 "	1,431 "
Crop Rotations	24,813 "	18,059 "
Water Disposal Areas	628 "	228 "
Kudzu	568 "	151 "
Alfalfa and Perennial Grass	1,366 "	672 "
Fish Ponds	39 "	22 "

b. Annual Report for 1948.



## APPENDIX A

TABLE 3

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR THE YEAR 1949<sup>c</sup>

Practices	Planned	Applied
Contour Farming	24,327 Acres	22,879 Acres
Cover Cropping	13,277 "	13,220 "
Pasture Improvement	13,083 "	13,083 "
Seeding of Pasture	5,013 "	4,839 "
Wildlife Area Improvement	238 "	63 "
Farm Ponds	232 No.	232 "
Terraces	2,234 Miles	641 Miles
Farm Drainage	1,870 Acres	1,465 Acres
Crop Rotations	30,762 "	24,812 "
Water Disposal Areas	787 "	284 "
Kudzu	737 Acres	153 "
Sericea	711 Miles	159 "
Alfalfa and Perennials	1,868 Acres	3,833 "
Fish Ponds	46 No.	22 No.
Woodland Management	6,794 Acres	4,444 Acres
Tree Planting	67 "	48 "
Field Diversion	41 Miles	2 Miles
	10 No.	8 No.
	1,655 Acres	640 Acres

c. Annual Report for 1949.

Report for 1950.

## APPENDIX A

TABLE 4

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR THE YEAR 1950<sup>d</sup>

Practices	Planned	Applied
Contour Farming	3,361 Acres	3,486 Acres
Cover Cropping	3,498 "	6,038 "
Strip Cropping	81 "	31 "
Pasture Improvement	6,284 "	5,909 "
Seeding of Pasture	5,227 "	6,050 "
Wildlife Area Improvement	54 "	13 "
Woodland Management	2,688 "	2,063 "
Tree Planting	28 "	5 "
Farm Ponds	38 No.	40 No.
Terraces	97 Miles	65 Miles
Field Diversions	15 "	4 "
Farm Drainage	434 Acres	91 Acres
Open Drains	11 Miles	6 Miles
Crop Rotation	4,650 Acres	3,765 Acres
Water Disposal Areas	96 "	39 "
Kudzu	51 "	0 "
Sericea	2,223 "	571 "
Alfalfa & Perennial Grass	181 "	95 "
Fish Ponds	10 No.	8 No.
Woodland Protection	1,655 Acres	640 Acres

d. Annual Report for 1950.



## APPENDIX A

TABLE 5

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR THE YEAR 1951<sup>e</sup>

Practices	Applied
Contour Farming	3,199 Acres
Cover Cropping	803 "
Strip Cropping	38 "
Pasture Improvement	5,768 "
Seeding of Pasture	3,793 "
Wildlife Area Improvement	30 "
Woodland Management	1,716 "
Tree Planting	3 "
Farm Ponds	27 No.
Terraces	24 Miles
Field Diversions	3 "
Farm Drainage	34 Acres
Crop Rotations	4,594 "
Waterways	47 "
Kudzu	4 "
Sericea	450 "
Alfalfa, Perennial Grasses	24 "
Woodland Protection	49 "
Fish Ponds	7 No.

e. Annual Report for 1951.

Annual Report for 1952.

## APPENDIX A

RESOURCE PEOPLE USED IN THE STUDY

TABLE 6

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR THE YEAR 1952<sup>1</sup>

Montgomery County Soil Conservation District

Practices	Applied
Contour Farming	861 acres
Cover Cropping	1,022 "
Crop Rotations	643 "
Kudzu	21 "
Sericea	755 "
Alfalfa, Perennial Grasses	96 "
Proper Use of Grassland	4,703 "
Pasture Seeding	3,465 "
Woodland Improvement	1,735 "
Tree Planting	21 "
Woodland Protection	12 "
Wildlife Area Improvement	22 "
Fish Ponds	27 No.
Farm Drainage	21 Acres
Open Drains	1.2 Miles
Irrigation Water Management	500 Acres
Terracing	34 Miles
Diversion Construction	1/2 Mile
Pond Construction	100 No.
Waterway Development	47 Acres
Land Clearing	240 "

f. Annual Report for 1952.



## APPENDIX B

## RESOURCE PEOPLE USED IN THE STUDY

Mr. Cuyler Dunbar  
Supervisor  
Montgomery County Soil Conservation District

Mr. James English, Jr.  
Assistant Agricultural Agent  
Montgomery County

Mr. Paul Horton  
Agricultural Agent  
Montgomery County

Mr. Harry Law  
Professor of Geography  
Austin Peay State College

Mr. Lester Solomon  
Soil Conservationist  
Montgomery County

## APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE IN REGARD TO ESTABLISHING  
THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY CONSERVATION UNITCooperation Extension Work  
DIRECTORS  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
1953

W. B. Allen  
Peachers Mill Community

T. B. Batson  
Grange Hall Community

J. W. Cross  
Hickory Point Community

Cuyler Dunbar  
Dotsonville Community

Marvin Grant  
Sango Community

I feel free to call on me in case you need any further  
even though it may be by remote control or long dis-  
tance. I have no doubt about a good job being done by  
anybody. I have no doubt about a good job being done by  
anybody.

I am sorry that a schedule already made for the same type  
work in Madison and Jackson Counties prevents my assisting you  
as I learned in the early years in school, it is  
a body to be in two separate places at the same  
time. I have no doubt about a good job being done by  
anybody.

Yours very truly,

G. S. HOLLINGSWORTH  
Extension Soil Conservationist



## APPENDIX D

SOME CORRESPONDENCE IN REGARD TO ESTABLISHING  
THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY CONSERVATION UNIT

July 19, 1944

Cooperative Extension Work  
Agriculture and Home Economics  
North State of Tennessee2321 West End Avenue  
Post Office Box 419  
Nashville 1, Tennessee  
June 19, 1944

Mr. H. W. Short  
County Agent  
Clarksville, Tennessee

Dear Mr. Short:

Since our conversation, have discussed the need of assistance with Mr. Harmon and am today making request of Mr. Hardy for George Buller of the Soil Conservation Service to assist you in the educational work necessary, prior to the hearing as set for July 3rd on the creation of a soil conservation district.

I am sorry that a schedule already made for the same type of work in Smith and Jackson Counties prevents my assisting you in this work, as I learned in the early years in school, it is impossible for a body to be in two separate places at the same time, however, I have no doubt about a good job being done by you and Mr. Buller.

Please feel free to call on me in case you need any further assistance, even though it may be by remote control or long distance, you can contact me through Mrs. Roberts at this office who has my itinerary.

Withing you success in this, your third attempt, and with best regards, I am

Yours very truly,

G. S. HOLLINGSWORTH  
Extension Soil Conservationist

CC: A. B. Harmon  
W. M. Hardy  
George Buller

## APPENDIX D

Clarksville, Tennessee  
July 19, 1944

Nashville 1, Tennessee  
July 20, 1944

Mr. G. S. Hollinsworth  
Extension Soil Conservationist  
2321 West End Avenue  
Nashville 1, Tennessee

Dear Mr. Hollinsworth:

We are planning to have our cover crop meetings and soil conservation district meetings together starting July 25th. and going through August 2nd.

All our meetings will be at night as the farmers are so busy at this time of year.

We would be glad to have you with us at these meetings if possible. We plan to have our referendum August 3rd., the same time of the regular election. There will be 24 polling places.

Very truly yours,

H. W. Short  
County Agent

HWS/morgan

Yours very truly,

G. S. HOLLINSWORTH  
Extension Soil Conservationist



## APPENDIX D

Cooperative Extension Work  
Agriculture and Home Economics  
State of Tennessee

\*\*\*

Nashville 1, Tennessee  
July 20, 1944

Mr. H. W. Short  
County Agent  
Clarksville, Tennessee

Dear Mr. Short:

Thank you for your invitation to be with you for the cover crop meeting and Soil Conservation District work. I am sorry that I will be in West Tennessee during the time you mentioned, but it is very necessary that I be over there at that time, with engagements already made.

In handling the materials, such as ballots and other forms used in the referendum, there is one suggestion I would like to make. We find there is one satisfactory method, and that is to deliver in person to the Polling Officer in each precinct, these forms, and explain how they are to handle this referendum.

We have in the past, had experience where these forms were mailed to a Polling Officer, and in some cases, were never opened, and on the day of the referendum, nothing was done. Of course the method I suggest requires considerable work, but we find it very necessary, and if you need some help in this matter, please let me know right away, and I am sure I can get you some assistance. I am sorry I can't be of assistance to you at this time but would like to congratulate you on an excellent job in informing the people of your county of the district work and the successful hearing resulting from this work.

Remember me to the children and be sure to let me know on receipt of this letter, if you need assistance in the work necessary for a good referendum.

With best regards, I am

Yours very truly,

G. S. HOLLINGSWORTH  
Extension Soil Conservationist

GSH:ar



## APPENDIX D

Cooperative Extension Work  
Clarksville, Tennessee

Nashville July 25, 1944

June 19, 1944

Mr. G. S. Hollingsworth  
Extension Soil Conservationist  
2321 West End Avenue  
Nashville 1, Tennessee

Dear Mr. Hollingsworth:

In answer to your letter of the 25th, we are today sending you some information to get much information, but from what I could get from the county agent, it is satisfactory.

I could use someone Monday, July 31, August 1, and August 2nd.

I have borrowed a film from the S.C.S. office in Springfield to be used in the meetings, but I will have to return it to them Friday, July 28th. I wish you would get me a good cover crop or Soil Conservation film and mail to me so I would get it by July 28th. to be used through August 2nd.

Thanking you very much, I am

Yours very truly,  
Very truly yours,

Extension Soil Conservationist

H. W. Short  
County Agent

HWS/morgan



## APPENDIX D

Cooperative Extension Work

\*\*\*\*\*

Nashville 1, Tennessee

June 19, 1944

Mr. H. W. Short  
County Agent  
Clarksville, Tennessee

Dear Mr. Short:

In answer to your letter of the 25th, we are today sending two films as you requested. In looking over the list of available films, I was unable to get much information, but from what I could learn, these were suggested as the best available. I certainly hope they will be satisfactory.

Due to conditions existing at the present time with commitments, I will be unable to be there next week, but have arranged for Mr. Currie to help you in the necessary work you are doing prior to the referendum. I regret very much that I have been unable to work with you during the establishment of the district, but hope to give more assistance in the future.

I am always glad to hear from you any time and with best regards, I am

Yours very truly,

G. S. HOLLINGSWORTH  
Extension Soil Conservationist

gsh:ar



## APPENDIX D

## Cooperative Extension Work

\*\*\*\*\*

Nashville 1, Tennessee

August 3, 1944

Mr. H. W. Short  
County Agent  
Clarksville, Tennessee

Dear Mr. Short:

When the returns from the referendum on the establishment of a soil conservation district are in, counted, and the returns reported, the next order of business is the appointment of two supervisors. You will be requested by the State Committee to send a list of names so the committee can select two to be appointed.

The success of a soil conservation district depends in a large measure on the type of men on the Board of Supervisors and would like to point out a few errors made in the past that I hope you can avoid. In a number of cases men were selected who, due to their interest and influence in agricultural matters in the county, were members of other boards and committees. In some cases these men just had too much to do in addition to their private affairs to do the job necessary as members of this board.

In a number of cases after the members of the Board were appointed and elected, it was found that in the county were some retired farmers who had held county offices who were ideally suited due to their interest in conservation and the welfare of their communities, these men make ideal supervisors and have the time to devote to the work and enjoy doing something worthwhile.

I would like to suggest that you discuss with leading farmers in the county, and if the Program Planning Committee gets together, or if you can discuss this with them individually, am sure they would be helpful in their suggestions. There is another point I would like to bring to your attention, it is helpful to have at least one member of the board who lives in or near the county seat as there are times when papers must be signed and certain business transacted that in this case would eliminate travel and time required, if this member lived in a remote section of the county, when the board of five members meets for the purpose



## APPENDIX D

of organization, they usually select as chairman, the one who lives close in, another reason for some thought relative to this selection.

To you as county agent, would also like to leave this thought with you, that the five men on the board be those with whom you can work to the best advantage and am sure you will play an important part in the work with the board as it should be. If I can be of any help in these matters, feel free to call on me.

Yours very truly,

G. S. HOLLINGSWORTH  
Extension Soil Conservationist

## APPENDIX D

Cooperative Extension Work  
Agriculture and Home Economics  
State of Tennessee

\*\*\*

Nashville 1, Tennessee

November 14, 1944

TO COUNTY AGENTS: Robison, Short, Thomson and Lowe

Dear Agent:

When the supervisors of the newly organized soil conservation district meet to perfect the organization and make a program and work plan, would suggest that dates be arranged through your District Agent, Mr. Harmon, to make possible his attendance.

The usual order of business at the supervisors' first meeting is:

1. Organization of board and election of chairman, vice-chairman and secretary.
2. Preparation of program which is the long-time overall job to be done. This is prepared by using the information available from your office. The results of the surveys made by the Soil Conservation Service and their own knowledge of the county and conditions.
3. Preparation of Work Plan. This follows the program and simply outlines the jobs to be done, who will do them and how and when as well as where.
4. By having Mr. Harmon and Mr. Hardy of the Soil Conservation Service present, it will be possible to complete all work in one day meeting which would include the making of the necessary agreement with the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the supplemental agreement with the Soil Conservation Service.

If the meeting is called at nine or nine-thirty, we should be able to complete the job by early or mid-afternoon.

This is not to rush you as I know annual reports are in the making, annual convention not far off, the usual load of work



## APPENDIX D

that is always present, but more to suggest that dates be arranged that will make possible the completion of the job in one day rather than have to call several meetings. As to the time, that is up to you and Mr. Harmon, and I'm sure Mr. Hardy can arrange to comply with some previous knowledge of the date.

If there's any further information wanted, let me know.

Yours very truly,

G. S. HOLLINGSWORTH  
Extension Soil Conservationist

GSH:ar

CC: Mr. Harmon