University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-1915

Some phases of the rural sociological situation.

Jonas William Boyer 1890-1947

University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Boyer, Jonas William 1890-1947, "Some phases of the rural sociological situation." (1915). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 136.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/136>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

SOME PHASES OF THE RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SITUATION.

SOME PHASES OF THE RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SITUATION

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE

FACULTY OF THE

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

THROUGH PROFESSOR CALDWELL IN CANDIDACY

FOR THE DEGREE

"MASTER OF ARTS"

BY

JONAS WILLIAM BOYER

1915.

To

My Teacher and Friend

Professor Morley A. Caldwell, A.M., PH.D.,

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

This treatise is not intended to cover the whole field of Rural Sociology. It deals briefly with the more important phases of the subject. Perchance many important problems have been omitted which the reader will call to mind. This will go to show that the reader is thinking about the subject, and will be led to consider further the welfare of the rural population.

The Science of Rural Sociology is rather new in consideration, but the oldest of all sciences in practice. The original inhabitants of this world were ruralists, and necessarily social conditions sprang up with them which needed their attention. Although it was not a complex situation, yet it was the beginning of Rural Sociology.

This discussion does not include the "exceptions," either one way or the other, but it aims to consider the average situation, and suggest possible remedies. These suggestions may not meet with the approval of the reader. I would be surprised if they all did coincide with his views. Each person has a right to his views, and I would not try to suppress his views, but on the other hand, it will be a pleasure to the author if these pages should stimulate any to original constructive thinking and endeavor along rural sociological lines.

Before launching upon the partially known seas of rural sociological investigation, I want to give my heartfelt thanks to the farmers who responded so readily, and especially to my Professor who has shown such interest in this discussion.

J.W.B.

CONTENTS.

Chapter I.

The Introduction.....1.

Chapter II.

Are the Rural Districts growing ~~Better~~ or Worse?...7.

Chapter III.

The Liquor Traffic and Rural Communities.....19.

Chapter IV.

The Church and the Country.....31.

Chapter V.

From the Farm to the City.....48.

- Chapter VI.

Rural Education.....71.

Chapter VII.

Rural Organizations.....89.

Chapter VIII.

Scientific Farming.....103.

Chapter IX.

Farming as a Life's Work.....114.

Bibliography.....121.

SOME PHASES OF THE RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SITUATION.

Chapter I.

Introduction.

The field of sociology is not small. The term comes from "socius" and "logos", meaning "companion" and "discourse". Thus "sociology" means "a discourse on human relationships". From this definition, we see how far reaching is this newest of the sciences in formulation, but the oldest in practice. This simple definition of sociology does not give, to some, an adequate conception of what sociology really is. Various definitions have been given. Among the most worthy are: "Sociology is a science which deals with social evils and their remedies", "Science of social phenomena", "Science of the phenomena of sociability", "Science of the order or organization of society", "The science of the forms or modes of association". The first one is too narrow, as it deals only with abnormal society, rather than with both normal and abnormal situations. The other four are too indefinite, and can be misunderstood very easily. The definition given by Professor Ellwood seems to be better for our study, as it is more specific. It is that, "Sociology is the science of organization and evolution of society". But I believe that Professor J.A. Thomson, a biologist, has given even a better definition for this science. He holds that, "Sociology is the science of the origin, development, structure and functions of the forms of association". This last one is clearer than most of the others, and affords us a good statement of

the science that we are now to pursue.

The writer recognizes that many students of sociology do not limit themselves to human associations, but also take animal associations into account, as an aid to their understanding in full the human side of sociology. For our present study, we shall limit ourselves to the human side of the sociological problem, for in it there is ample room for profitable investigation.

Sociology has been likened to the trunk of a tree, while the other sciences constitute its branches. No doubt this is true, for nearly every science in the whole sphere of learning, has a vital connection with, or is built upon sociology. Economics, political science, jurisprudence, religion, ethics, history, philosophy, biology, psychology, metaphysics, language, and nearly every branch of learning conceivable, has a close association to the all-inclusive study of sociology. Just what is the relation of sociology to each of these sciences, we shall not now consider, but the student of this new science of sociology, realizes its importance in the whole field of learning and endeavor.

There are two classes of sociological investigation. The one deals with city problems and achievements. The other with rural conditions and possibilities. Most sociological principles are common to both of these fields, but their application is not affected in the same way. A certain procedure in the city would accomplish much, while the same application in the country would mean sure failure. As each person is different from his fellow-men, so is it in the field of sociology. Each group, tribe

nation and race of people has its peculiar sociology. Therefore we cannot be dogmatic on any point, except in so far as it is most truly applicable to a certain locality. Yet the general sociological principles are applicable to a certain degree to all peoples.

Urban sociology is a great and most interesting study. It takes us to the heart of our American civilization and prosperity, and introduces us to the greatest corruption. Many books have been written concerning urban problems, with marked success for her inhabitants. The effect that publicity has had upon city conditions, is very great, for it directed the attention and serious thought of mankind toward her varied conditions. Public opinion demanded reforms, and reform came. But the city is very far from being perfect. What publicity has done for the city it can do for the country. While urban sociology is a fascinating study, we shall not here consider it, except in so far as it has a direct bearing upon the subject at hand.

Rural sociology is a large subject. Very little has been written on this phase of the great subject of sociology. Thus we have a field in which something might be said or something investigated that will throw light on the rural situation. It is not the idea of the writer to cover entirely the field of rural sociology. Neither is it his purpose to deal very much with the psychological nature of the farmer except in so far as it aids in our better understanding the millions of ruralists, and their betterment along all lines of activity. Therefore, the

subject for this thesis will be, "SOME PHASES OF THE RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SITUATION". Note you "some phases", of this great problem. The writer has selected a few of the problems that seem to him to be the most important, and will try, in this discussion, to give a fair exposition of each of them. Only the great principles that make for rural betterment will be presented.

The rural problems have been exaggerated by some, and minimized by others. Place an object very close to your eye and you cannot see it very distinctly. But place it at a proper distance from the eye, and look at it from the right angle, and you will not only be able to see it, but you will be able to tell its qualities. The farmer has been too close to the object of his study. He fails to see the many problems connected with farm life, and consequently does not and cannot tell what should be the qualities of the remedies that are necessary. Thus he minimizes the rural problems. Yet he is not asleep to all her problems which we shall see later in the discussion. As far as he knows how to remedy certain things he is awake and active. So the main thing for the helper to do, is, to point out the remedy to the farmer, and assist in its application. On the other hand the city people are too far away from rural life to realize that they cannot see the object of their discussion as clearly as they might. Thus the city people exaggerate the rural problems, and because of their misconceptions, the suggestions and plans that they offer for the solution of many farm problems are wholly inadequate to meet the situation.

The urban-ruralite, that is, one who was reared on the farm until about the age of eighteen or twenty, and who then studied agriculture and city life, with an eye single to rural betterment, is the best person to aid the farmer in the many knotty problems that he must face each year. In such a person the farmer will have confidence, and only through such, can the expert hope to attain a great degree of success.

I have not any pet theories that I wish to prove. It is my desire to come to the truth as near as possible, and then try to find some way to interest the farmer in those things. Everything will be said in the same spirit in which I hope it will be received. It was my good fortune first to see the light of day from an old farm house on the banks of Mill Creek, Adams County, Illinois. After a few years of my roaming over those hills in childish pleasure, my parents moved to Missouri. For many years to follow I experienced the hardest of farm work. Then it was my good fortune to have enough grit to work my way through college, and a few more years of post graduate study. Although absent from the farm for a few years, I have not lost my interest in rural development. In fact I have a greater respect for, and interest in, rural life now than I have ever had. Thus we shall not shun rural defects, but picture them as they are and suggest possible remedies. With minds free from urban and rural prejudices, we shall discuss this all important problem, keeping the best interests of all mankind in view.

During the early part of 1915 I sent out 125 letters containing a questionnaire. I sent 75 of these letters to farmers in as many communities, 25 to county superintendents, and 25 to county agents for farmers. These letters went out over three states, namely, Indiana, Kentucky and Missouri. I received inside of a month after I sent them, replies from about two thirds of my letters. Of the 75 sent to farmers, 50 sent replies. Of the 25 to superintendents 16 gave me good replies. Of the 25 sent to county agents for farmers, only 6 answered. This small receipt was due to the fact that, in many counties to which I sent them, there were no county agents. However ten of the letters were returned and no doubt others were placed in the hands of men who were not official county agents. I have carefully gone over all the replies, and made several tables from the contents. These tables the reader will find in the various chapters that deal with things relevant to their contents. In each table A. refers to the farmer's answers, B. to the superintendents, and C. to the county agents. The number of replies far exceeded the writers expectation, and it goes to show that the farmer and those closely connected with rural life are not asleep but awake and active. The reports may not be in accord with special communities in these three states, yet I believe that they give us a fair average of existing rural conditions. The opinions of some of the farmers may be biased in some cases, yet it gives us a sample of their way of thinking. With this review of the situation, we are ready to embark in the launch which will carry us into the good waters of rural simplicity.

Chapter II.

ARE RURAL COMMUNITIES GROWING BETTER?

Chapter II.

Are Rural Communities Growing Better?

The question is asked repeatedly today, "Is the world growing better or worse?" The people are divided on this question. The evolutionist must necessarily hold that the world is growing better, as his chief principle is evolving or progressing upward and not downward. Thus the evolutionists cannot hold that the world is growing worse and be consistent. There are others who hold that the world is getting worse and worse and that the world will soon go to the how-wows. The Christian pessimist believes that he can see the downward course in human affairs, while the Christian optimist can clearly see the great progress that the human race is making. But are there any facts to consider in the case? If so, let us place them upon the witness stand and hear their testimony concerning the progression or retrogression of mankind. One way to consider this question, is to call to the witness stand some reliable men who lived from 30 to 50 years ago, and see what their testimony is regarding the question in hand. Men who have been keen observers of the moral situation for all these years should be competent men to bear testimony in this particular case. Let us call Chas. R. Hemphill, D.D., LL.D. President of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky, to the stand and hear his opinion based upon 50 years of careful observation. As near as I can recall it, these were the thoughts that he presented to his class in Homiletics during the year 1914. "We hear people talk about the good old times away back there, when everybody did good and no one did what was wrong. When

everybody went to church on Sunday, spoke the truth with his neighbor, helped the poor, and did only good. O! for the good old times that our grand-parents enjoyed! Would that we were living in that age again, how different it would be. Yes DIFFERENT it would be. But different in what ways? When I was a boy everyone had wine cellars, and they were not only for show either, for people became intoxicated. The women used liquor, and it was thought not out of place to treat the minister with wines. Often when the minister would leave he would be presented with a good flask of the best of the liquor as a token of their esteem and admiration. In those good old days, murder was not uncommon, theft was frequent and immorality was evident but not frowned upon as it is today. Many things were tolerated then that are outlawed today. Young men, I have noticed many changes in the last 40 or 50 years, and I can testify that the good old times that we hear so much about are only in the thought and that they never had an existence. People are more faithful to the Church and Christianity today than ever before. The liquor question was hardly known then, but now it has already seen the hand writing on the wall. Murder is less frequent according to the population, and theft is entirely under the ban. The moral situation is better today than ever before, and each year I notice decided progress. Consequently, young men, put little stock in the phrase, "The good old times", for it is only a fancy of latter days. The past has been good, the present is better and the future will be still better." Dr. Hemphill is a conservative, and when we know his ability, this statement comes with extremely great force.

It is a recognized fact that the rural districts are better morally than the cities. Ask any brewer where he sells most of his finished products, and he will tell you, "Of course in the city". The farmers are against the liquor traffic. This is evidenced in the fact that the rural communities generally vote "dry" by a great majority. Often the city in a county will go "wet", while the rural vote will be decidedly for the "dry" side. This will be treated in full later. It is sufficient to notice here that the rural districts are in favor of prohibition, and that this sentiment is becoming stronger in the country each year.

Some of my opponents may say that more murders are being committed today than ever before. I answer, yes, but not according to the population. You may see several accounts of murder in the paper each day, but that does not prove your point. Look at the newspapers of 20 years ago, and you will see that their pages are checkered with even more murders than they are today. The public conscience is sensitive to the taking of life, and such news are frowned upon more today than 20 years ago. The number of murders per 1000 population is less than it was many years ago.

No doubt there are more cases of theft brought to light than in past years. This does not mean that more are committed, but I believe it means that more are brought to trial for their crimes. This indicates a higher moral consciousness on the part of our American people. In past years the guilty parties were not brought to trial, but today they must answer for their actions. Morality

is continually getting higher and higher. This indicates progression, and what is true of our country at large is also true of the rural districts.

Are there not more witnesses to be called to the stand to testify regarding the morality of rural communities? The next witnesses will be the farmers themselves, and they ought to know the situation. In table I. page 15, you will notice the results of the moral situation as given to us by the farmers themselves. 36 of the 50 say that the moral condition of their community is better, 10 say that it is worse, while 4 say it is the same. Their judgment covers a period of 15 years. Also, in the county superintendents' report, of the 16 answers, 10 say better, and 6 say fair, while none say worse. Of the 6 letters from the county agents for farmers, 5 say better, and only one says fair. So from these three sources, 51 say better, 11 say fair, 10 worse, and 4 the same. Therefore it is an evident indication from the optimistic tone of these replies, that the moral condition of the rural people is improving very much. When we consider that this report comes from men who are very conservative in their statement of the estimation of their home community, we are ready to give even more attention to their opinion on this subject. If the farmer says that his community is about the same morally, you can count on it that it is better, for his moral consciousness is ever becoming more acute. If he says that it is worse, you may count on that. But if he says that he can see that it is much better, no doubt very great progress has been made in that community. Faults are not overlooked in the country as they are in the city. Thus Moral Progression.

Although the testimony of conservative representatives of many years ago and the conditions that existed then, as on the side of the Christian optimists, yet many hold that the world is no better, and some even say that it is worse. No doubt but that those who hold this opinion are honest in their judgment. One thing they have forgotten to consider this fact, that the moral consciousness of today is far above that of 25 to 50 years ago. Many things were then perfectly alright, but today they are condemned and in some cases outlawed. Some one may say this is contradictory. Yes, it is for those who hold the theory of "The good old times". The reason that people often do not see that the moral consciousness was lower then than it is today, is because there hangs a cloud or mist between the past and present. Thus he sees only the good of the past on this point, and the evil is hidden from his view. May it not be because the good shines the brighter, and thus is seen through the mists of past years? Once a man holds the principle that "The evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones", in the next breath he will proclaim that the world is growing worse in order to prove his theory, of "The good old times". From history and the opinions of old men the greater amount of evidence is on the side of the Christian Optimist.

For instance, take the liquor traffic which was allowed to go free, so to speak, in the early history of our nation, but which is now beginning to be considered an outlaw and a menace to mankind. The nations in Europe in conflict are beginning to banish King Alcohol, and this attitude with

the great strides that are being made in our own land along the lines of prohibition, is evidence enough to show that in this phase of the situation our country is growing better.

Johnson County, Indiana, bears witness to the fact that many years ago, places in the small towns were operated that were a nuisance and a shame to any locality. This went on without the protest of the people in general. The moral consciousness became more acute, and several years ago they were expelled from those towns. Today it is even better, and in this county each year the moral tone of the community, the older citizens say, is getting higher and higher.

In a rural community in Ralls County, Missouri, there was every kind of vice, in the latter part of the nineteenth century. In 15 years or a little more several places of corruption have been expelled, the community is becoming more respectable, and the sentiment is strongly now in favor of things religious and uplifting. Look about you wherever you may, and in the short space of 25 years, you will see the sentiment rapidly changing on many important questions. Politics is getting cleaner because the high moral tone of the country is demanding it. And this is very noticeable in the rural communities. From the report in Table I, the opinion of the farmers is decidedly in favor of the contention that the world is getting better, especially in the rural districts. Let these few instances suffice, to show or point out the upward trend of morality in our land. Let him who cries aloud that the rural communities are getting worse, consider the facts in the case, and he no doubt will come to see the truth of the statement, that

the trend of rural morality is on the upward grade. We can only judge the future by the past, and thus judging, indications point to a better and richer future, than the past has been.

The question for discussion in this thesis is not whether the rural districts are better morally than the city. Everyone recognizes this fact, I believe. From the very nature of the case, the rural surroundings are more conducive to purity than is the city environment. But the point of issue with us in this discussion is, whether the moral condition of the rural community is better today than it was 15, 25 or more years ago. From the foregoing paragraphs, we have seen that in many cases, the moral tone is superior today, and indications are rather for a steady progression in rural communities.

Altho the farmer minimizes the rural problem, yet he is not blind to the fact that there is plenty of room for improvement. He is ready to help in the things that make for moral betterment. To the question "What do you suggest to make the rural communities better morally?" there are various replies. 25 offer prohibition as the best thing for the rural communities, while 44 of the 50 men who answered the question were in favor of prohibition. Others suggested more preaching, and live ministers; others one church for each rural community, more Christian work, better schools, morals taught in schools, and material advantages of various kinds. From these answers we can see that the farmer is not asleep at his job, but that he is awake to his many opportunities of service to mankind.

Table No.I.

Questions.			
A. Moral condition			
of your Comm.	Better-36.	Worse-10	Same-4
1. with 15 yrs ago?			
2. Where teach morals?	Home-20	School and Home-30	
3. Elections today	Better-32	Worse 12	Same -3
and 25 yrs ago?			No ans-3.
B. Moral condition			
of comms in your			
1. county?	High-10	Fair-6.	
2. Where teach mor	Both home and	10 command-	Bible in
als?	school.	ments in	schools-4
	16	schools- 10.	
C. Moral condition			
of comm in your	Good-5	Fair-1.	
County?			
Totals:			
72 letters.	Better-51.	Worse-10	Same-4
			Fair-7.

Table No.I.

Table NO.I. deals with three reports; one from the farmers, another from the county superintendents, and the third from county agents for farmers. Capital letters in the first column indicate from whom the letters were received. A, stands for the farmers' report, B, for the superintendents', and C, refers to the county agents' report.

"Comm" in the report means "community" and "comms" "communities." In this table the present is compared with the past 15 or 25 years. Thus answers are generally in the comparative. With the superintendents and county agents the answers refer to the average rural community in their county.

The question of amusements is attracting the attention of the farmers. Many of the older people seem to think that the young people should act ~~as the farmers~~ are now doing, and they seem to forget the fact that a child is not a small man. Neither is the man a grown up child. The man needs not so many kinds of pleasure as the child. His activity is less, and therefore he can not sympathize with the child in his desire for continual amusements. But today many of the parents in the rural communities, are beginning to see that the child must be active, and that proper amusements must be supplied him by his elders, or he will seek such amusements ~~as~~ are not for his well-being.

Interest creates activity, seldom the reverse. Activity without interest is slovenly done and very little is accomplished. The farmer is becoming awake to his opportunities, and is becoming interested in his farm life. Not only is he taking a deep interest in the physical side of the farm life, but is alert to its mental, moral and religious aspects. The farmer is getting interested in the moral welfare of his community, and activity always follows sincere interest.

Self-satisfaction means degradation and retrogression and ultimate failure and despair. Such is not the case with the venerable old farmer who follows the plow all day, and enjoys the sleep of the just at night. He is thinking about the higher things of life, he is becoming interested in them, and the result of that interest in better things will mean a purer atmosphere for the rural communities.

Supplement.

Professor Wright, in his "Practical Sociology" gives several tables and statistics concerning crime today and many years ago. These tables will be found in chapter XXI. Part VII. under the subject of "Criminology". As far as they go they are alright, but I think that they do not bear the message that their first reading seems to indicate. These tables are taken from penitentiaries and jails and do not represent the entire situation. In some cases they may be too few in others too large. As far as the arrests and convictions are concerned, the conclusions are correct. But this is not all. As I stated in the first part of this chapter, the moral consciousness of our country is a great deal higher now than it was many years ago. In fact it is going higher every year. As the standard is raised, more people are brought before courts, and more are convicted consequently. In times past many things were passed by unnoticed, where now they are contrary to the law and the offender is arrested and convicted. Thus because there are more laws to violate, the number naturally goes higher. If we consider the increase of laws to be violated, I think that we will see that the per centage is not as high as it was several years ago. At one time such things were done, and they were considered alright. But now the offender is brought to answer for his action. Therefore the number of sentences does not necessarily mean that more crimes are being committed today per 1000 population than formerly, but I believe that it means that the moral consciousness of our people is becoming so high, that every year new crimes are

being added to the list, which are not in reality new or more crimes, but simply a recognition of conditions that are not now up to the high standard that has been recently taken.

I think that if these considerations are noticed in the reports of penal institutions, we will see that the moral consciousness of our country men is going higher, and also, that from the very fact of more convictions on record per one thousand population, that the people are demanding a better moral condition. This must necessarily be followed by a lessening of crime in actuality and thus we can conclude that the moral condition of our country is better today than it was many years ago.

This conclusion carries with it the statement that the rural districts are advancing morally. In a report of one of the departments at Washington, I read recently that there was more insanity and crime in cities than in rural districts. If this be so, as it no doubt is, the conclusion that we have reached carries even greater force, for in past years there were more people living in rural districts than today. Therefore I think that we have substantiated the statement that the rural districts are growing better morally.

Chapter III.

RURALITY AND THE LIQUOR QUESTION.

Chapter III.

Rurality and the Liquor Question.

The liquor question is a knotty problem. What would suit one place or community, would not be feasible in another. But one thing we are sure of, and on that basis we begin, and that is, that liquor is not for the well-being of man. We are not concerned so much in this chapter with the harmfulness of narcotics, or the ways of dealing with the problem. To discuss this would mean many chapters. In this discussion it is our desire to see if the rural communities have made any progress in the last few years, and to get their attitude upon this question. Of course the limited knowledge that we have upon the opinions of rural inhabitants, will necessitate our omitting any dogmatic statements. From the evidence that we do have, I believe that we can get a glimpse of the trend of public opinion as it exists in the country, and from these intimations, so to speak, we will probably be able to draw some plausible conclusions. It is our idea to seek out the truth of the rural situation in regard to the liquor question. Therefore we shall lay aside any pet theories concerning this, and pursue a course of reasoning that will bring about conclusions which will be for the betterment of the rural population.

As we have before stated, the evidence that we have in the many tables in this thesis, comes from representative, progressive, and prosperous farmers of as many different communities, from three states of the middle-west, namely Indiana, Kentucky and Missouri. In general these farmers are influential men in their respective commun-

ities, and their answers may therefore be considered representative. Inasmuch as these men are prosperous and progressive, their opinions possess added value. If a prosperous farmer holds that a certain thing is detrimental to his well being or advancement, no doubt it is. For if that certain thing would aid him in his prosperity, then would he not be in favor of it? Therefore, if these prosperous farmers are opposed to the liquor traffic, it will be because the liquor traffic is detrimental to their prosperity, and to the well-being of their fellowmen. From the very fact that a great majority of these communities are already "dry", we can legitimately conclude that the opinion of these representative farmers, is in general the sentiment of their communities.

In Table I, ~~page 26~~ we see that 3 out of the 50 letters received are in favor of the liquor traffic and the open saloon. 15 specifically state, and no doubt most of the other 47 are of the same opinion, that they are most emphatically in favor of national prohibition. 32 of the 50 communities are already "dry", and from this we see that 15 more are in favor of abolishing this traffic. Therefore only three out of fifty are for the open saloon. What does this indicate to the fair thinking person? In the face of such facts, there is but one conclusion, and that is that these rural communities are heartily in favor of banishing the liquor traffic. Of course there may be some ignorant rural communities that have not yet learned the evil effects of narcotics, but these are the exceptions, and do not affect the general rule.

It has been claimed by the minority in some places that the majority has not a moral right to pass such laws detrimental to the ~~farmers~~ liberties. In our American Government the will of the majority rules. Consequently if a community votes "dry", it is the duty of the minority to obey the law. But what is the character of most of the rural population who are in favor of the liquor business. On this we cannot be dogmatic, but I rather think, and I base this opinion on observation, that about half of the rural population who favor liquor are severely addicted to its use, and the other half are friendly to its taste or have special friends who are interested in its production, or distribution. Generally the ones who oppose the "drys" are just the ones who should be deprived of liquor. In the homes that use liquor, often the greatest amount of the trouble comes directly from it. Therefore the minorities that oppose the abolition of the liquor traffic, are less numerous and insignificant in comparison with those who favor a "dry" and pure rural community.

If the women were allowed to vote upon the liquor question, what would be the result in the rural community? Very seldom do we see a woman who desires her sons to become addicted to liquor, nor would she be pleased to have her husband numbered among the drunkards. If woman suffrage were in force today, it would no doubt change the rural sentiment in regard to liquor. Then, where now there is just a majority vote for the "drys", the number would be much greater. Thus the attitude of the female sex must be considered when we discuss this great problem.

It is a recognized fact that the city is addicted more to the use of intoxicants, than is the country. While this is true, I do not lose sight of the fact that there is a great army of city people who strongly oppose liquor. What makes this condition better in the country than in the city? Is it because the country people are better? I rather think not. There is a class of people who are strong for liquor who naturally migrate to the city. In this way the country loses many undesirable citizens, while the city receives them with their own products of legalized saloons. If these men would remain in the country, probably the rural districts would be very little ahead of the city. Yet because of the absence of saloons in the country, a great temptation is taken away, so they have few of the products of the saloon. The city gets its full share of such, and because of these two forces at work, the city is recognized as the center or hot-bed for the liquor traffic.

In the state of Indiana, Johnson County, Blue River Township, in the year 1914, an election on the liquor situation was held. The place had been "dry" for 6 years. The "wets" petitioned for an election, and the County Court granted it. In this township there is a town of 3000 people, and a good outlying country district. The name of the town is Edinburg, a beautiful little place, situated in that part of Indiana where the land is very valuable. The town has 7 or 8 factories, which attract all classes of people. In this election let us notice the difference in the country and city attitudes on this question, even though the election was held during a very busy season.

The day of election arrived. The sun came out clear and the day continued extremely beautiful, except for a few little showers late in the afternoon. Both sides were ready for the fight that comes every two years apparently. Workers were at the polls for both sides, especially the "dry" workers. Both sides hired automobiles to bring the busy farmers to town, for it was exactly in wheat cutting time, and we know that a farmer has little time to waste during that season. It was doubtful which way the vote would go, but both sides were confident. The spirit was running high, yet seldom have I seen an election that was conducted in such a quiet way and with so little hard feelings. Everybody was working quietly and intensely. The farmers were mostly there to cast their opinion, even though it was such a busy time of the year, and when the report was given out, the "drys" won by a majority of 44 votes. Although the feeling was high, many farmers said that it would go alright anyway, while others could not spare the time from their work. Despite the fact that some "dry" votes were not cast, the Township went against liquor. The "wet" side chose this time so it would be impossible for the farmers to come to the polls and vote. Through this very action it is evident that they feared the rural vote, knowing real well that it was "dry". It was claimed by the opposition that every liquor advocate in the entire township voted. Therefore when we count those "dry" votes that were not cast, we can see how much larger the returns for the anti-liquor side would have been. In the campaign, the ruralists were denounced as ignorant of the situation, and therefore would vote "dry". From this one example we see the attitude of the ruralists.

Table No.2.

Questions.			
1. The Liquor	8		
A. question?		"dry"-32	"wet"-18
Conditions.			
2. Wish of Farm-			
ers.		Favor "dry"	Favor "wet" 3.
		47.	
3. What make	National	Preaching-18	
farm better	Prohibition		Union of cha.
Morally?	15		-6
o Anti-liquor			
t suggestions from the Superintendents & Agents			NONE.
al			

Table No.2.

Table NO.2. deals with answers received from the farmers only, in regard to the liquor traffic. "Dry" means anti-liquor, and "wet" means pro-liquor. "Chs" in the third column is for "churches".

Neither the superintendents nor the county agents made any suggestions along the line of prohibition. Consequently in table No.2. only A. is seen in the first small column. The question was not put directly to them, and this may count for their not making any such suggestions. The thought or trend of their answers would naturally be in line with the things that they are especially interested in. The farmers are not at all backward in their open condemnation of the liquor traffic as we can see in this table.

Another fact we must not lose sight of in this Edinburg campaign, and that is that it was fairly estimated that half of the men who voted in favor of liquor, own no property, and pay little or no taxes at all. Yet it was this very class who made the complaint that the taxes were so high because of the absence of the saloons. On the other hand it was proven from the county records that the taxes were then and had been lower for the average of the 6 "dry" years by 5 cents, than it was for the 6 previous "wet" years. This is no much more a striking fact when we know that during the 6 last years a new High School was built in the town, and the city water works was greatly improved. Despite these improvements, the taxes were lower.

All of Johnson County is on the "water wagon", and the reports showed that there were hardly any paupers in the county poor house, where before that time there had been many. Often it is said that most of the inmates of these charitable institutions come from the rural districts. This has been given as an argument for the saloon. But what is the truth of this report? "The Kansas City Star," the paper published for the farmer as well as the city people, has a report from one of the Departments at Washington D.C. to the effect that the theory that there are more insane people from the country filling insane asylums is false. The writer based his conclusion on the reports as sent to his Department from all over the United States. He says that there are a good many more from the cities than from rural districts. What is the cause of this? No doubt the liquor traffic has a great effect on this report, for Superintendents report that in their asylums, liquor causes 60% of the trouble.

The brewers and saloon keepers realize that the rural districts are against their traffic, for they do not want state-wide prohibition. They want "home rule", which means that the city people are afraid of the prohibition vote of the country. In this we realize that there are a great many city people who are against liquor, but I think or know that this class is in the minority, for if they were not, the traffic would soon have to go. The liquor people have said, that if the state votes as a unit on this issue, the "dry" country vote will overbalance the majority city vote that is "wet", and the whole state will go against the liquor interests. In this they acknowledge that they know that the majority of the voters in the state are against them, yet they will work any scheme to have the will of the majority in the state, which is "dry", defeated. In this we have shown that rural districts, by the liquor interests, are considered to be in the "dry" column. This is a strong point for the purity of rural manhood.

It has been argued that the saloon in the city does not affect the rural population very much. And because of this the ruralists ought ~~not to~~ have anything to say about the prohibition issue in the city. But is it a fact that the city and country come into contact very little? No, it is not. There is a very close connection between the city and the country and rightly so. What affects one, in a way, affects the other. If you could build a large high wall around every city, and keep all the corruption in them, then they could say that the country should not have any voice in regard to prohibiting the liquor traffic within their walls. But this is impossible. The city depends in

a way upon the rural districts about her, and necessarily there must be constant and vital connections between them. If there be saloons in the city, it means that the country boys and men will have an opportunity to become drinkers, and many of them will. It is natural for the rural population to oppose that which opposes their well-being, consequently they despise the liquor traffic and vote prohibition.

At Burr Oak, Kansas, a small town of about 500 people, the community used to have saloons. They were banished a good while ago, and it is estimated that that community morally, financially and in every other way is better off by many folds. The larger towns some distance from that place wanted saloons even though the state was "dry". Why? To make the rural communities better? Of course NO. They wanted to make money, and cared little about the welfare of the community and the surrounding country. The farmer does not look as hard at the dollar as the city person, in regard to taxes the farmer would sooner pay a little extra rather than have the high licensed saloon. In Kansas the rural communities are considered strongly in favor of prohibition, while some in the cities are for the liquor traffic.

No doubt but that you will find "boot legging" or "blind tigers" in some places in "dry" territory. Who is at the head of such? Is it the farmer? The city is the place to find such, and inside her majestic walls the liquor gang generally congregates. The farmer despises such illegal selling and stands out strongly for law enforcement.

One thing we must not lose sight of, and that is that the city people have taken the initiative along prohibition lines. It is the few in the city that will come out boldly against the traffic. The majority, yes, the great majority keep still and let the rest fight it out. Therefore we will say that the city person is the leader. But a leader without a follower will not accomplish much. The rural population are ready to follow a good leader in a good cause. So by this conjunction the traffic is made to tremble and finally fall from its high and lofty throne that it has held for these many centuries. Now it is falling for good. For a long time the minds of the country were not awake to the evil in this traffic, but orators and temperance speakers aroused the public, and because of the "white ribbon beau" that the good and faithful women of our land wore, the men are today saved from the tempter as he comes in the form of the sweet drink. When once aroused to the situation, we can count on the American people to right the wrongs that have ravished our beloved land.

From this discussion on the liquor traffic in the rural districts, we have the following conclusions: First, that the country is not asleep to the great moral issues of the day, especially the liquor question. Second, that the moral consciousness of the country is higher than the city. Third, that supposed culture does not insure a corresponding elevation in morals. Fourth, that the farmer may be uneducated from a city standpoint, but that he is wise in fundamentals of life. Fifth, that the farmer is a progressive-conservative, who desires results, and who will not go forward thoughtlessly.

Sixth, that because the liquor interests hate the rural vote it is evident that the farmers oppose their evil trade. Seventh, that the city cannot exist in corruption without transmitting a portion of that to the rural districts. Eighth, that the moral consciousness is increasing in rural communities, and that they will be a great means of helping the city to become purer. Ninth, that the women have had no small part in the banishment of evils from rural and city communities. Tenth, that from the progress that we have noticed in the last 25 or 40 years, we may expect even greater things in the future. Education has accomplished extremely much and with the stress on such, the sentiments of the ones who are now children will mould the nation in a few years to come. That strong pure rural blood that has been at a premium for these many years, will continue to hold that high standard I trust, and never give up till it has lifted other blood to the same level. Then the morality of the country will be on an equality with the city or rather vice versa, and the results will measure to the ideal that visionaries have long held.

Chapter IV.

THE CHURCH AND RURAL COMMUNITIES.

Chapter IV.

The church and rural communities.

When the frontiersmen hewed their way through the thick forests and penetrated the forbidden lands of the wild savage, the church was near at hand. The rank and file went for financial reasons, while the missionaries followed for the sake of humanity and Christ. The first thing for the settlers to do was to build their houses, and then they erected a church in cognizance of their faith and trust in the All Wise Providence. Heroic have her representatives been in those early days, for the needs of the hour required, it. The church has always been—barring the middle ages—the mainstay of civilization. And even during the middle ages the invisible church was equal to the great task of purifying in a way the stained visible church. So in these early days of our American history not a few men underwent much that the teachings of the Bible might be carried to the benighted red men.

This courage was manifested in the early days of our country, and is still going on today in the neglected portions of our continent. In the western states there are thousands of Indians who have never heard the Gospel of Christ, and as many others who have little chance to know the whole story of redemption. In this regard what is the church doing today? Men equal to those who went out a century ago, are giving their lives for these people. Doing this not for the small compensation, but for their love of humanity and their devotion to the Perfect One.

We hear the question asked, "Has the church lost her power in the rural communities?" Why is this question asked, and who asks it? To answer some of these questions is not easy. Let us survey the conditions and see if the problem is as large as it is usually thought to be. In the early days there were few places of worship, the country was thinly settled, means of travelling were very poor, and the people naturally looked to a higher power for help. Even with this circumstance to lead them to serious thought, the people of a newly settled country are usually looked upon as being rather rough and irreligious. The early ministry was as a class uneducated, but in harmony with the surroundings. Thus they were able to lead men in better ways, although that better way would be very severely criticised by the church today. This we saw in the chapter on rural morality of today and of the past. In these early days did the church do her duty? Judging from the circumstances at that time it probably did. But I little wonder, but, what is criticised in the church today was equally condemned by the men of a century ago. Thus with every generation the criticism comes, that the church is not doing her duty. But that duty was different than our duty today. As civilization becomes more complex, the duties of the church become more varied and numerous. This is noticed especially in the rural communities, as they do not have the many opportunities of accomplishing that work through various channels. What is accomplished in the country, the church must do.

In beginning this discussion we must first consider who it is that asks this question concerning the rural church. Does this criticism come from within or without its ranks? No doubt the church has not done her full duty, as that would mean perfection if she could do that. The members of every church realize that they are not doing their entire duty to the community. Thus if this criticism came from them alone it would mean that the church was not self-satisfied but anxious to do more. If the church is anxious to do more why does she not accomplish more? This leads us to ask the question, who offers this criticism against the church, namely that she is not doing her duty? Without further reasoning about it, we realize that the bulk of this stinging attack comes from those who are opposed to the church or from the do-nothings, or from people who want to hide behind this criticism and use it as an excuse from doing their duty toward the church and mankind. With all this has the church lost her power? No! Never has she stood so firmly against the corruption that is widespread in our land, and accomplished so much with the means at her disposal. She has not lost her power. That power is felt in every corner of our land, and when I asked the farmers, whether we could get along without the church, the answers came in strong and firm "NO," and "By No Means"! Hardly any thought that they would wish to see our land devoid of this strong moral force. Civilization, we saw in the beginning, rests on the Christian religion. Thus the church is a necessity.

The rural church condition is peculiar. It is so much the more because very few persons realize what constitutes the church. It is not a mystical organization and it has not untold wealth at its command. What is the church? It is an aggregate of believers in Jesus Christ. The motive of their organization is to lead men to a knowledge of Christ, to better living and to a fuller realization of what the future means. In many rural communities about half of the members are not active in the work of the church. From whence come the bold critics? Generally from those who are doing nothing in the church or from the people who are outside of its organization. Many of the critics do not want to have anything to do with the church, refuse to unite with her in doing her duty, and have no idea of helping the church people to make the community better. How much per year do the critics give toward helping the church do her duty? In most cases not one dollar per year, and often not one cent. Yet they are continually crying "The church is not doing her duty". These people should be the very last ones to raise their voices in condemnation of the great and valuable work that these religious institutions are doing. Therefore about one third of the community is doing the work that the church is accomplishing, while the rest of the community stand back with thier hands in their pockets doing nothing and finding fault. The real church is doing her duty nobly. The fault is with those who are on the outside. They are the ones who are not doing their duty. This is where the guilt lies in

the rural church situation. From these the criticism comes with a feeling of malice, while from the Christian it comes with an earnest desire for better work. If the people outside of the church were doing as much as the people in the church, there would be no rural church problem. But it is a problem because the great work has been placed upon the shoulders of one third of the community rather than upon the whole community.

But there is a rural church problem. In many rural communities where there ought to be only one church there are often two or more. This is a ~~gr~~evous fault no doubt, with the rural situation, but there is no use worrying about it. It is useless to criticize and condemn the men of a century or more ago because of this doubling of the number of churches in one rural community. If you remember, this took place in the "good old time". Then it was in a way alright but now it is severely condemned. The thing for a community to do where there are two or more churches, is, to try to unite them in work if not in organization. I would advocate a union of organization where it is possible. But this is not possible in every case, as each of the congregations may have convictions on doctrinal points that they would not be willing to surrender. Therefore the union would be only temporary and the final result might be very disastrous to each of the churches. Thus the work of the community religiously would be greatly decreased, and the object lost. Therefore great care should be taken regarding church union.

The main differences between Religious Denominations is not in doctrine, but in church government. Whenever a great church controversy sprang up between two Denominations most generally it is one of means or ways of doing things rather than points of doctrine necessary for salvation. When a community becomes so interested and worked up over such an affair, invariably they lose sight of the great needs of the community, and only the unimportant things are tended to as a result. Generally it is characteristic of the non-church members to assist in the quarrel, and thus cause the church to neglect her duty to her locality. After they have done this, then they criticise the church and point the finger of scorn at an organization that is missing its calling. When I speak of such differences in a single church, or between two churches, I realize that my remarks refer to every rural community known to mankind. Fusses and strife are known to every church. While it is an evidence of discord among them, at the same time it manifests the fact that the people are thinking, and often better work is accomplished when concord reigns once more. The continual strife between the church members and the non-church people constitute the greatest menace in the rural localities in keeping the faithful few from doing the great work of the church. Let the community give the church organization fair play, help her in the work that they say that she ought to do, and the problem will not be nearly as great as it is considered today.

It is said that the rural church problem can be very easily solved on paper, but not in actual experience. This is partially true, but not complimentary to the rural communities. It can be solved in a community if the people want it to be solved. So the question is, to get the people into the right attitude toward all churches. More of Christianity and less of churchanity or denominationality will simplify matters very much. Take for instance a community where there are two churches of different denominations. Let us call them Presbyterian and Methodist in this first community. In a second community are found churches of the same denominations. In the first community the Presbyterians are more numerous, and in the second community the Methodists. My plan is, to have the stronger church take over the smaller body of believers, and in this way form one strong church in each rural community. Of course this would not do very well unless the smaller denomination was willing for the union. Back in "the good old times" the spirit was such that two churches were built in the same community. The one often was built to spite the other denomination. But today we are hearing much about the unity of churches, not only in rural communities, but also in the cities. The way to accomplish this worthy object in rural communities, is, to convert the minister first and let him proclaim union from every point of view. By his continual advocating this union of forces the opinion of the public will be gradually changed, and the result accomplished in the near future.

By a union of the church forces in rural communities, money would be saved, and the people would secure better service from the ministry because they would be in a position to demand better men. Another result would follow, and that is the fact that the forces of the whole community would be centralized. And we know the good results that have come from centralization of various things. The time of the community could be utilized in good work, rather than spent in useless strife and argument. Church differences would cease to be the main thought, and the similarities in their doctrines and ways of doing God's work would receive most of the attention.

For such a united church in the rural community, I would suggest the name, "The Union Christian Church". This very name suggests power and strength, and the name would not be misleading. After many years, when all the churches in our land could be reconciled in this way, the name "Union" probably could be dropped. Then the church of God would be known as, "The Christian Church". There are denominations known by various names and titles who have rebelled against the older denominations, and because of this attitude, they cannot bring about union among all denominations. If, instead of beginning another denomination, they had worked quietly among their fellow men and advocated the union of the churches, today we might have had union. Therefore all existing religious bodies must work together from now on to attain the goal of church union.

Table No.3.

Questions.			
A.			
1. How is the Lord's day regarded?	Very sacred-20	Disregarded-20	Day of frolic-10
2. How often preaching?	Full time chs-10.	Half time chs-8.	1/4 time chs-24. No ans.-8.
3. Where are the full time chs?	In towns of 2000--7.	In rural comm-3.	
4. % of comm ch members?	25%-5.	50% 25.	60-80%-20.
5. Get along without chs?	No-46.	Yes-"but"-2	Partially-2.
6. Minister's salary.	\$2500/--2.	\$1200-1800-4.	\$800-1100-22. \$700&less- No ans-14. 8.
7. Suggestions for moral betterment?	More preaching-18. Live preachers-15.	Union of chs-6.	Real Christianity-16.
B.			
1. Is the ch doing duty?	Not at all-11	Yes -3	Partly-2
2. Comm get along without ch?	Yes 1	No-15.	
3. Where teach morals?	Both home and school.		Bible also.
C.			
1. Country get along without chs?	No-6.		

Table No.3.

As in previous tables, "chs" is for "churches", "ans" is for "answers", "comm" is for "community". A. B. and C. in the first column are used as in former tables.

With two churches in a community, the criticism comes that she is not doing her duty. Where there is only one church to a community we hear the same complaint. But what do the critics of the rural church want her to do besides what she is doing? Do they want her to take the lead in all the progressive agricultural, political, economical and other phases of life? To this I say very emphatically. NO! It is the duty of the church to lead men to know Jesus Christ as their personal Savior. She was not intended by the Great Founder to preach any other gospel, except the Gospel of the Grace of God. In every community there are other buildings for the public, such as the school house and the township high school. In these buildings let the farmers meet for their work other than the church work. Let this work be apart from the work of the church, but the same men who are active in the church may be the leaders in these progressive policies along secular matters. The line must be drawn sharply between spiritual matters and secular matters, if the most is to be accomplished in each of the fields.

~~Rural~~ benevolence is worthy of our attention. The same principle applies both to city and country. If a person helps the poor as an individual, the giver receives the praise for it. If the gift is placed into the hands of the benevolence committee of the rural church, the Head of the church even Jesus Christ will get the praise for the gift. I have seen this done in many cases, and I firmly advocate that each church have a committee that

will receive the gifts of individuals, and give them out in the name of Christ. In this way the poor will feel grateful to the church and Christ, rather than to any individual. If it is the desire of any person to keep secret what he is doing in this regard, let him give what he wants to through the committee for certain persons and the committee in the name of Christ will see that the proper parties receive the donation. This will systematize the giving in a way, and will elevate the church and her work in the eyes of the community. If this is done much of the criticism that is directed against the church will cease, and the problem of the poor in the community will not be so great. If this is done it will be surprising to see how much Christian people are doing in the benevolent way.

Each person has an opportunity to unite with the church if he so desires. If he does not unite with the church and help her to do her duty in seeing after the poor of the community, he has no right to criticise her work or lack of work. Even though he feels no responsibility in regard to church work, nevertheless it is his duty to help the poor of the community. The fact that a few earnest people have banded themselves together to better the conditions of a community, does not place upon them the whole work of that community. They are held accountable only for their share. The rest the non-church members or people are responsible for, and if they neglect their duty, they have no reason to criticise.

In Table 3, page 20, you will see that to the question "Is the church doing her duty?" the answers come, from the County superintendents, "Not at all". Of the 16 letters received, 11 say "Not at all", while 3 say "Yes" and 2 say "Partly". To the question, "Could the rural community get along just as well without the church?", the answer comes nearly with unanimity, "No". Thus we see that the farmers and villagers are not satisfied with the work of the church, probably because they do not fully realize what is the duty of the church, but that they are cognizant of the fact that they could not get along without the great moral and spiritual influence of her presence and work.

In this same table you will notice that of the 50 communities heard from, 10 have full time churches, 8 have half time, while 24 have preaching only once per month, and 8 gave no answer at all. The very fact that 8 men did not answer this question is evidence to show that many ruralists have not a deep interest in the affairs of the church, even though they may be vitally interested in the uplift of their community. Of the 10 full time churches, I learned that they were in small towns. Thus the rural districts do not benefit especially from this good part of the report. All the other communities have preaching only half time or fourth time. From this we see that the country gets very little preaching in comparison with the city people. Each rural community can, if it will, afford a full time church, but this can only come as the ruralists decide to do as much for their religion as did

the Hebrew people of old. This means that they are to give at least one tenth of the net income. This to my mind is the solution of the rural financial church problem. Then salaries equal to the expectations of the community concerning the minister can be paid. Instead of some \$500. and \$600. men, the least will be \$1000. or even more, and the community will be the recipient of worthy service. (See Table 3, page 40, for particulars).

The country church does not need much more along the line of organization, but more life and interest in the organizations that they already have. In many places all the time is taken up in the committee meetings, and nothing is done to carry out their minute and all-inclusive plans. I think that the rural church in general is comparatively free from too much of organization. This is a great fault of the city church. More life in what we have is a good principle to follow in church work.

The very presence of the minister in the country has a wonderful influence over the lives of men about him. It is estimated that 95 % of the ministry come from rural districts. Although the city looks upon the country church with contempt in many cases, yet it is from these rural churches that she gets her strong ministry. Thus the rural church work is not in vain after all. We may say that it is accomplishing even more along some lines than the aristocratic city church. The minister through the church is creating a sociability among his people that is of great value to the happiness and welfare of the young and old alike.

The minister has often been severely criticised for leaving the rural church to become pastor of some large city church. He cannot be criticised in this at all. That is, the criticism is not always just. It may be that he has a family to educate or other financial burdens that must be seen after, and therefore a greater salary is needed. On the other hand he may be looking for greater opportunities for work, and because of the great corruption in the city, it affords him a better chance for strong constructive work. The farmers lose sight of the fact that most ministers have had to go to school for a long time to become able to preach the Gospel, that a great expense was incurred thereby, and because of their fitness for life's work, they should be recompensed accordingly. By paying good salaries the rural churches can keep strong men in her pulpits.

The rural church makes the community more prosperous than it would otherwise be. This is proven by the fact that the most prosperous lands are the ones where Christianity has held sway for many centuries, or is fast taking hold of the people. But does a prosperous rural community insure high morality and spirituality--that is, a corresponding state of affairs?. What does history prove? Greece, Rome, Israel, Babylon and other nations have been the lowest morally when they were the highest outwardly and financially. We cannot deny that each has a great bearing on the other, yet can there be a high morality without Christianity? No, they are united. But morality and prosperity do not go hand in hand, as has been illustrated from the pages of history.

Many recent inventions and improvements have been a great stimulus to the rural church. The automobile the good roads, the inter-urban lines and other means have greatly increased and ~~diminished church attendance~~ as the case may be. In one community it has taken some people to town to church, while in others it, that is, the modern modes of locomotion- has caused or helped people to go who otherwise could not go so far to services. I realize that many say that the automobile is going to ruin the church because so many go out for pleasure riding at that time of the day. But to be truthful we can hardly say that these improvements and inventions are detrimental to church attendance, but I believe that they will be a great means for making the rural church what it ought to be. I predict that in a few years, the flying machine will be as common as the automobile, and then it will be a pleasure on a hot summer day to fly to church. Distance will not mean much then to man, and the added pleasure that the trip brings will encourage the ruralist to be in attendance at the public worship on the holy day.

The bone and sinew of our country to a great extent comes from the farm. I do not say all, but I do think that a majority can claim that they first saw the light of day from some obscure farm dwelling, and grew up amidst the smiling and fragrant foliage of rural possessions. At one of the great missionary conventions of the Presbyterian church, the question was asked, "How many were reared in the rural communities?" The answer was surprisingly greatly

in favor of the country. About 90 % of 1600 delegates expressed themselves to the effect that they were reared on the farm. What was evident in this gathering, we may feel sure will be partially true along other lines of activity. The farmer in many cases looks ignorant and rude, but back of ~~that appearance~~ you will find a mind intelligent above the bright looking face that secludes the stunted mind of the city people who have not taken the proper care of themselves. The farmer has received his training from some good old people in a country church where truth is emphasized rather than the form or appearance of the service. These great principles that he learned while in the rural community, he carries with him to the city, and there he lends a helping hand to those who are trying to lift the city higher morally and spiritually. The farmer receives some of his best advice from the city people, while the city receives some of its best advice from the country.

The rural church problem is a large one, and we have ~~just begun~~ to discuss the many peculiar situations. Yet this is all the space that we can give to it now. To every problem there is a solution. In the gospel that the church preaches most of the solutions lie. Therefore we do right in laying great stress upon the importance of the rural church problem. From these few statements concerning this great subject, I trust that the reader has been interested enough to take issue with me on some points, and that they will be the means of stimulating his thought along rural church betterment.

Chapter V.

FROM THE FARM TO THE CITY.

FROM THE FARM TO THE CITY.

Why do the boys and girls leave the farm and go to the cities to dwell? This question has been variously answered, and many of the reasons or views presented are very unsound and erroneous. This is a vital question in rural sociology. If we can find out why the young people are leaving the farm, we will be in a position to select the remedy that will right matters.

No doubt there is a misconception in the minds of many in regard to what country life ought to be. There are some persons who would like to make the country like the city, but this would be impossible we readily see. It is useless to try to cut the rural cloth over the city pattern. There is a distinct kind of life for the city people, and another for the country folk. The sooner this distinction is realized by both the farmer and the city people, the sooner more and better progress will be made in the field of rural sociology. The city cannot be considered in this discussion, except in so far as it bears directly upon the rural conditions. It is a twisted idea to think that the city people have all the conveniences and the farmer has very few. While the average farmer lacks many conveniences that he could have if he thought so, yet when we look at the real condition of affairs I believe that we will agree that they are about equal. Although we will not try to give all the good qualities of farm and city, and at the same time point out the many defects of each, yet we will mention a few of the most important and fundamental.

The conveniences of both the city and country are many. The handicaps are likewise many we shall see. The following constitute a partial list of the conveniences of the farm:

1. Plenty of good fresh air for all.
2. A good play-ground for the school children.
3. The child has a better opportunity for exercise, and recreation than have the city children.
4. Less chance for disease to spread in the country, because of the little contact between the rural population.
5. The rural child looks upon God as the Author of all things, and their helper and friend.
6. More real liberty in the country than in the city.
7. The great chance for the sport of hunting in the country. This is denied the city people, except by the good grace of some old farmer.
8. Vegetables can be raised in the country, while they must be purchased in the city, and then often they are wilted and of a second grade.
9. There is little noise and bustle in the country.
10. The moral conditions of the country are superior to the conditions of the city.
11. The parents in the country have more time to give personal attention to their children than have the city parents.
12. Less of temptations in the rural districts.
13. The serious side of life is emphasized rather than the frivolous side.

The following references are only a few of the city advantages over the rural districts. It is impossible to enumerate all for either country or city. Thus we shall only consider a few of the most important.

1. The city has better schools than the rural districts.
 2. The city must buy cold storage eggs and other things that are not fresh. This is the best that they can do. This means especially the average of the city population. (City disadvantage).
 3. The street car, automobile, "jitney" bus, and other conveyances make the city travelling very fine.
 4. The electric light, the gas light, and water system add to the city's attractiveness.
 5. Good theatres & high class entertainments are a good and great attraction in the city.
 6. The church service in the city is so much better than the rural church work apparently. Good ministers fill the pulpits, and the services are very attractive when compared with the rural churches.
 7. The social conditions of the city tend to polish those who desire to be polished and who have the social standing to begin with. From a literary stand-point the city is far ahead of the country.
 8. Mankind rejoices to be in a crowd usually. The city gives them this opportunity.
 9. The aesthetic taste of the city child is superior to the uncultivated taste of the rural child.
- Of course in all these things, we have the exceptions.

From the preceding consideration of the city and rural conveniences I believe that we see that both have their advantages. But enough has not been said to show the relation of these conveniences to the movement "from the farm to the city". The farmer does not realize his good estate. In so many ways his condition is inviting to the city people, and it is no wonder that we hear of a movement known as the, "back to the farm movement". Many city people are becoming tired of those things that attracted them to the city, and they are coming back to their "first love"--- the farm.

We acknowledge the advantages that the city has over the country, and are proud of the fact that the city people have been interested enough in the welfare of mankind to make such possible. In fact they could not do otherwise very well, for their own interests were often the means or causes of their good actions. Some of the city advantages cannot be given to the country. Also some of the rural advantages cannot be bequeathed to the city. Such is an impossibility because of the very nature of the city and of the country. For instance fresh air in the country is conducive to health, while the crowded conditions of the city with her many large factories belching forth volumes of smoke and gases are far from sanitary and are detrimental to the health of her citizens. We recognize that all parts of a city are not this way. When you get far enough out of the city, I mean at the edge of the city, where such is not the case, you are almost in the rural

community rather than in the city. The city boundary line or city limits we consider the dividing line between country and city. In the study of sociology, towns of 2500 or less are considered rural communities, while places of more than 2500 are termed cities. It is hardly necessary to take into account the advantages for both city and country of contiguous portions. These balance one another. We are concerned with the real country and pure city.

The rural school is far behind the up-to-date city school. This is a recognized fact and need not be considered now. While the rural school has been poor in teachers and equipment, it has started into life some of the greatest men that the world has ever seen. This probably is so, not because of the fact that they began in the rural school, but they became great despite the fact that they had a poor beginning in the rural school. What relation has this to the tendency of the farm boys to leave the farm? It means that the country boys are anxious to secure an education, and they must go to the city to secure that. Today the township high schools are replacing the poor rural school houses. The result will be manifold. The equipment will be better, and the character of the teachers very greatly improved. Thus about four communities will have a central meeting place, and the activities will accomplish more because they are centralized. This will tend to keep the boy on the farm for four more years. If during these four years a great amount of agriculture is taught, the boys will come to realize that farming is not a common task, but a dignified work, - perchance a calling.

There is not doubt but that the farm boys lose sight of the many and varied advantages of the farm life and see only her dark side. Further that they do not behold the disadvantages of the city, but see mainly her inviting conditions. Looking at the city from this angle the youth of the country is induced to leave the farm and take up work in the cities of our land.

Modes of travel in the city are superior to that of the country. This looks fine to the average country boy. He thinks that he will be able to get a fine automobile when he gets to town like the other city people. Also that it will be a great joy to him to ride in carriages and street cars. Whenever he wants to he can go a long way for only a nickel. The city is ahead of the country along such lines of activity. But what have we in the country today? A few years ago there were no rapid means of conveyance. Only now and then some rich farmer would get an automobile. The great majority were left to walk or ride horse-back or in big wagon, etc. if they wanted to go any place. How is it now? Many of the farmers have fine automobiles, and as a result of these, the roads are being greatly improved every year. Inter-urban electric lines are beginning to become common in many states. Other means of locomotion are better than they have ever been. All this is fine, but the city is superior to the country, and the youths of our farms are led to the cities in order that they may enjoy these conveniences. This is only one of the causes of the migration to the city. Rural conditions in this regard are becoming better, and will be a great means of keeping the boys on the farm.

The luxuries of yesterday are the necessities of today, it has been said. This is no doubt true. Great strides are being made along such lines, and each year, it seems, greater progress is made. The city conveniences, such as lights, baths, car lines, "jitneys", water systems, good telephone systems, doctors near at hand in case of sickness, and other conveniences make the city a very attractive place for the young of our land. They see, I repeat, the bright side of the city life. But what is the condition in the rural districts? It is not as bad as is generally supposed. In some places the farmers are getting the electric current from the city, and in this way they are as fortunate as the city people. At Noblesville, Ind. Hamilton County, the farmers near the city and for some distance out are receiving the city current of electricity and are extremely proud of this city convenience. It was in the past a city convenience but soon it will be common in the rural districts. Many farmers have placed a water system in their home, and you would feel as if you were in the city should you visit them. Along the lines of conveniences the farmer is waking up, and a revival in this regard will tend to make the farm more attractive and thereby hold the boy for the farm.

The city has many other attractions. Thus the shows, theatres, saloons, billiard rooms or parlors, and evil places of amusement are a great attraction to the country boys. The double standard of morals that is recognized in our land is the cause of many boys leaving the farm to go to the city, and there waste their vitality and money and brains on things that profit less than little. The rural

districts are not entirely void of many such things, yet their absence in the country is conspicuous, I am very happy to say. I am here speaking of the evil attractions in the city. Of those attractions that are elevating and beneficial in the city I have nothing to say, except words of praise. The rural population are deprived of them now, but through the modern means of locomotion they are brought very near to the door of the farmer. The boy in the future can work on the farm all day, and instead of driving the horses to town at night to attend a show, he can get into his automobile and enjoy the drive to the city as well as the show. To my mind this is one of the greatest means of keeping the boy on the farm.

The polish that the city life affords to all who sincerely enter her walls is of great importance in leading the young to adopt the city as a place of residence rather than the backward country habits. This might not apply to some rural communities, but I think that it does to the average rural community. Where there is polish in the country, I think that we will find that it came from the city. The city and country are closely united we see, and this result is a good one, if it tends to make the farmer an uplifting force, rather than big-headed as it does in so many cases. The literary attainments of the city are gradually being given to the rural districts. Thus in the distant future there will be not such a great difference between city and country people, for their interests will become more and more similar.

Table No.4.

Table showing the causes for leaving the farm,
as presented in the letters that the writer received
from the farmers, county superintendent and county agents.

Questions.

A.			
Men satisfied	Yes-30	No-15	School
1. on the farm?			reasons-5.
2.			
Many boys leav-			
ing the farm?	No- 30	Yes-14	No answer
			-6
3.			
Why do boys	No answer	Better salaries)	Not needed
leave the farm?	-32	-10	-4
		Attractions	-10
4.			
Wives and girls	Yes-35	No-10	Toleration
satisfied with			-5
farm life?			
5.			
Can have city	Yes, if money	No-13.	
improvements	-37		
on the farm?			
6.			
What make rural	Better	Schools	Amusements
comm' better?	Roads-6.	-14	-15.
B.			
Many boys leav-			
ing the farm?	No-10	Yes-6.	
2.			
Get rich on			
the farm?	Yes-13	No-3	
3.			
What make rural	Better schools)	Farm attract-	
comm' better?	-8	ions-5	Clean amuse-
			ments-6.
C.			
Ought there be	Yes-3	No-1	"Stay on farm"
'movement,"back'			-2.
)))'to the farm?			
2.			
Farm more	Better bldgs!	Better schools)	Roads-
attractive?	-3	-3	-2.
3.			
How farming			
for life's work?	Good-6.		

In table No.4. you will notice a summary of the answers that I received from the farmers,superintendents and county agents. Abbreviations in this table are similar to those in former tables. An examination of this table will give us an idea of the average opinion of the farmers in three of the Middle West States.Of course this opinion is not absolute,but it is only representative.

The tone of table No.4 is very optimistic,I think. The farmer is not as dissatisfied as some people would try to make us believe. To the first question on page 57 you see that 30 say that they are satisfied with the farm life.15 say that they are not satisfied,and give as a reason in 5 instances, that they want to go to the city because of the good schools there. The rural schools are getting better,and this objection to the rural life may become very small later. The second question shows us that not nearly as many boys are leaving the farm as some think. 30 say that very few are leaving the farm. 14 say that quite a few are leaving,while 6 do not even answer the question. Go to the rural districts and enquire whether there are enough boys remaining on the farm, and I think that you will in most cases receive the reply in the affirmative. This has been my observation in many rural communities. Of course in harvest time a few extra hands are needed,but this cannot be considered in the question. They could not afford to be on the farm all the year for that little amount of work in the summer. The superintendents report in this same table under B-1. that not so many boys are leaving the farm. In A-3 we see that many leave because they are not needed at home.

Are the women and girls satisfied with farm life? 36 say "Yes" 10 say "No," and 5 say they are satisfied because they have to be. That is they tolerate the farm life, but long for the city and her pleasures. I think that this is a good average of the situation among the women on the farm. The most of the women are satisfied with farm life, and they enjoy it cares and pleasures. Many are not satisfied, who would not be satisfied in any place you put them. They are always groping after the unattainable in life and of course never reach it. Those who tolerate the farm usually are making little success on the soil, and would make less success if they should go to the city. It is no doubt true that the lives of many farmers' wives are made nearly unbearable. This is not because of the fact that they live in the country, but it is this way because of the character of their husbands. There are two sides we know to every thing. If the boys go to the city, you may count on the girls following, because the former will call the latter to make their homes complete.

Best I forget this one thing, I will mention it now. In former years the farmer had to go to the city to get his mail. Naturally he could go only now and then so he did not get his mail very often. How different it is today. The rural free deliveries have completely changed this situation, and now we get our mail at our doors or gates every day. The parcels post system is working exceedingly well for the benefit of the farmer, and it is going to make him more prosperous.

Many of the girls are leaving the farm because the homes in which they live are not homes, they are only houses. Where love abides you will find a home, where strife is wont to linger there will be little of real home life. Many boys leave the farm because of the fact that they have no real home. The reader can see what I mean in this paragraph, and it will be unnecessary further to consider this phase of the subject.

I must refer to a point connected to the former. Take a community where the average farm dwelling is good, but a few are poor. While a distinction may not be made between the young people because of this fact, yet in reality that girl who lives in a poor old dwelling has not equal opportunities with the rest of the girls. This will not affect the chances of the boy doing well. But it does greatly affect the chances of the girl for securing a companion in life. I have seen this in life and can bear witness to the fact that the girl who dwells in a poor house in the country is not popular with the young men and may become disheartened and choose a companion who is far below her standing and character. Therefore it is the duty of every farmer to fix up his dwelling as much as possible in order that his daughters may have a fair chance in life. Whether this is right on the part of the young men or not, I will not here say. What we are concerned with is facts, and when we see the facts in this case I believe that every fair thinking man will try to make his home in the country attractive. Then his daughter will have an opportunity equal with others.

It is the general opinion of many parents that the son should take up the same kind of work that they are doing. This is a very erroneous idea in their part. The fact that a man is a carpenter, does not necessarily mean that his son should be a carpenter. So also with other professions. That a father made a success in a certain line of business, does not insure success for his son. It is invariably the case that where the father is very successful the son is likely to rest upon his achievements while he himself will be a successful failure, if I may so term it. Therefore a farmer should not be disappointed at all if some or all of his sons leave the farm and go into the professions of life. The boy may not be suited for farm work, and should he remain on the farm he might make a complete failure.

In Northern Missouri near Hannibal, there lives a settlement of Germans who still have preaching in German. In that community or near it there is an academy called "Van Rensselaer" which takes the students through the twelfth grade. In this German community there were two boys of strong parentage and strong physiques. These two boys decided that business should be their life's work. They went to the academy, then to college, then to the University Of Illinois. Today one is drawing a large salary in an insurance company, while the other is the head of the agricultural department of one of the Western state universities. We will agree that this was a good move on their part. Had they remained on the farm, they might have been very successful, but in their present po-

sition they are privileged to exert a greater influence upon the well being of the people with whom they come in contact. These boys were not needed on the farm, and why should they have stayed there to accomplish a little in life when there is plenty of room at the top.

In this community where the academy is established, about 25 years ago, a young man decided to leave the farm and go to the city. He did not leave the farm to find a job that meant little work; but he went to the city to succeed. Whenever a boy goes to the city to have a good time, or to find work that takes very little energy, the chances are that he will not be a success. This young man from Rensselaer, Missouri, went with an idea of doing right and making a success in life. He went to work with the Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company in St. Louis, Missouri. His work was the very lowest on the machines at first. He did that faithfully and was promoted from time to time, till his salary was beginning to give him an opportunity to do greater things. The opportunity came, and he seized it. Other opportunities came and he was not asleep to the advantages that they afforded him. Success after success came his way---not by luck--but through hard work and clear insight and sound judgment. After a period of 25 years he has accumulated around a million dollars or more. In dollars and cents what a success he has been! On the farm it seemed that he had no interest in anything of that nature--that is of farm work. Had he remained on the farm he might have been a failure. Who will say that it was not well for this young man to go

to the city and work out the destiny that a higher power had planned for him? I hold the principle that the parent should advise with the children and try to help them to choose the work that God wants them to do. Therefore you see that I hold to the principle that for every man God has a peculiar work in life. I firmly believe that if he honestly seeks that work God will help him find his calling, and he will be a success in the eyes of the Infinite One. Also I believe that if a person seeks out his life's work without taking God into account, he may not find his work, and if he does not, there will be a likelihood that he will be a failure in that work. I realize that many of the readers may not agree with me in these last few statements, yet each has a right to his views. I only wish that the reader will conscientiously consider them, and try to see if they are what the writer claims them to be.

I might give instance after instance to show these principles as they have affected the lives of people, but that is unnecessary at this point. The principle is clear and reasonable I believe. I also might mention other country boys who have gone to the city and made a success, but that too is unnecessary. Look about you, and no doubt but that you will point to many successful men in all the walks of life who once lived on the farm. When we see that prosperity has attended so many of the boys who have left the farm, we cannot help but hold the principle, that if the boy wants to go into business or one of the professions let him go and help him to reach his ideals.

While many boys leave the farm to better their conditions financially, socially, educationally, and from the standpoint of pleasure, yet many are directly or indirectly driven from the farm life. This sounds unreasonable, nevertheless I believe that I can prove the point, by the experiences of young people that I have closely observed. I realize that it would be better if many boys would take the advice of their parents, and stay on the farm. But why is it that these parents have such little control over their children? Is it not because of the fact that their dealings with their children in infancy and childhood caused the children to mistrust them. Having this idea of distrust in their minds, it is then natural for the child to turn a deaf ear to the advice of his parents. Thus when advised to remain on the farm, he thinks that they are deceiving him and decides to go to the city. The point that I am making here is that the parents should so conduct themselves that the child will have the greatest respect and regard for their advice. Then it may be that the parents will advise the child to enter some other work or profession, rather than remaining on the farm. I have seen this course pursued- that is the thoughtlessness of parents- and as a result four out of six boys of one family have gone into other professions.

We learn from the psychology of the child that the time to begin training him is at birth. If you want an evil character begin training him from infancy in that direction or neglect to train him. I believe that the neglect of training is causing many children to go astray. If you want a good child begin training him at infancy.

by your precept and example and that child will go in the right way. If the parents have so guided their child, when the time comes for him to select his life's work they will have enough influence over him and regard for his future that they, counselling together, will select the right work for the child.

This principle of psychology is very applicable to the rural children. The parents are thoughtlessly moulding the ideas of the child till about the age of 14, and then they begin consciously to direct the child. But it is then too late. The ideas of the child are formed and in a way fixed, and it will take great tact and thought to remould the ideas of the child. If the parents want their boy to be a farmer, they should begin training him for that work at infancy. It is useless to try forcibly to reconstruct the ideas of the child which have been formed for 14 or more years. But this is what many farmers are trying to do, and they are making miserable failures of it.

How is the farmer going to train the child to be a farmer if this is the wish of the parent? There are several ways. The first one has already stated. Namely,

Keep the confidence of the child. Second, when the child reaches the age of five or six, give him a small interest in the farm work or stock. As he becomes older give him a little more, and the increased interest of the child in the work of the farm will increase the results correspondingly. Thus the farmer will not lose

anything financially, but, on the other hand he will gain a great deal inasmuch as the child will have a sincere interest in the work of the farm in general. This is a principle that very few farmers realize. Those who do see that this is necessary to keep the child interested and on the farm, have realized much more than the child's part cost them. In Northern Missouri a farmer gave to his boys an interest in the stock. True it was, that that interest was small, yet the boys became deeply interested in the farm work. The result was that both boys are today farmers. The same interest that they manifested in their part of the farm work was also evidenced in their interest in the father's part of the work. I know of another man who did not give his children a part in the stock and the result is, that they have left the farm. Therefore the principle here is, that you must get the child interested in a certain line of work before you can keep him in that work. There can be little interest in a given work, unless the child owns a part of it.

The child cannot be easily fooled. The third way to train the child to remain on the farm, is, to give him a real interest in the farm work or stock. The parent cannot say to the child, "Son, this hog or sheep belongs to you", and after the child has taken his father at his word and fed and fattened the animals, the parents sell them, put the money into the bank and never say anything to the child again about it. About two trips like this and the child will be very careless about caring for that which is supposed to belong to him. The animal must belong to the child in reality, and not only in name.

The fourth way to train a child to become a farmer is to make the farm attractive to him. Not only the former ways will make it attractive to him, but the home must be a real home and not an artificial one. The parents should be peaceful and harmonious in their relations to one another and also with the children. A home where strife is continually in evidence is not attractive for the rural children. This is one of the fundamental principles of farm attractiveness, but is overlooked by so many people.

The fifth way to keep the boy on the farm is to give him as much education as possible in connection with agricultural pursuits. This may seem contradictory to some, but let us consider it. If the parents have neglected the early training of the child in regard to farm life, then sending him to school would not tend to keep him on the farm. To keep him at home or away from school will not keep him on the farm if this early training has been deficient. For the boy has his ideas formed in regard to farm work, and he is going to leave the farm in spite of all the hedging in that the father may try to do. But if the parents have carefully trained their children in early childhood, the education that is afforded them will tend to keep them on the farm. If the reader does not agree with me in this particular I would be pleased further to consider the subject at a favorable opportunity. But this is all the space and time that we can give to this principle now. The farmers need to be educated. The great advances along agricultural lines have been made by learned men. Therefore educate the boys.

The sixth way to keep the boys on the farm is to afford them many means and ways of pleasure. If there are three boys in a family, and all three are at the age when they enjoy the association of their lady friends, it is necessary for them to have a good means of taking their friends to such social affairs that are uplifting and beneficial. The parents cannot deprive their children of money, ways of going, good clothes, and even forbid their going to parties and social events, and expect them to love the farm life. Often a father thinks that if he does not get a buggy for his boy, give him money to spend and get him good clothes, he will have a better chance to keep him on the farm. But the results have been nearly the opposite as I have observed them. The boy reasons thus: "I am on the farm with my father, and I have no money to spend like the other boys. As long as I stay with my parents on the farm it will be this way. I must have some money to spend and father will not give it to me. Therefore I will have to do something else to have my desires gratified. I will stop working on the farm as soon as possible. I will go to school, then get into some profession, and then I will have my own money and can do with it whatever I wish." If he cannot have a buggy and horse, to have a good time like the other boys around him, he will become soured on the farm work and life, and will leave the cultivation of the soil. This has been the real experiences of several boys that I have known, and the former is their way of reasoning. Let the parent make the farm life attractive to the child

in these several ways that I have mentioned and he will find the farm life a pleasure rather than a drudgery. This is another principle that is twisted in the minds of many fathers, and the results are the opposite of the wishes of the parents.

The seventh way to keep the boy on the farm is to convince him of the fact that he is not a slave but a free born citizen. If the boy gets it into his mind that the father cares little about his future, and is working him hard for the money that it will put into his pocket, that boy will not be satisfied with the farm work very long. I have seen fathers who considered that they had the power of nearly life and death over their children, even in this enlightened day and generation. If the father associates with his boys and is one of them the result will be as he desires, for his desire will be for their best interests and welfare. Let him lord it over his children and the boys will soon vacate their places on the farm. The child is not to lay up for the father, but the father for the child. Let them work in union and the burden will be light. If the father takes an interest in the social pleasures of the child, the child will be satisfied with the farm life, even though he has to work pretty hard on the farm. When I was on the farm I would do more work in a week if I was allowed to go to some social event in the evening. But if I was deprived of that pleasure that the rest of my associates were enjoying, my work was not as good, and I was led to hate the farm work.

The eighth way to keep the boys on the farm is to have musical instruments in the home. Nearly every boy loves some kind of music. It is the work of the parents to discover what that desire is, and satisfy it if possible. If this pleasure were given to the boys and to the girls, their desire to go to the city to hear them would be very little, because they could hear them right at home. The graphophone, the pianola, the victrola, and other musical instruments are making the farm life more attractive and thereby helping the father to keep his boys on the farm.

The child needs a great amount of play. He cannot act like those older, for it is natural for him to be active. Let the parent direct that activity along lines of usefulness, and it will be surprising what that child will accomplish. The child wants to be hammering, driving nails, making things, and constructing his own ideas into visible objects. This is play for the child, and no father should hinder him in it. On the other hand the parent should provide boards and other means, that the results of child's activity might be worth while. In this way useful things will be made by the child, his brain developed, and his physical self greatly helped.

I realize that we have considered just a few of the important principles that make the farm attractive to the boys. I hope that this consideration will be the means of stimulating the thoughts of the reader and causing him to desire further to investigate these vital principles of keeping the boys on the farm.

Chapter VI.
RURAL EDUCATION.

Chapter VI.

RURAL EDUCATION.

The educational situation alone in the rural communities is worthy of a long discussion. The good qualities and defects are not altogether unnoticed by the rural population. On the other hand they are not as large in the eyes of the farmers as they truly are. But this is not at all surprising to a close observer. Usually the observer from without has a better chance to take in the whole situation than the ones so closely connected with the work. There are many questions that we shall consider in connection with the rural school situation. The issue in this chapter is not so much "How bad is the rural school?" but "How much progress is being made each year or period of years?" Of course we shall also notice the defects and good qualities of the rural school.

In beginning this discussion, let us recognize the advantages of city schools over rural schools. This is evidenced very plainly in many ways. But at the same time let us not lose sight of the fact that the rural schools, even though they are generally considered unworthy of the name, have many good qualities and some advantages over the city schools.

In this chapter we shall not try to boost either one school situation or another, but present the facts as they are both in the rural communities and in the cities. I think that we shall see that the rural situation is not as bad as it is thought to be by the city people. While on the other hand it is not as up to date as the rural population consider it.

Table No. 5.
Rural schools.

Questions.			
A.			
1. School teachers?	Good-25	Poor-10	No ans.-15
2. Salary?	\$40-50;-(20)	\$50-80;-(10)	Over \$80;-(10)
			No ans.-(10)
3. Efficiency of Schools?	Of 10 poor '8 low salary	Of 25 good '5 low salary	Of 10 best '8 in towns.
4. Agri. Educ.	Yes-42	No-8	
'H.S. " "	'Yes-44	'No-6	
B.			
Kind of schools in your comm?	Good-11	Fair-5	
2. Schools now & 15 yrs. ago?	Better-16		
3. Efficiency of rural schools?	High-8	Average-6	Poor-2
4. Average wage of teachers?	Less than \$50.--(3)	\$50.--(11)	More than \$50.)(2)
5. Kind of buildings?	Fine -4	Average-7	Poor-5
6. Why poor work in schools?	(3) Lack of int by all.	Poor teachers 8.	'Small sal.-7 'Too much for one teach.-4
7. % female teachers?	50%-1	60%-5	80%-5 90%-5
8. Which better?	Equal--7	Male for 6th, 7th and 8th-7	Female for 1st 5 grades

(Contd on next page).

(Table No 5 Cont'd.)

Questions.				
'B.'				
9. Farmers	Medium-11	Fine-3	Fair-2	
'int.in seh?				
10. Politics	Out of place			
'in sch.elect? -13		Alright-2	No ans.-1.	
11.How select				
'teachers?	Commissioner -9	County Board -2	Cooperation - 5.	
C.				
'1.'Agri in				
schools?	Yes-6			
'2.' Rural teach-				
ing?	Good-4	Do not know --2		
'3.Farmers take				
int. in seh?	Yes -6			
'4.'Agri & H.S.	Yes-6.			
Educ for far-				
'mers?				

Table No.5.

RURAL SCHOOLS.

"Ans" stands for "answer". "Agri" means "agriculture".
 "Educ" means "education". "Comm" means "community". "Sal"
 means "salary". "Int" means "interest". "Sch" means "school".
 "H.S." means "High school". "Elect" means "election".

This table is a brief summary of the replies that
 I received from the farmers to whom I sent questionnaires.
 As usual "A" stands for "Farmers", "B" for "Superintendents",
 and "C" for "county agents".

In table No.5, the reader will notice a report on many of the phases of the rural school. We shall follow this table closely, and consider the different points as they come.

Is the rural school as good today as it was many years ago? The superintendents unanimously say, "Yes". These men are from the small towns or larger towns. If they say that the rural schools are so much better now than they were a few years ago, we may count it as true.

"What kind of school teachers have you in your community?" This is the exact form of the question that I sent out to the farmers and others. The farmers replied, "good-25", "poor-10", and 15 gave no answer at all. The superintendents reported, that the efficiency of the rural schools was as follows: "High-8", "average-6", and only 2 say that the school work in their counties is poor. The county agents report extremely favorably as you will notice from the table, C, 2. Thus we see that the opinion of all- that is a majority- is very much in favor of an optimistic view of the work done in the rural schools. But what are we going to do with the minority report which is unfavorable? I do not hold that every rural school is up to date. Many of them are far from it. But what we are after in this discussion is the general average, and this we see is very good. From the superintendents' report we see that they are unanimous in thinking that the rural schools are far better now than they were 15 years ago. There is cause to rejoice because of this favorable report.

The minority report which is unfavorable is not difficult to solve. 15 of the farmers did not answer my questions at all. This manifests that a good many farmers are not interested in schools. Some of them because they have no children probably. Others because their children are through school. While others may be struggling so hard for existence that they have little time to devote to the rural school question. Do these things excuse the farmers? No! By no means, no! Because they have no children or because their children are through school are not reasons for their giving little attention to the education of the children of other people's children. But the people are not altogether to blame for the poor work done in the rural schools. The state is partly responsible for this state of affairs. The community may be doing their best in regard to the rural school, but that "best" may not mean very much if the district is small and the land very poor. The tax that would be levied in such a school district would not be sufficient to enable them to hire a competent school teacher. In such a case, if the state does not come to their aid, by necessity that rural school will be very poor. If the finances are lacking most any school will soon go down, and the result will be, extremely poor work. Therefore I hold that it is the duty of the state to come to the assistance of needy school districts. Such an amount should be given them that will enable them to hire a competent school teacher. In some of the states this is being done, but not to such an extent as it should be. In this way the number of poor schools would become less.

There is no doubt but that the low salaries paid to rural teachers have something to do with the inefficiency of the rural school work. My principle is: "Pay a man one dollar per day and he will earn one dollar. Pay him one and one half dollars and he will earn that. Pay him two dollars and generally he will earn that." Condensing the statement, I would present it thus: "A man will usually earn what he is paid for his services". Of course I expect the reader to use reason in this discussion, and not place the amount of salary too high. What connection has this ~~with~~ the rural school teachers? Are the teachers going to look at the dollar when they are training the children, If their salary is good they will do good work, but if it is small they will do poor work? No, this is not a fair conclusion. We must go back one step farther. A good teacher can command a good salary. While a poor teacher cannot command a good salary. Therefore the good teacher will accept the good position usually, and the poorer teacher will be compelled to take the work that is left. Thus they may do their best in the teaching, but the results will be far apart because one had a good foundation, so to speak, while the other had not the same capabilities. The one achieves success, the other fails. Not because their motives were different, but because they were not equally capable. Then, if we want good teachers in the places of these poor teachers, we will have to get others who have capabilities equal to the work. If we get such teachers, it will be necessary to pay them a

larger salary, especially larger than we pay the poorer teachers. To my mind this is the cause of so much poor work done in rural schools. The teachers are underpaid for the important work of training the child while it is away from its mother.

What does the report show in table No.5? The salaries of 20 teachers are between \$40 and \$50 per month. 10 between \$50 and \$80 per month, while only 10 are over the last amount. Note you that 10 did not answer my question at all. From the superintendents' report we see that the average wage for the rural school teacher is about \$50. Remember that these letters were sent to communities a little above the average, or about the average. From my own experience I know that there are many rural teachers who are not receiving over \$30 or \$40 per month for their services. I believe that if we could accurately find out what wage each school teacher in the country was receiving all over our commonwealth, we would be startled to see that it would not be over \$40. per month. But this is the past and present. The future will bring forth better equipped teachers, and they will ask a better salary, and command it no doubt.

Of the 10 poor teachers referred to in the report 8 received low salaries. This shows that two teachers made a success despite the fact that they received low salaries. Of the 25 good teachers 5 received low salaries. This shows that a few will make good even though they are not paid what they are worth. 8 of the high salaried teachers lived in towns of about 2000 each, and two in smaller places. The rural teacher is not paid enough.

So often I have read in our daily papers that some think that the school teachers are paid too much. This is an evidence of ignorance, and I think that the reader will agree with me in that statement if he considers the following reasoning, and undisputable facts.

A good many of our friends forget the fact that the day laborer who fixes our furnaces when they are out of repair receives more per day than the average rural teacher. The man that works at the common tasks of life receives more than the person who is employed to teach the child wisdom and understanding. Yes, the men who work in the ditch or the street receive more than the person who takes the place of the mother and father for a greater part of the day during the school year. Think of it! Is this all the parents think of the training of their children? Is the laborer worth more than the person who trains the child intellectually? Surely the statement, that the teachers are paid too much, that they are altogether working for the dollar alone, is unjust and false. When I send a child to school I want to send it to a person in whom I have confidence. Confidence in his ability and confidence in his fitness rightly to train the child that I have placed in his care.

Also let us not lose sight of the fact that the school teachers must go to school for a long time, spend a great deal of money, study hard, stand the examinations, and then do a great amount of work, for the small salary that they are to receive. While the workman does not go to any expense to learn his trade. If we give them justice

will we not pay them a salary that will enable them to pay the debt that they have incurred while they were in school, and a reasonable amount beyond that and expenses? I think that this reasoning will bring us to the conclusion, that the teacher ought to have a better salary than the common laborer on the street and in the ditch. If a larger salary is offered, the person will prepare better for the position, and the result will be two fold. Namely, better teachers, and better work accomplished in the schools.

In many communities very few people know what the teacher is receiving. Usually it is this class that makes the main objection when the proposition is before the people to increase the teacher's salary. This no doubt holds good in all the professions of life. In the ministry it is so. Usually the ones who pay nothing, and ~~who~~ would like to receive from the church, are the ones who say that the minister is receiving too large salary for the work that he is doing. They have but one standard to measure by, and that standard is physical. . . When we consider the mental labor, and the amount of efficiency that the trained mind possesses, I think that we will agree that the teacher is not paid enough salary for the work that he accomplishes.

Another point must be considered, and it is this. The school teacher only teaches a part of the year. He is paid for the time that he works or teaches, and the rest of the year he must find some other means of subsistence. Usually he goes to school and spends the little that he has saved during the winter, to be more efficient.

Does the farmer need an agricultural, high school and college education to become the most efficient farmer? Some say "Yes," while others say "No." What do we mean by each of these phases of the educational situation? It is well for the farmer to have as much education as possible. But it is not the privilege of every farmer to secure a college education. Very few farmers have a college education, and I think that we can rule out this phase of the question, as unnecessary yet desirable if possible. Shall every farmer have a high school education? If he wants to become more than the average farmer in his community, in this advanced day, it is necessary for him to have a four years high school education. The reader may point to many who have no education at all and who have succeeded in life. Yet do not forget that such examples are exceptions to the general rule. How much greater success might these men have achieved had they had the high school education. Thus the writer considers that it is necessary for the farmer to have at least a high school education if he wishes to reach a high degree of success on the farm.

Is it necessary for the farmer to have an agricultural education? There is a great division of opinion upon this part of the subject. In my experience I have seen scientific farmers who were failures. I also have seen a greater number of unscientific farmers who were more than failures. Here we are concerned with the question "Should agriculture be taught in the rural schools?" This brings up many important considerations.

The first objection that the farmers bring up is, that the average rural school teacher is from the city or small towns and therefore knows very little about agriculture and is entirely unable to teach boys and girls who live in the rural districts. This, to my mind, is a valid objection. From the school reports you will find that a great number of the teachers are from the cities. The greater part of the other teachers are from the country, but they know very little about real farming, for many of them are girls who pay no attention to the working of the soil. From the report of the superintendents we see that the greater per cent of the rural teachers are female. Thus the subject of agriculture would be taught very poorly in a majority of the districts. But the question for our consideration is, what shall we do to make the rural districts better? Even though they teach agriculture very poorly, is it not better that it be taught this way than not at all? However poorly a subject may be taught there are a few who will get some good out of it. If the farmers would always keep this kind of reasoning the subject of agriculture would never be taught in the rural schools. But here let us notice, that a person can learn some things out of books that he can put to practical use. If he can do this, is it not possible for the rural teacher ~~so to~~ to teach the subject that the minds of the country boys will be stimulated to greater activity along agricultural lines? Where the subject is taught I have heard competent judges say that it is doing much good for the boys and the farm life.

The second objection that the farmers offer concerning teaching agriculture in the rural schools is, that new ideas are put into the head of the child which are impracticable and therefore injurious to farm life. This objection comes from those who know little and care less about the improvement of rural life. It is true that the child is receptive to these new ideas and that he will go home from school and tell them to his father and try to get him to try the new ways. Fathers usually resent this on the part of their children, but this resentment comes because of ignorance rather than because of wisdom. No man gets too old to learn, even from those who are younger.

There are other objections to the teaching of this subject in rural schools, but we shall not consider them further. Now let us notice two great benefits that come from the study of this in the grades.

The first great help in the study of agriculture in the rural schools, is, that it stimulates the mind of the youth while the mind is receptive to such stimulations. It is useless to try to teach an old person new things. He may get them, but not to any degree of perfection. The time to train the child is while he is young. Impressions are made upon his mind then that could not possibly be made later in life. The time to hit the iron is while it is hot or red. The time to mould the mind of the child is while it is in a receptive condition.

The second great advantage in the study of agriculture in the grades, is, that it gives the child a chance to test the teachings of the book in the laboratory of the farm. A great stimulus is given to the child.

We have considered the causes of the poor work done in the rural schools. We saw that so many of the rural communities took so little interest in the schools, and that there were so many poor teachers. Right here I want to say that if the patrons of a school would help the teacher more than they do there would be fewer poor teachers. Small salaries do not command the best of teachers. But the main point that I want to consider

is the fact that each rural teacher has entirely too many subjects to teach. She usually has from the first to the eighth grades to teach, and we know that this is too much for any teacher even though her talents be very great. I asked the superintendents which class of teachers was the better, the male or female. The reply was, "the female for the first 5 grades, and the male for the rest of the grades. It is generally considered that the teachers in the high schools should be men teachers.

When the child gets to this age he wants to be associated with men, and the male teachers can have a greater influence over his life. It is true that the rural teacher has too much to teach. She cannot do the work justice or the pupils either. What will remedy the situation in this regard? My solution is, the township high schools.

In many of the states of our country laws are being passed permitting several districts to unite and form one large district. This is known as the township school. It is located near the center of the township, and wagons bring the children to school and take them home at the expense

of the township. Thus instead of having four small weak district schools, the township has one large fine building, well heated, sanitary, up to date, and large enough for the probable growth of the township. In this school there will be a teacher for about each two grades. In this way the teacher can give the children justice and teach their subjects with greater power. This will usher in more and more, even in the grades, the need of specialization.

This township school does not only afford a better training in the grades, but it will have in connection with it a high school under the supervision of the state. This will mean that many boys and girls who could not go off to the high schools, will have an opportunity to secure a high school education and remain under the influences of the home. How often have we seen boys and girls leave the purity of the home, attend some city high school, and return stained with the sins of the city life. The township high school will take away this doubtful situation, and make it possible for the boys and girls to remain at home and take their high school education. We know that the high school age is the most important time in the life of the young people. More habits are formed then than at any other time. Therefore it is fine for the young people that they can take their advanced schooling and remain under the protecting care of a mother's and father's love. The township high school will fill a much needed want in the education of the young people of the rural districts.

One more thing that I must mention in connection with the township high school situation. Had it not been for one of these schools, the writer would not be considering this important subject of rural sociology. In our community there was an academy, called the Van Rensselaer Academy, situated at Rensselaer, Missouri. I know from my own experience and from the experience of others that I have noticed, that many of the young people in our community would have never gone to the high school, much less the college, had it not been for that old academy. This will be found true no doubt in each community where there is such an academy or a township high schools. In this way many poor people will have an opportunity to send their children through the high school. When they once get through the high school, if they are determined enough, they will be willing to work their way through college and probably further. Untold good will result from the establishment of the township high schools all over our country.

A great hindrance in our public school system is that politics enters into so many of the elections. It is a recognized fact that politics has no place in school matters. Too much is at stake, for the patrons of the school to allow petty differences so to influence their opinion that the efficiency of the school will be impaired. Politics is alright in its place, but it is out of place in matters of education. Only one thought should be in the minds of the people, and that is which course will be for the best interests of the pupils.

One of the great questions before the educators to-day, is, how shall rural teachers be selected? Some propose that a county commissioner appoint teachers for the entire county. This is placing a great power in the hands of one man. Others propose that a county board select the teachers or appoint them for the entire county. This I believe is a better plan than the former. Still others propose that each township have a commissioner, and that commissioner appoint the teachers for the rural schools. This is the best plan so far I think. There are others who advocate cooperation. This plan is, that a county commissioner cooperate with a representative of each township or rural district, and they together will select the teachers for the various schools.

In some places each district has a school board of three members who have the power to select the person that they want to teach their children. The county commissioner has nothing to do with it, if the teacher has a certificate. The representatives of the people in each community have the privilege of selecting the teacher that they desire. This is local self government, and I think that it is the best way. In all of the former plans there is a great opportunity for graft, and I have talked with people who say that there is graft where these systems of selecting teachers are in vogue.. In the last way, which is selecting the teacher by a school board of three in each district, there is no chance for graft, and the people have an opportunity to choose the person in whose hands they entrust their children for so great a part of the year.

The writer has not tried to exhaust the rural educational situation. Many important problems have simply been touched upon, and the reader, it is hoped, will be interested enough in some phase of the subject, that he will go far beyond the investigations of the writer.

Advantages of city over rural schools have been lightly touched upon. Likewise the advantages of rural over city schools. The reader will recognize the advantages of each, and spend his thought along lines which will tend toward the righting of the wrongs and defects in each of the places.

The importance of the training of the mind of the child can be hardly overestimated. So much good or evil can be done in so short time. Ours is a Christian land and a religious land. Therefore it behooves us to have in our schools only such teachers whose characters are beyond reproach. The patron wants a teacher ~~to~~ so ^{to} train his children that they will make good pure religious and Christian citizens. Thus it should be the desire of the school board to secure such teachers. If the commissioner is of a doubtful character, what will he care if corrupt teachers are placed in the rural schools? The rural situation is an important one, and the best thought that we can give to it is none too good.

Chapter VII.

RURAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Chapter VII.

RURAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Until recently rural organizations have been very few. The farmers have been very backward in doing anything along this line, and as a result nothing has been done. About two years ago the Department of Agriculture at Washington D.C. organized a special department for the promotion of rural organizations. It is known as the "Bureau of Markets and Rural Organization". This bureau offers free literature to be sent to any address on application. The idea of this work is to interest the farmers in the subject, and, interested, they will seek more light upon the subject and try to put to practice some of the principles which are proposed by the governmental bureau. While this work has been going on for only two years, very much is being accomplished. The results so far indicate that the object of the bureau will be realized some time, and that time not so many years distant.

The city is full of organizations, and the country has comparatively few. The spirit of the city is going out to the rural districts, and the farmers are beginning to think about organization which will mean mutual benefit. As in all ages, new ideas run slowly. People desire to cling to the old and reject the new. But this tendency on the part of people in general does not silence the proclamations of the ambitious and patriots who through their love for better things, urge the backward public to accept the new and discard the old.

Table No.6..

Questions		Causes-----
A. In favor of		Who stand loss?-15
'organization'	Yes-16	Cannot organize farm-
'among the'	No-32	ers-15
'farmers which		
B. 'will enable them	Yes-1	
'to hold their	No -4	No reasons
'grain till'		
'prices go higher?		
C. '(Same question	Yes-1	
'for all three).	No- 5	No reasons

Table No.6.

Very few of the questions were directly upon this subject of organizations. But in the discussion we will make reference to other tables as they have some conclusions which are important to this discussion.

As usual "A" stands for Farmers. "B" for superintendents. "C" for county agents. A few other minor reasons for opposing this proposition were presented by the farmers, which will be brought out in the discussion of the subject.

"Centralization" is the one word for rural communities from a sociological standpoint. In all the walks of life this is being practiced except in rural communities. In the country this is hard to do, because with the farmers there is a feeling of independence. But are they independent of their fellow men? Not by any means. It is to the interest of the urban population to keep the farmer in that way of thinking. Many and varied will be the results when the farmer comes to realize the advantages to be gained through cooperation.

Why is it so hard to get the farmers together? As soon as a person begins to talk about organizing them for their own benefit and welfare, they begin to doubt his motives, because they have been tricked a few times before. In nearly every community there are some farmers who, at one time or another, have been swindled out of a few dollars by some smooth fellow from the city. Today most of the men who try to organize the farmers, come from the city and consequently are mistrusted. Even though they are true and desire the welfare of the farmers, their pleading, in most cases, does little good. The farmers are standing in their own light, but they are too independent to move. Therefore they will be deprived of the light of that social welfare which comes through beneficial rural organizations.

In table number 6, page 91, you will notice the attitude of the farmers, superintendents and county agents toward the following proposition. "What do you think about organizing the farmers into such an organization as will enable the small farmer, who has to sell his wheat or grain at threshing time, to sell it to the company at the price

paid at that time;the company will hold it till wheat goes higher,then sell it ,deduct the cost of handling it,then take out 5 cents per bushel as a reserve fund,and then pay what is left to the original owner of the grain?" This is a brief statment of the proposition.Of course anything that will keep may be included in this proposition. The writer took wheat as an example best suited for our consideration. To this question or proposition the following replies were received: 32 farmers said "No" to the proposition,while only 16 said "Yes". One superintendant said "Yes",and 4 said "No". One county agent said "Yes",while 5 said "No". This table goes to show that a great majority of the people are opposed to the plan.How many communities have tried this plan? Probably none. Yet the answer comes in a firm way "No". It is a charaacteristic of the farmer that he does not want to try something new.He would sooner do things in the old way and make a little money,rather than do things in a new way and have the great chances to make more money. The farmer wants to take no chances on anything. He wants to play sure.I think that it is a fact that the great moneyed men today reached their high position in the financial world because they were not afraid to try the new. Knowing the way that the farmers think,I believe that the plan that I suggested for helping the small farmer,and at the same time helping the large farmers,is a good one.The main reason that so many are opposed to it is because it is new.

You will notice that the superintendants and county agents gave no reasons for ~~their~~ negative replies.The farmers ventured to give a few,and they are reasonable ones. First,"You

will not be able to organize the farmers". This is a good reason. It will be hard to organize the farmers no doubt, but this should not keep us from trying it. If a community will honestly try the scheme that I propose, I believe that it will prove to be an asset to that community. The question is, it seems to me, will the farmers give it a fair trial? To say that it cannot be done, is a severe indictment to bring against all the farmers. In every community there are enough progressive farmers who certainly should be willing to take up a line of activity which has made many grain buyers very wealthy. If the elevator men can make good money with it, I see nothing to hinder an organization which will carry on the same work. To say that the farmers will not organize, is not enough to discourage progressive farmers. The elevator men discourage the farmers all they can. It is to their interest of course. But why should one or a few become wealthy, and the community be the losers ?

Let it be remembered, that it is not necessary to organize the whole community. As many farmers as desire to join the organization can do so. If only one third of the farmers want to go into this organization, that will be plenty to begin with. As the organization succeeds there will be others who will desire to join them.

Another reason presented against the plan, is, that in case of a deficiency who will stand the loss? If the grain drops in price, who will pay the loss? This is another good reason. It is always well to consider all

possible objections, but these should not be considered in a prejudiced light. The plan that I suggested makes a provision for a deficit now and then. In the last few years---say 10 years---in not over two years, if there have been that many, has wheat gone below the threshing price. Nearly every year it has gone far above the price for which it was selling from the machine. I proposed that five cents per bushel be reserved each year, as a reserve fund to protect the organization against the time when the price at which they sell will be below the threshing time price. This provision will do away with the argument, that there will be no one to pay the bill if there should be a loss.

The farmer and men of other occupations also, as a rule are afraid to go into new organizations. As a result they stay out, and the men who are progressive enough to go into the new things, are the men who are called millionaires today. When some of these millionaires were poor young people, they were ridiculed and laughed at because they dared to do the thing that was beyond the ordinary or customary. They paid no attention to the criticism of the world, and today they are captains of industry.

As a rule the average public stands back, while the few are forging ahead into the unknown fields and accomplishing great things. When a new thing succeeds, those who stood back and had no connection with its success, are often the very ones who come forth and are ready to accept part of the glory. Should the organization

fail in its attempt, the average citizen then will heap upon the promoter all the blame. Had the people in general aided the men at the head of the organization success would have crowned their labors instead of defeat. This same principle is evident in all the walks of life. It is a principle that means less progression than could be made if all would try to give every one else a fair deal or a square deal.

No doubt there are other minor objection to this plan, but we shall not refer to them. These two are a good sample of the validity of the arguments that the people present against new plans and propositions.

"Rural credits" is a great thing for the farmer but very few know it. This is rather a new thing for the United States. In the European countries it has worked with marked success. The "rural credits" plan is as follows: A few men get together who have enough money to start the organization. They are recognized by the state officials, and given the opportunity to organize at--say a million dollars capital stock. Then the organization hires a few agents to work the state for them. The agent comes to a farmer, the farmer takes one share of \$100.00 or more shares. No man can buy over 25 shares. For every \$100.00 the stock holder can borrow \$1000.00 on his farm land, provided that the amount that he borrows will not exceed half the worth of the land. He may borrow this money at 5% interest for a period of 5, 10, 25 or a few more years if he wishes. Should he desire at any time to pay all of it back he may do so. None but stock holders are benefited in this.

The "rural credits" plan of aiding the farmers who desire to be aided, and are willing to take up something that is new, is an extremely good one. It has received the endorsement of the last three presidents of the United States, and also by most of the governors of the various states. Even though it has worked so well in other countries the people here are taking interest in the plan very slowly. A bill has been introduced into the national congress for the third time embracing the "rural credits" plan. Each time the bill has failed. Why? At first it could hardly be understood why the representatives of the people should turn down such a plan, when they could see what it has meant to the other countries where it has been tried. But why did our men in Washington who claim to represent us, turn down the proposed bill? The answer is clear and plain. The moneyed men in Wall Street opposed the plan. If it should pass and the people all over the United States should welcome it, they would not be able to lend money to the small banks all over our land. It means this. The more money the "rural credits" plan brings to the farmers, the less money the capitalists can lend the bankers, for there will be little demand for so much of the banks' money. This will also mean that the bankers will have to charge less interest. They will have to come down to 5% to be on an equal basis with the "rural credits" banks. Consequently the bankers, the capitalists in the East and men who have a great amount of money to lend are opposed to the "rural credits" bill. These rich men are not seeking the

welfare of the farmers. They are out for their own interests and care little about the farmers who have to borrow from the banks and pay an enormous rate of interest. According to the "rural credits" plan the money goes direct to the farmers, while as it now is, the bankers have to get their portion of the interest. The former will eliminate the middle man.

The terms upon which the farmer can get money according to this plan, are very excellent. He does not have to give security, other than his land. He does not have to get the note renewed every three or four months, but he can borrow it upon several years time. The "rural credits" plan has so many good things about it that we have been able to mention only a few. Enough has been said on this point, which will lead the reader to further investigation and study. From the present indications it will not be long till several companies similar to this will be in operation in our own state of Kentucky. When the farmers realize the great opportunities that this plan offers to them, the world will see a greater United States.

The church is about the most powerful organization in the rural districts. Go wherever you will, and you will see some kind of a religious organization. A great amount of property is held by these churches, and this property is nontaxible because of the fact, that the state recognizes that the church is essential to the progress and welfare of the Union. Although some of the rural churches may not appear to have such a great influence in a community, yet very few would do without her uplifting influence.

In many rural communities the Masonic lodge, the Knights of Pythias, the Odd Fellows and other lodges are a great source of pleasure and benefit to the people who take a part in them. Although these lodges are confined to the small towns and cities, yet their influence reaches out into the rural districts. The place that these organizations fill in the social fabric is invaluable. The more civilized a country becomes the better organized will the people become. A great work can be done along such lines in the rural districts. Literary societies, sewing clubs, parties in certain organizations tend to bind the people of a community closer together. If I had my way every person in a community would belong to some organization for pleasure and profit. In such a community the whole social atmosphere would be fragrant with the scents of social well being and prosperity.

In this day we should not forget to mention the game of base ball. I like to see a good game of base ball. But the question with me is, when should the game be played? On Sunday afternoons or on Saturdays? Without going into the subject at any length, I propose to eliminate the Sunday ball playing. What shall we do for those who work in the shops all day for six days in the week? When shall they play. In Australia all workmen work only five and one half days per week. Saturday afternoon is the time for recreation and pleasure. I advocate the same law for our country. This would permit the city people to play ball on Saturday instead of Sunday. In fact the city people can play or go to games whenever they please. That

is, the people outside of the factories and offices. This law would give the country young people a chance to attend a ball game on Saturday afternoon instead of Sunday. I stand for the church which is the foundation of our government. The Sabbath day is one of the stones which makes that foundation. Therefore I am for a law which will preserve the foundation of our Union, and decidedly opposed to desecrating the Sabbath day. This plan of mine would give the people a chance to rest and enjoy themselves. It is a recognized fact that a person can do more work by taking frequent rests than he can by working straight along for a longer period..

These organizations in the rural districts for the financial betterment of the people will mean a higher social status. The question is often asked, "If the farmers organize and make more out of their grain will it not mean that the city people will have to pay that much more for the produce? Not at all. In a few words let me say, that it will tend to eliminate the middle man or probably I should say the middle men. The result will be better for the farmer and better for the consumer in the city. The middle man has a perfect right to buy and sell if he wishes to so do. But the point I am making is, that we do not owe him anything, and it is alright to antagonize his position if it will benefit the social well being of people in general. The principle that we should always keep in mind is, "the greatest amount of good to the greatest number."

The rural community should be so organized that

the bad characters could not corrupt the morals of the rural young people. I do not mean that they should be considered as outcasts, but that they would know that as soon as they went astray they could not associate with the pure of the community, yet would be received back into the organization as soon as they proved their worthiness to be numbered again with them. This would prevent many young people from going astray. As it is today some of the most popular young people are not worthy to associate with those considered their social inferiors. While this is noticable in the country, it is not near as bad as it is in the city. Generally in the city one's social standing depends upon the amount of money that he possesses. It is not so to the same degree in the country. There is not such a great difference in the rural districts between the financial conditions of one man and his beighbors. Even though there may be a great difference in some cases, the emphasis is not placed upon that part of the social fabric. The emphasis is placed more upon the character. This is one of the various reasons that the country is considered a good place to rear a family. Great care must be observed in the guidance of such an organization among the young people, but I believe that if it is carefully supervised by those who are interested in the welfare of the young people and the community, a great amount of good will result.

Telephone organizations in the rural districts have proven to be a success. In the community where I lived several years ago, the farmers banded themselves

together and made the rural telephone a marked success. The amount of pleasure that such a telephone system affords the community is very great, and the financial saving that it has proven to be should not be overlooked. In threshing time the farmer can telephone his neighbors exactly the time when to come to his house to begin work. Before the telephone was used the farmer had to get in his buggy or go on horse-back all over a community to tell the farmers when to come to help him thresh. I have done some of this riding in threshing time and I can say that the telephone is a time saver, a money saver, and a great pleasure.

The rural communities are unorganized when it comes to the rural school situation. They believe that the state will not do any more than they are doing, and why should they organize to make the rural school better? This is a mistaken idea. If enough communities will organize the state will soon recognize them, and it will surprise them to see what the state will do for their schools. It is true that one community will not amount to much, but a great number of these small communities make the large states. When these small communities get together the state will take notice of them, and results will follow.

I shall not try to exhaust this large subject. What I have said concerns the most important problems. The farmers are beginning to wake up along all lines, and are demanding better things. It is our desire that they wake up enough to organize their scattered forces into special units. When this unity of purpose is evident results are bound to follow, for "in union there is power".

Chapter VIII.
SCIENTIFIC FARMING.

Chapter VIII.

SCIENTIFIC FARMING.

Books could be written upon this subject alone. Scientific farming is receiving more attention in the state universities today than is any other subject. More money is being appropriated by the state legislatures for this cause than is spent in several other departments of our state government. In as much as the subject is receiving so much attention, it must be important. The farmer looks upon the whole situation as a waste of money. When I say this I mean the general average of the farmers. In every community we find a few who are awake to the new things that are making the rural conditions better. These are the men who are the wealthiest most generally in a community. Although the farmer has been asleep for a long time in regard to scientific farming he is now beginning to see the dawn of the bright day when scientific farming will be the means of transforming the dull rural communities into places of beauty and grandeur, fragrant with that perfume which brightens the financial nerves of an expectant and worthy people.

This new farming is the result of urban thought and endeavor. The reform has come from without as usual. The farmer has had plenty of land, and has cared little about trying to make it produce a greater crop. In Europe this new farming has transformed the rural districts because it was a necessity. In America we are becoming awake to the opportunities, while we have plenty of land, and be-

cause of this fact, scientific farming in America will no doubt reach a greater degree of success that it has reached in Europe. It is surprising to see one of these farmers take a poor run-down piece of land and by the application of his knowledge and fertilizers, grow crops much larger. In the mountain districts a living can hardly be made. This is the experience of the mountain people of the past. Today many of the tops and sides of these mountains are being cultivated, and the result is that the living conditions of the mountain people are much better than formerly. At Berea, Kentucky, there is a school called Berea College. This is a school for all, but especially for the mountain children. This college is taking a great interest in the cultivation of the soil. A good deal of farming is done by the college as they own several thousand acres in and around the little town. Great stress is put upon their going home in the summer time and teaching their neighbors and friends and parents the things that they have learned along the farming lines. Parts of the hill sides are now being cultivated, corn and other grains planted, and in many places fruit trees crown the brows of the peaks.

Scientific farming makes the financial condition of the community so much better, although it takes a great amount of money to farm extensively in this way. But financial prosperity does not insure moral and spiritual progression. How often it is the opposite. When the community becomes very prosperous it forgets other things, and the emphasis is placed upon the dollar. Thus other phases of society are often neglected.

Table No.7.

Questions.

A.		
1. Possible to have 'city improvements on the farm?	Yes if have the the money-37	Impossible-13
2. Is farm work 'harder today than formerly?	No-35	Yes-15 "but" not much.
B.		
Get rich on the farm?	Yes-13	No-3
C.		
1. Are farmers tak- ing int in se.f.	Yes-6	
2. How is the state 'U. helping the farmers?	Lecture-4 Farm visits-2	Organize-2 Contests-2
3. Is state helping 'enough?	Yes-4	No-2
4. Se.f.increase 'bushels per acre?	Yes-6	
5. Effect of mach- 'inery on f.life?	Good-6	
6. What do you think 'of the federal reserve law?	It is fine-3	It is no good to the farmer-3.

Table No.7.

"Int" stands for "interest". "Se" for "scientific".
 "F" for "farming". "U" for "university". Other parts of
 this table are of the same meaning as in other tables.

An important item was omitted from table number 7. I asked the farmers whether or not they favored scientific farming? The answers were as follows: "Yes" 42; "No" - 8. This indicates that the farmers are nearly unanimously in favor of the new ways of cultivating the soil. The superintendents seem to have a good opinion of the productiveness of the farm land. The county agents from whom I received replies were unanimous in their approval of the new farming. We expected this kind of an answer from them, yet in other places they manifest an interest which convinces us that they are not interested in scientific farming just because they are in the position of county agents. These men are placed in these positions because of their fitness and interest in the welfare of the country population.

Many are in favor of scientific farming who are not able financially to bear the burden that it imposes. Others are against it because they have not been progressive enough to try it. Others want to do things in the same old way, like their fathers have been doing for 40 years. Many are the reasons for the slowness on the part of the country people in taking advantage of the new discoveries that experts are continually making along the lines of progressive farming.

The main objection is the financial situation. A good many would like to try the new ways, but they have not enough money to finance the project. The rural credits banking plan will simplify money matters for the country people who own a little land and are willing to take shares in that organization.

Taking it for granted that the farmer has enough money to begin to farm scientifically, how are we to induce him to begin the new ways? It cannot be done by law, as that would violate the fundamental principles of our American government. It seems to the writer that the state has taken the proper course. That course is through education. The only way to secure a permanent reform is by education. The best way to make progress along the lines of farming is by educating the younger people. The ideas of most old people are fixed, and it is of little use to try to change their ways of working. The time to begin training for scientific farming is from childhood. Implant these new ideas in the minds of the boys and the harvest will be reaped in the near future. Many state universities are taking a great interest in this phase of rural betterment. They are sending out their professors and instructors to lecture and demonstrate to the farmers what they have accomplished along certain lines. They also issue a farm journal which contains a great amount of valuable news to the agriculturalists.

The state university in many parts of the state has experiment stations. The United States government also has experiment stations scattered all over our land. At these stations the government furnishes the money with which to carry on the experiments. Accurate accounts are kept and reports made to the state and national governments annually or semi-annually as the requirements may be. In this way the people can see what can be done if they will honestly try the new ways.

It is advocated by some, that the agricultural meetings should be held in the rural church. This does not meet with my approval. Those who criticise the church and condemn it as a failure, would be very pleased to see the pulpit turned into a public forum upon which all questions could be considered. These men do not realize the mission of the church. The church is to take care of men spiritually, while the government is to see after them otherwise. In each community there is a school house which will be large enough for the crowd that usually attends such a meeting or institute. Wherever they have township high schools, it is a good idea to have the meeting in one of the larger class rooms or in the assembly room if there be any. This will place the problem where it belongs, namely, among educational questions. The church will be free to do her work of regeneration, while the school will endeavor ~~so~~ to train the body and mind that the good results of scientific farming may be planted into the minds of these who will soon be the leaders and makers of our government.

In most state universities a course is given, called the "agricultural course", leading to the degree of "Bachelor of Arts". Thus we see to what an exalted position the the studies along agricultural lines have attained. Usually there is the full 9 months course. Then there is a course of 4 months for those who cannot attend the entire year. This course is still more practical than the former. Finally there is the six weeks course for farmers. This course is more practical than either of the others, and is very adaptable to the farmers.

Through the boys contests which have been inaugurated all over our land, scientific farming has received a great impetus. The children have become intensely interested, have worked under the supervision of government agents, and have succeeded. The results have been far beyond what could be expected. Not only the children have become interested, but the parents see that there is something in this new farming after all. Therefore they begin to farm according to the directions of the government agents, and splendid results follow their earnest endeavors. Many farmers try about half of the suggestions that the agents make, and fail. Then they condemn such farming. Had they followed the agents advice completely probably the results would have been different. Where a person will follow the instructions of the experts the results will be pleasing generally. In our regular way of farming, now and then a bad year comes. So we can expect a bad year to come when we are trying advanced plans and ideas. If such should be our experience the first year, the experimenter should not give up in despair. Had many of our inventors done thus we would be deprived of the telephone, telegraph, automobile, engine, and thousands of other things which make our existence happy and joyous.

Farm work is not as hard today as it was 50 years ago when our parents were boys. Inventions along the lines of machinery have completely revolutionized the farm life. It is the testimony of 35 out of 50 farmers that the work is easier today than it was formerly. This

report you will notice in table number 7. To the question, "is it possible for the farmer to have the city improvements on his farm?", 37 answered "Yes" and only 13 "No". Most of them were of the opinion that it was possible if the farmers had the money. The farmers are getting more improvements each year, and it will be only a matter of time till the average rural home will be furnished with most of the conveniences that the city home possesses. In central Indiana it is surprising to find extremely fine rural dwellings with nearly all the modern conveniences. As scientific farming develops the land the rural homes will become better till the city will be ashamed of her homes of red brick and frame when she views the magnificent structures of rural prosperity.

A majority of the superintendents think that it is possible to get rich on the farm. One may become rich, but seldom does he become a millionaire. The farmer does not make big gains like the business man. With the farmer his increase in wealth is according to the productiveness of the soil upon which he lives and labors. He cannot and does not expect to get rich fast, but he can make money if he keeps at business and is a good manager. Poor management is the cause of most of the failures on the farm. So many people I have seen who could work ever so hard yet they were not able to get anything ahead. The thing for such a person to do is to take the advice of his fellow men, but usually these are the men who will not take any advice. They know it all, and discard all suggestions which are for their welfare and betterment.

It is claimed by some that the federal reserve law will be very beneficial to the farmers. It has been in effect for some time, and does not seem to be doing very much along that line. In fact it is not helping the farmer as much as it is helping the smaller bankers. The banks have more money to lend to the farmers, but the terms upon which that money is secured are not easier than they used to be. Consequently it has not helped the farmer nearly as much as it has helped the smaller bankers. Thus the farmer cannot get money easier for scientific farming even though the federal reserve banking system is in full force. "Rural credits" is the one institution that will furnish the farmer with enough money to farm scientifically with any degree of success. Of course the farmer who has plenty of cash is alright without the federal reserve plan or rural credits, but it is the small farmer who will be helped the most. Most of the farmers in our land are small farmers. Therefore this new system will help those who really need help and encouragement.

Scientific farming does not only refer to the soil. Scientific farming equally refers to the affairs of the house-hold. The wife has to do many things in the old way and accomplishes very little. Should she have the opportunity to use some of the modern inventions which make the home duties so much lighter, her farm life would not be a drudgery to her, but it would be a pleasure. In former years the wife had to sew by hand, but now she has the sewing machine, and can do so much more in a little amount of time. The carpet sweeper has taken the place of the tiresome broom. The heater has replaced the fire place.

The cooking utensils are being improved upon each year. New stoves are greatly adding to the ease in cooking. Other comforts which are nearly without number have completely transformed the home life. But the future has much in store for the rural women by the application of the scientific farming in the home.

The more scientific farming is practiced, the more dignified will the farm work become. This means that the new farming will usher in a new era in the welfare of the laboring man. As the farm work becomes elevated the dull rural communities will become more interesting and brighter. Men will then be going back to the farm life. Boys will decide to remain on the farm, and each year much progress will be made along such lines. The dawn of the scientific day is beginning. The brightness of rural prosperity will arise gradually in strength and power, and I verily believe that within the next twenty five years, scientific farming will so revolutionize the rural districts that the rural sun will shine forth with such brilliancy that it will become a source of light to the darkened portions of the urban population.

Chapter IX.

FARMING AS A LIFE'S WORK.

Chapter IX.

FARMING AS A LIFE'S WORK.

Farming as a life's work has been laughed to scorn by some of the city people and overestimated by others. The former class thinks that if a man is not able to do anything else he can farm. Many of the latter class think that the farmer has an easy job. All he has to do is to plant the grain or seed, and nature will take care of the rest till gathering time. They lose sight of the fact that the farmer has to labor many long days to produce that fine crop of corn or many other grains. Each of these classes are ignorant of the great possibilities in the rural districts, and asleep to the conditions as they really exist. Man and nature must work together if the greatest crops are produced from the soil. Although the state of affairs in the rural districts has not been ideal and they are not ideal now, yet conditions are improving very fast, and each year science brings to light many new ways of doing things so that the soil becomes more productive and the lot of the house wives becomes more pleasant.

After the boy has come to the age when he must decide what he is going to do in life, he usually considers a few of the professions or trades. If he has had the proper advantages he may choose one of the professions. If he has had fewer advantages or no advantages he is liable to select one of the trades as his life's work. If he thinks that he will fail in any one of the pro-

fessions, the chances are that he will come to the conclusion that there is nothing that he can do, therefore he will have to be a farmer. The minister is called to his peculiar and exalted work. The lawyer or doctor enters his profession, but the farmer takes up his work because there is nothing left for him to do. Going into his work with such a feeling, it is no wonder that so many farmers just make a living or fail. If the men in the professions would enter their work in the same spirit or attitude, they would accomplish very little.

I hold to the principle that the Divine One has a plan for every life. If man by the help of the Absolute finds that plan and works faithfully he will attain success.

Probably not the success that the world considers, but success in the sight of God. His life will be happy because he will be conscious of the fact that he is on the right road. Realizing this the farm work will not be a drudgery but a delight. Therefore I hold that the farmer is called to his work just as the minister is.

This has not been held by so many, yet if God has that plan for every life, He certainly would lead the man into that calling if he seeks the Divine plan. The reason that the minister is "called" and the lawyer "enters" his work, is because the former's ear is receptive to that Still Small Voice, while the latter's ear is generally receptive to the praise of the world with the financial goal in view. This principle may sound peculiar to those who do not think much in spiritual terms, yet it has been the main spring of our progress.

Every man should be very careful in selecting his life's work. If he selects the wrong work, he is liable to fail, and if he fails society will be that much the loser. Therefore it is not a personal matter alone when it comes to deciding what one shall do in life. Society should be considered, for unless we are a help to the social well being we in truth and reality are failures in life. It is not a question of "how much can I get out of life;" but the question is, "how much can I put into life;" that the world may be better because I have lived in it.

The profession of farming is advancing. In the past anybody could be a farmer, but it is not so today. We are making of it a science, so to speak, and becoming such, it demands men of ability and character properly to fill the position.

Throughout the thesis we have told the good and the bad qualities of farm life. It was not the idea of the writer to white-wash the rural problems, and paint the evils of city life in all their hideousness. From a study of the foregoing pages it will be seen that the writer has paid little attention to the city evils and problems. We recognize that there are many in the cities, and at the same time we do not lose sight of the many advantages and good qualities. The rural life we have seen has many evils and perplexing problems. It also has a great number of inviting qualities which are not so conspicuous as the allurements of the city. But in the next few pages we shall briefly consider the farm life as a life's work.

110

First, the farm is attractive as a life's work because it offers such work and exercise as are conducive to strength and longevity. The farmer does not have to breathe the poisonous gases from factories or inhale the air which comes from the slum districts and uninviting portions of the city. In the country the air is fresh and there is plenty of it. This is a vital attraction which the rural districts offer.

Second, the farm offers now, and will offer more in the future when scientific farming is universally practiced, a means of livelihood which will exceed the possibilities of urban employment. This has special reference to the laboring man in the factories and the clerks in the various classes of stores. While it is true that it will take a little more of physical labor, nevertheless the strain will not be as hard upon the whole constitution of man. It will rather tend to make him more healthy, and that strong physical constitution will be the means of presenting to the world a stronger and better posterity. From the standpoint of practical eugenics as well as from a sociological view point, this is a strong point in favor of the rural life as a man's life's work.

Third, it is a recognized fact that the temptations in the country are fewer than they are in the city. For the man who has a family of any size, this should be and it is an attraction. The place to rear a family is in the country where the moral standard is high.

Fourth, the freedom that the rural life offers is of great importance. The farm laborer can go to work when he feels like it (if he is the boss) and stop when he so desires. He is his own boss, and feels a freedom that is not enjoyed by the urban dweller. Of course there are a few in the cities who enjoy this freedom, but not to the same extent that the farmer enjoys it. The hired hand on the farm has a position where he can save more than the city laborer. The very atmosphere of the country manifests a freedom of thought and action that is incomparable with the regulations of the city.

Fifth, the poor have a better opportunity on the farm than they have in the cities. If the time comes when a family becomes destitute, they are not turned out of house and home, but are helped by their neighbors in many ways. This aid is given through the churches, lodges, societies for the poor, and often in the form of work. It is noble to help the poor and deserving, but it is better to help them to help themselves.

Sixth, all work is honorable. And it seems to me that the most honorable, besides the Gospel ministry, is that work which causes man to come into contact with the productive forces of mother earth. Man sees the laws of God working in such harmony that he cannot help but be impressed by their perfection and power. Farm work used to be looked upon with contempt, but that idea is becoming less and less, through scientific farming.

Fifty years ago the young man longed for the time when he could leave the country and go to the city to do great things in life. Today he is beginning to think more seriously, and as a result of that sincere thought many of the young men are remaining on the farm. The cities in the last few years have not been growing nearly so fast as they did twenty five years ago. Why? There can be but one answer. "The boys and girls are remaining on the farm". In many places the city people are investing in land, and renting it to progressive farmers. They are beginning to see the vast possibilities in rural development, and naturally want to have a part in the great advance. The general tone is "back to the farm". I would not encourage this movement, but I am heartily in favor of the movement, "remain on the farm", if that is the work for which you are suited.

The rural life is not perfect. It is not all ease and enjoyment. Farming means hard work and a great deal of it. The man who realizes this and goes into it with all his soul and might, cannot help but be a success.

The urban life is predicated upon rural activity and prosperity. Why should we neglect the foundation of our future greatness and build the structure of our social fabric in vain? Nay, let us take care that the rural life be made as prosperous as possible. Then the city will have a right to build high because of the firm foundation of rural prosperity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Bolton-Principles of Education.

Cubberley-Rural Life and Education.

Dealey-Sociology.

Ellwood-Sociology in its Psychological Aspects.

Fletcher-Introduction to Philosophy.

Giddings-Principles of Sociology.

Henderson-Principles of Education.

Henderson-Social Elements.

Monroe-A Brief course in the History of Education.

Marvin-First Book in Metaphysics.

Münsterberg-Psychology and Industrial Efficiency.

Plunkett-Rural Life.

Ross-Changing America.

Ross-Social Psychology.

Roosevelt-American Ideals and Other Essays.

Scott-Increasing Human Efficiency in Business.

Smith-Social Pathology.

Ward-Outlines of Sociology.

Wright-Practical Sociology.

Addresses at Men and Religion Forward Movement at
Chattanooga and Memphis Tennessee.

P.S. Many other articles were read by the author
of this thesis, which he does not deem necessary to
mention in the bibliography.