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Federal Rural Development Policy Since 1972

In the last 20 years, rural life has witnessed a series of demographic, economic, and political changes that increased the complexity of rural problems and the difficulty of implementing proposed solutions. The rural population expanded then contracted, the job base shifted, and five administrations alternated agendas. With the establishment in 1992 of the Rural Development Administration marking a new Federal commitment to rural development, a review of the past two decades may provide some perspective and context for new ideas and actions to come.

The 1970's marked a critical change in the orientation of Federal rural policy from the poverty focus of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to a focus on the effects of rapid urban growth. Although most Federal rural policy in the 20th century arose from concern about declining rural populations, the policy of the early 1970's responded also to a growing sense of the insurmountability of urban problems, punctuated by the urban unrest of the late 1960's. Language in the Agriculture Act of 1970 underscored this motivation for a Federal rural development policy. Congress committed itself to "a sound balance between rural and urban America," which it considered "so essential to the peace, prosperity, and welfare of all our citizens that the highest priority must be given to the revitalization and development of rural areas."

Shared Goals, Opposing Strategies:
The Nixon/Ford Administrations and the Rural Development Act of 1972

The Nixon administration entered the rural development policy arena with two primary proposals. In his State of the Union address in January 1970, President Nixon noted the need to "not only stem the migration to urban centers, but reverse it." He proposed a rural revenue-sharing plan that would earmark Federal funds for rural development. The Nixon administration also proposed the creation of a new Cabinet department for community development, part of a comprehensive reorganization of the executive branch into four super-departments. The Department of Community Development would have brought together community facilities and infrastructure programs from the Departments of Agriculture, Transportation, and Commerce, as well as most of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Neither of these two proposals survived Congress, however. The New Federalism, of which the rural revenue-sharing plan was a part, evoked fears that local governments would control Federal funds, and the Cabinet-level reorganization plan suggested to many a super-bureaucracy even more unwieldy than the one it would replace. The Community Development Department worried rural development advocates in particular, because it appeared that urban programs, with their larger constituency, budget, and bureaucracy, would dominate the new department. Instead, majority support in Congress lined up behind what became the Rural Development Act of 1972 (RDA), in which funding remained a federally controlled categorical grant system and the Department of Agriculture emerged as the designated leader in the Federal rural development effort.

The RDA increased credit to improve facilities and infrastructure to promote small businesses and industrialization, expanded programs for soil and water conservation and pollution control, initiated Federal financial and technical assistance for rural fire protection, and supported increased research and extension programs focusing on rural development. The RDA authorized a new Assistant Secretary for Rural Development (William Erwin), who formed the Rural Development Service to carry out the Department's new responsibilities. While the RDA embodied many of the Nixon administration's expressed goals for rural areas, rejection of the administration's revenue-sharing and reorganization proposals led to a lack of cooperation between Congress and the administration in implementation of the act.

The Nixon and Ford administrations did not hide their preference for State and local direction of rural development policies. Congress stopped an attempt by Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz in 1973 to delegate rural development funding decisions to State govern-
ments. Also that year, in response to fiscal stress, the Nixon administration began efforts to reduce the Federal budget and proposed to rescind funding for a number of rural development programs. Congress restored that funding, but in 1974 President Gerald Ford ordered a second impoundment of funds. By 1975, accusations surfaced that the USDA had not taken its responsibilities under the Rural Development Act seriously. But Assistant Secretary Erwin defended the administration's implementation of the act, reporting that all appropriated funds had been obligated and insisting that delays in funding programs reflected careful preparations before initiating new projects.

As a result of the divergent positions of Congress and the Presidents, both Nixon and Ford, national rural development policy remained limited. Congress included provisions for grants to rural communities in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, which created Community Development Block Grants. Similar provisions in the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976 guaranteed funds to rural areas for local public works. But the comprehensive, coordinated Federal rural development policy advocated by supporters of the RDA never emerged.

Rural Renaissance: New Policy Questions for the Carter Administration

Meanwhile, a startling demographic trend came to light in 1975. Demographer Calvin L. Beale, of the USDA's Economic Research Service, reported a reversal of the rural-to-urban migration pattern that had prevailed in the United States since World War II. Although the rural or nonmetro counties with the greatest population increase were located adjacent to metro areas, nonmetro counties remote from metro areas also gained population at a faster rate than metro areas.

Beale identified such factors as decentralization of industry, increased rural employment in trade and service industries, slowing losses of population in agricultural and traditionally Black counties, the rise of recreation and retirement communities, and the expansion of State colleges and universities as responsible for the increases in rural population. Beale noted, additionally, a preference for rural or smalltown living indicated by urban respondents to a national survey of residential preferences. Improved transportation and communications systems, as well as increased employment opportunities, finally allowed individuals and families to choose to live in smaller communities.

The consequences of these changes for rural development policy were twofold. On the one hand, interests wishing to reduce spending suggested that rural America had begun to thrive again on its own and so needed no special Federal attention. On the other hand, interests advocating a stronger rural policy claimed the changes showed the effectiveness of Federal rural policies and required continued intervention to help rural counties cope with an influx of population. Conflict between these two points of view fueled
debate on the question of Federal rural policy for the next 15 years.

Advocates of a federally directed rural policy expected advancement of their cause with the election of Democratic President Jimmy Carter in 1976. Carter initiated a study of rural development policy by the Rural Development Service that concluded the Federal rural development effort consisted of programs, rather than policy. The study recommended substantial reorganization within the USDA, and even across Cabinet-level Departments, and a more explicit focus on policy and goals. The study also recommended the development of State and local government capacities to support and coordinate the large number of rural development efforts funded by the Federal Government. The Rural Development Service had operated training schools for rural leaders since its establishment in 1973, but the new recommendations encouraged funding of "policy management staffs" to help States learn to administer Federal programs.

In response to the study, the Carter White House issued a series of Rural Development Initiatives to address complexities of funding local programs, while the administration continued to work out more permanent solutions like reorganization and increased funding. The Initiatives, one of which appeared every couple of months from October 1978 through June 1979, focused on such program areas as health care, water and sewer facilities, transportation, energy, and communications. At the same time, the merging of the Rural Development Service into the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) in 1978 indicated the prominence of housing loan programs within the Carter rural development strategy. In March 1979, Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland offered additional Federal assistance to State and local governments by establishing State Rural Development Coordinating Committees made up of "appropriate USDA agencies, other Federal agencies, State agencies, colleges and universities, and private organizations." Secretary Bergland also established a USDA Rural Development Coordinating Committee "as a vehicle for coordinating rural development policy and activities within the Department of Agriculture and assisting State committees with their rural development responsibilities." Although the Carter administration stressed the need for a national rural development policy, the Federal approach to rural development policy continued to include a strong orientation toward facilitating efforts by local communities and State agencies, rather than imposing national solutions.

The Carter administration's comprehensive policy and program statement appeared in December 1979 after 2 years of consideration. The new policy goals focused on providing for "basic human needs," full employment opportunities, population management, and "responsible use" of natural resources and the environment. Pursuit of these goals would follow a set of principles oriented toward recognizing State and local priorities and powers, encouraging private investment, developing the capacity of State and local governments to obtain and use Federal funds, and targeting funds "to disadvantaged persons and distressed communities." This new policy thus combined the poverty focus of the Kennedy/Johnson rural policy with the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herbert Hoover</th>
<th>Franklin Roosevelt</th>
<th>Harry Truman</th>
<th>Dwight Eisenhower</th>
<th>John Kennedy</th>
<th>Lyndon Johnson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Marketing Act passed, a bold attempt to improve rural income</td>
<td>Tennessee Valley Authority established</td>
<td>Rural Development Initiative of the Economic Report issued an extensive report on rural poverty</td>
<td>Rural Development Committees organized to help local communities establish new training programs and other activities</td>
<td>Office of Rural Areas Development (USDA) and Rural Development Committee (replaced Rural Development Committees) established to eliminate rural underemployment</td>
<td>Economic Opportunity Act enacted 'war on poverty'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprecedented drought relief legislation enacted</td>
<td>35% of farms electrified</td>
<td>12% of population lives on farms</td>
<td>President established interdepartmental Committee on Rural Development to coordinate Federal rural development efforts</td>
<td>Rural renewal program authorized by Congress</td>
<td>Housing and Urban Development Act passed to improve rural and urban housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% of population lives on farms</td>
<td>26% of population lives on farms</td>
<td>8% of population lives on farms</td>
<td>8% of population lives on farms</td>
<td>National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty (NACRP) organized</td>
<td>National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty (NACRP) organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43% of population lives in rural areas</td>
<td>10,000 miles of Interstate Highway System completed</td>
<td>3.1 million miles of rural roads exist</td>
<td></td>
<td>NACRP publishes The People Left Behind, calling attention to rural poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State and local direction of the Nixon/Ford New Federalism.

Reducing the Federal Role: Fiscal and Policy Restraint by the Reagan Administration

Culminating the Carter era of Federal rural development policy, the Rural Development Policy Act of 1980 required the Secretary of Agriculture to develop national goals and strategies for the achievement of rural development, established the position of Under Secretary of Small Community and Rural Development, and reauthorized the funding of rural development research. The 1980 act acknowledged some lack of national direction and coordination inherent in the 1972 Rural Development Act and required a more carefully focused effort.

Following the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980, however, White House commitment to a federally directed rural development policy evaporated. Within months of taking office, Secretary of Agriculture John Block asked for deep cuts in the Department's budget, including slashing of rural development funds within the FmHA and the Rural Electrification Administration (REA). Although Congress refused to make those cuts, rural development programs still shrank. Federal spending on rural development programs within USDA dropped by over 50 percent during the 1980's.

Secretary Block did create the Office of Rural Development Policy (ORDP), in October 1981, to coordinate the Department's responsibilities under the Rural Development Policy Act of 1980. ORDP announced its official rural development strategy in February 1983 in a report titled Better Country: A Strategy for Rural Development in the 1980's. The Reagan administration's rural policy focused on the benefits to rural areas of general economic reforms already implemented by the administration, including tax relief, regulatory reform, reduced Federal spending, lowered inflation and interest rates, emphasis on international trade, new job-training programs, and the consolidation of categorical grants into block grants for flexible administration by local governments. Specific rural development policies continued the administration's overall theme of increased local and State control of funding and reliance on the private sector to initiate economic recovery and added an emphasis on agricultural policy as a central component of rural development, as well.

An ORDP update of the Reagan administration's rural development strategy in 1985 reiterated the strategy of encouraging private investment and job creation, returning government responsibilities to local communities, training local officials to "meet the challenge of the expanded role of local government," and focusing attention within the Federal Government on the impact of national policies on rural areas. ORDP reported that "much of rural America seems to be sharing in the prosperity and economic progress of the 1980's." ORDP acknowledged some pockets of difficulty, particularly in manufacturing and farming counties, but maintained that a continued national policy of economic growth would bring recovery to those areas as well.

Many rural advocates in Congress still viewed ORDP as a cover for Reagan administration neglect of rural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richard Nixon</th>
<th>Gerald Ford</th>
<th>Jimmy Carter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1969</strong></td>
<td><strong>1974</strong></td>
<td><strong>1978</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presidential Task Force on Rural Development recommends programs for public and private sector</td>
<td>• Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 requires grants to rural communities</td>
<td>• White House Rural Development Initiatives on health, water, sewers, communications, energy, and transportation issued to secure cooperation in solving rural problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1970</strong></td>
<td><strong>1975</strong></td>
<td><strong>1979</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3.7 million miles of rural roads exist</td>
<td>• Economic Research Service reports reversal of rural-to-urban migration during 1970-73</td>
<td>• 99% of farms electrified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 26% of population lives in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Carter White House Small Community and Rural Development Policy articulates rural development goals to provide for basic human needs and full employment opportunities, relieve isolation and control growth, and encourage responsible use of natural resources and the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Departmental Rural Development Committee replaces Rural Community Development Service as coordinator of USDA rural development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1980</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USDA Committee for Rural Development set up in each State to coordinate USDA rural development programs at the State level</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 41,000 miles of Interstate Highway System completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1971</strong></td>
<td><strong>1976</strong></td>
<td><strong>1983</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural Development Service organized to direct USDA rural development programs</td>
<td>• Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976 requires grants to rural communities</td>
<td>• Better Country: A Strategy for Rural Development in the 1980's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural Telephone Bank organized to finance rural telephone cooperatives</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1985</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First Regional Rural Development Center established to carry out regional extension and research for rural development</td>
<td></td>
<td>• A new job-training strategy in 1985 reiterated the strategy of encouraging private investment and job creation, returning government responsibilities to local communities, training local officials to &quot;meet the challenge of the expanded role of local government,&quot; and focusing attention within the Federal Government on the impact of national policies on rural areas. ORDP reported that &quot;much of rural America seems to be sharing in the prosperity and economic progress of the 1980's.&quot; ORDP acknowledged some pockets of difficulty, particularly in manufacturing and farming counties, but maintained that a continued national policy of economic growth would bring recovery to those areas as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1972</strong></td>
<td><strong>1977</strong></td>
<td><strong>1990</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5% of population lives on farms</td>
<td>• USDA's Rural Development Service merged into FmHA, emphasizes rural housing needs</td>
<td>• USDA establishes National Advisory Council on Small Community and Rural Development to give varied groups opportunity to participate in policy and program planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural Development Act signed into law, giving broad authority for rural development programs to USDA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1991</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congressional Rural Caucus organized to emphasize needs of rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>• An ORDP update of the Reagan administration's rural development strategy in 1985 reiterated the strategy of encouraging private investment and job creation, returning government responsibilities to local communities, training local officials to &quot;meet the challenge of the expanded role of local government,&quot; and focusing attention within the Federal Government on the impact of national policies on rural areas. ORDP reported that &quot;much of rural America seems to be sharing in the prosperity and economic progress of the 1980's.&quot; ORDP acknowledged some pockets of difficulty, particularly in manufacturing and farming counties, but maintained that a continued national policy of economic growth would bring recovery to those areas as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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needs. Evidence suggested that the 1981-82 recession had hit rural areas much harder and much longer than urban areas. Moreover, the farm crisis of the 1980's continued unabated in many areas in 1985. Congress refused to continue funding ORDP, and the office was abolished at the end of 1985.

A further reduction of Federal aid to rural areas came with the end of local revenue sharing in 1986. Revenue sharing, begun during the Nixon administration, returned a portion of Federal tax receipts to State and local governments for spending at their own discretion, within specified program limits. The Carter administration had renewed the Federal revenue sharing plan but ended the State component in 1980, as State tax revenues began to increase with inflation and Federal budgets began to rise rapidly, also the result of inflation. Local revenue sharing, however, had continued through the early years of the Reagan administration, helping local governments to support development activities of their own design. Loss of these Federal funds created a crisis for some local governments, forcing reduction of services and curtailment of economic development plans.

The Reagan administration, in 1988, acknowledged the economic difficulties experienced by rural America. Secretary of Agriculture Richard Lyng, who had replaced John Block in March 1986, issued a Six-Point Rural Regeneration Initiative in May 1987, designed to invigorate the Department’s rural policy. The initiatives committed the Extension Service to increase its emphasis on rural education and training, organized Rural Enterprise Teams at the State level to assist communities with business and employment problems, created a Rural Information Center at the National Agricultural Library, increased research on rural development topics, and redirected FmHA Business and Industry Loans toward job creation in communities with high unemployment.

A 1988 report by the Office of the Undersecretary for Small Community and Rural Development noted that population migration had returned to its former rural-to-urban pattern. This reversal reflected the loss of manufacturing jobs and accompanying service opportunities to increasing international competition, and the loss of employment and business opportunities in the farm sector as a result of the farm crisis. Although the overall rural economy had diversified throughout the 1960's and 1970's, the economic troubles of the 1980's indicated that most rural areas still depended on a narrow range of industries.

Secretary Lyng appointed a new National Advisory Council on Rural Development in August 1987, and that body issued its “Final Report to the Secretary” in January 1989. While acknowledging the continued importance of agriculture in the rural economy, the Council noted the need to emphasize the nonagricultural aspects of rural development, going so far as to suggest the Department of Agriculture be renamed the Department of Agriculture and Rural Affairs. The group still insisted State and local governments should lead in rural development work, but also suggested an increased role for the Extension Service and an effort to make the Department’s rural development programs better known on the local level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ronald Reagan</th>
<th>George Bush</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1981</strong></td>
<td><strong>1989</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USDA establishes Office of Rural Developmental Policy (ORDP) to formulate policy and coordinate rural development efforts</td>
<td>• Rural Revitalization Task Force recommends actions to increase effectiveness of USDA rural development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3% of population lives on farms; 97% of farms have telephone service</td>
<td>• Presidential Initiative, Rural Economic Development for the 90's, articulates rural development plans, establishes a Presidential Council and State Rural Development Councils, funds a series of demonstration programs, provides a rural development information hotline, targets programs for “maximum net economic benefits,” and establishes high-level Working Group on Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Advisory Council on Rural Development established to identify rural problems and support rural development policies</td>
<td>• Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 includes rural development title authorizing establishment of a Rural Development Administration in USDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1983</strong></td>
<td><strong>1990</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ORDP report, Better Country: A Strategy for Rural Development in the 1980's, articulates goals to increase local and State control of funding, rely on the private sector to initiate economic recovery, and renew emphasis on agriculture’s role in rural development</td>
<td>• Report of National Advisory Commission on Agriculture and Rural Development Policy, Future Directions in Rural Development Policy, emphasizes diversity, flexibility, cooperation, and strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ORDP closes when Congress refuses to fund it</td>
<td><strong>1991</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food Security Act establishes a National Advisory Commission on Agricultural and Rural Development Policy to address the future of development policy in light of the farm crisis of the 1980's</td>
<td>• State Rural Development Councils pilot program begins, testing effectiveness of greater coordination, flexibility, and local initiative in implementation of rural development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Six-Point Rural Regeneration Initiative issued</td>
<td><strong>1992</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Advisory Council on Rural Development establishes a new citizens advisory panel to help develop policy</td>
<td>• Rural Development Administration receives funding and begins coordination of rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1988</strong></td>
<td><strong>1991</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 75% of U.S. counties and 26% of population are nonmetropolitan</td>
<td>• Remaining States and territories invited to form State Rural Development Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Rural Information Center established at National Agricultural Library to serve as development information clearinghouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cooperation, Innovation, and Information: The Bush Administration Renews the Federal Commitment

Under the new Bush administration in 1989, Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter appointed a Rural Revi-

talization Task Force that recommended 17 specific actions to "enhance the effectiveness of USDA’s rural
development efforts." Yeutter focused on streamlining and targeting rural development efforts, rather than

increasing funding or initiating new programs. In January 1990, the White House released its initiative on

"Rural Economic Development for the 90's." The initiative had six elements: (1) a Presidential Council of

farmers, State and local officials, rural business leaders, and high-tech industry representatives to advise on

Federal rural development policy; (2) State Rural Development Councils to coordinate already existing

Federal rural development programs; (3) a series of rural development demonstration programs, funded

from already existing budget resources; (4) a rural development information and technical assistance

hotline; (5) targeting of Federal rural development funds to programs determined to provide the "maxi-
mum net economic benefits"; and (6) a Working Group on Rural Development within the President’s Economic

Policy Council.

Congress joined the rural development arena again with the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade

Act of 1990, which included a title on rural development. Provisions within this act authorized a rural

development partnerships investment program to support local investment; State rural economic develop-

ment review panels to make recommendations for program funding; and programs to improve telecommu-
nications access for rural communities. To carry out this activity, the legislation authorized a Rural

Development Administration within the Department of Agriculture.

At the end of 1990, a long-awaited report by the Na-

tional Commission on Agriculture and Rural Develop-

ment Policy, mandated by the Food Security Act of

1985, addressed the question of future rural develop-

ment policy. The report emphasized rural economic
diversity; the need for improved information on rural

conditions; the importance of a comprehensive ap-

proach and better cooperation among programs; the

necessity of flexibility, innovation, and experimenta-
tion; the fundamental role of education in rural de-

velopment; and the value of a strategic approach to rural
development policy goals. The new Secretary of Agri-
culture, Edward Madigan, incorporated these recom-

mendations in his rural development strategy report


By early 1992, the Bush administration’s rural develop-

ment policy had begun to take shape. The President’s

Council on Rural America had prepared recommenda-
tions to the President to be released in July 1992. State

Rural Development Councils piloted in eight States

showed promise and the administration planned to

initiate councils in additional States. The Rural Infor-
mation Center at the National Agricultural Library,
established in 1988, had expanded its information

network to incorporate cooperative projects with a

number of Federal agencies. Following negotiations to

secure appropriations, the Rural Development Admin-

istration opened its doors in January 1992, promising

increased coordination of Federal activities on behalf of

rural development.

Uncertain Legacy, Promising Future?

Rural development policy since 1972 has followed a

rather frustrating path, repeatedly reaching a compre-
hensive set of national goals and a coordinated strat-
egy for achieving them, only to find a new set of politi-
cal and economic circumstances as attempts at imple-
mentation begin. Efforts born during the era of Federa-
tal intervention in the 1960’s confronted the New Federal-

alism of the Nixon/Ford administrations, while the
demographic and economic progress of the countryside

was not recognized until the mid-1970’s. The Carter
administration’s support for a federally directed rural
development policy was complicated by worsening
economic conditions and pressures for Federal fiscal

restraint. Almost by default, healthy State economies

and their governments took more responsibility for

carrying out the rural development effort, gaining in

the process the technical and leadership capacity for

implementing programs on their own.

Yet the improved capabilities of State and local govern-

ments confronted another obstacle as the serious reces-
sion of the early 1980’s ended the economic expansion

and population growth of rural areas. At a time when

State and local governments might have implemented

rural development programs and strategies, they faced

falling revenues and rising costs, restricting their fiscal
capacity to pursue rural development. By the time the

Reagan administration acknowledged the economic

problems of rural areas, Federal capacities to provide

relief had been eroded by rising deficits, and the na-
tional economy itself had begun to weaken.

The early 1990’s have witnessed further weakening of

the national economy. The prospects for increased

Federal funding of rural development programs have

not improved. State and local governments experi-

enced fiscal stress from reduced revenues and in-

creased expenses accompanying the 1990-91 recession.

Yet it may be that the 1990’s will present a renewed

opportunity to bring improved State and local capaci-
ties into concert with available Federal programs.
Although economic difficulties have not disappeared, support for Federal funding of rural development remains.

For Additional Reading...


---

True D. Morse: The Link Between Farm Management and Early Rural Development Policy

True D. Morse recognized that, even in farm-dependent areas, farms are part of a broader rural economy. His understanding of both farm management and regional economics coalesced in a vision for rural communities in which technological changes in farming did not necessarily lead to the demise of rural areas.

In 1955, the Department of Agriculture began a pilot rural development program that encouraged local leadership in promoting economic growth. The program was headed by True D. Morse, USDA Under Secretary and leader of the rural development program from 1954 to 1960. The program, which was supported by technical advice and limited financial assistance from the Federal Government, grew from the New Deal Programs and the activities of an agricultural consulting firm, Doane Agricultural Service in St. Louis, MO.

Doane, headed by True D. Morse, provided planning assistance to individual farms. It drew up detailed plats, analyzed soils and productivity, investigated local markets and community structures, and then produced a farm management plan.

Doane began, in the late 1930's, to assist large lending organizations in setting up farm loan programs. The firm conducted regional analyses of farm loan territories. As a result of this work, Morse's understanding of farm management expanded to include farm management within a regional system.

Morse's experiences with farm management and regional analysis converged, forming his vision of rural development. On July 27, 1944, Morse presented a talk, "Rural Community Development," to the Southwestern Institute for Commercial Executives in Dallas, TX. His speech was certainly one of the earliest (if not the earliest) public uses of the expression "rural community development." In this precent speech, Morse discussed many of the issues that would become staples of the rural development program of the 1950's.

Morse began by warning his listeners of the drastic changes that would affect agriculture when the war was over. In particular, he predicted that Southern agriculture would lose thousands of jobs to mechanical cottonpickers. Agriculture was facing a major shakeout that would cause the collapse of many rural communities. However, those communities that planned for the future would have a much better chance of surviving.

Morse called for community surveys that included all physical, biological, social, and economic factors affecting an area. Morse, who saw community development as a long-term process, counseled his listeners that such a time-consuming survey should be undertaken only if the community was strongly committed to putting it to use in a development program. According to Morse, "Nothing could be more fascinating and productive of greater benefit than building a program for a permanently progressive community and then, through the years, molding it to fit the pattern."

Morse's plan linked farming and technological changes in agriculture with rural community development. His plan included steps to optimize farm productivity and rationalize the distribution of credit. In addition, Morse saw the need to diversify farm operations so they would be less vulnerable to market fluctuations. He observed that off-farm labor had become increasingly important to farmers and speculated that diversified farms could absorb much of this labor. He saw what today is known as value-added agriculture as a means of absorbing farm labor freed by technological changes in farming.

Morse also foresaw the need to increase the amount of nonagricultural industry in rural communities, although this was more of an afterthought than a centerpiece of his proposal. Agriculture was still the overwhelmingly dominant rural industry in 1944, but Morse's brief discussion of the role of nonagricultural industry anticipated the expanded approach to rural development in the 1950's.

Morse saw development as more than income growth. He reminded his listeners that the objective of economic development is to enhance the health, recreational, religious, domestic, and governmental aspects of rural life. "Increasing the earnings of the people in an area is only a means to an end, not an end in itself."

Dennis Roth, Historian, Agric. and Rural Economy Division, ERS