8-1952

Farm Tenancy in Rusk County, Texas

W. R. Coss

FARM TENANCY IN RUSK COUNTY, TEXAS

COSS

1952

FARM TENANCY IN RUSK COUNTY, TEXAS

By

W. R. Coss

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science

In The

Graduate Division

of

Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College
Prairie View, Texas

August, 1952

Acknowledgment

The writer wishes to express his appreciation and indebtedness to Dr. J. M. Coruthers, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Prairie View, Texas for the suggestions and criticisms, which were necessary for the completion of this thesis.

W. R. C.

Dedicated

To my devoted wife whose encouragement has meant much to me in the continuation of my education

W. R. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I

Introduction

Rusk County:

Rusk County is located in central East Texas. It was created from Nacogdoches County in 1843, organized that same year. Named for Thomas J. Rusk, who fought at San Jacinto, was Secretary of War in Texas Republic and later United States Senator from Texas. A part of the Piney Wood Area. It has rolling terrain with low hill ranges in parts on the divide between the Sabine and Angelina Rivers. It has an altitude of three hundred feet to seven hundred and fifty feet. It has an annual rainfall of forty four and thirty two hundredth of an inch. Mean annual temperature of sixty six degrees.[1]

It is an oil, agricultural and industrial farming area. Twenty years ago, the site of the discovery of the East Texas oil field which cut across Northwestern and Western section, revolutionized the County's economy, standard of living and way of life. It has a high

---

[1] Texas Almanac. Published by The Dallas Morning News. 1949-50. P. 582.

density population, largely urban or rural-dwellings of industrial workers in the oil field. It is about twenty per cent Negro populated.[1]

Resources:

Rusk County is the second ranking oil-producing county in the state, with 42, 588, 512 barrels in 1948. Also large gas production, iron ores, brick clay and lignite. Soils are alluvial in valleys, gray, red, chocolate, sandy loam on uplands. It has Post Oak, Pine, Cypress, Pin Oak and Red Oak trees. Lumbering is important, the forestry products rank third in money value.

Excellent game range in less densely populated southern and eastern parts. Numerous running streams and lakes afford good fishing. Cherokee Lake on Cherokee Bayou under construction in 1949 will have 4,000 acre surface and 65 miles shoreline.

Principal Crops:

Crop growing is of a diversified character. The crops of Cotton, Corn, Watermelons, Tomatoes, Peas, Peanuts, Sweet and Irish potatoes and Sweet Sorghums are produced on commercial scale. Lespedeze hay is grown in volume also.

Principal Livestock:

Considerable beef-cattle raising with Hereford,

---

[1]Texas Almanac. Published by The Dallas Morning News. 1949-50. P. 582.

Shorthorn, Angus, Brahma and crossbreeds being the most common. There is some commercial hog raising and about forty Grade A dairies in the county.[1]

Henderson, the county seat, with a population of 10,000 grew rapidly during the oil boom and has attained permanent industrial, commercial and civic status. Industries include oil field equipment, brick and tile, ladies blouse and lingerie factories, black eye peas canning plant, sheet metal works and soft drink manufactures. It affords excellent civic development with fine schools, hospitals, public buildings, churches, business buildings and residences. It is one of the principal highway hubs in Texas.[2]

The profit in farming might be measured in several ways. The majority of farmers measure their profit by the amount of money they make. The farm labor income is used as a standardized measure of the money made from farming. It represents the receipts of the farm from which are deducted the expenses and allowance of five or six per cent interest on the capital invested. In addition to this the farmer has his house to live in and a portion of the produce of the farm which he needs for personal use. For the student of rural sociology this definition of farm income may not be satisfactory. He would think that the

---

[1] Texas Almanac. Published by The Dallas Morning News. 1949-50. P. 582.

[2] Ibid. P. 582.

farmer gets a great deal from the farm other than things which can be measured by the standard of money. It is evident that the farm may offer better opportunities for physical and moral welfare of the family than the city. There are times when this is the greatest advantage a farmer may have, yet it is a benefit which is very difficult to measure, although, it should be kept in mind.[1]

This survey includes information on:

1. Rental arrangement and other land lord-tenant relationships.
2. Farm organization, management and income.
3. Level of living and social status of the farm family.

This survey deals with the farm management and income phase of the study. Major emphasis is given to the relationship of the tenure of the farm operator and the performance of the farm unit. This survey includes land use, crop and livestock organization, a financial summary of the 1951 farm business and income. The data is organized and presented according to the tenure of operation in order that comparison can be made of farm performance as related to tenure, and to furnish an economic basis for the social and land lord-tenant relationship phases of the study.

---

[1] App, Frank, Farm Economics: Management and Distribution. Philadelphia, Chicago and London: The J. B. Lippincott Company, 1934. P. 14.

Statement of The Problem

1. To determine the tenancy rate of fifty Negro farmers in Rusk County, Texas.
2. To arrive at some recommendations for improving farming practices as a result of this study.

Purpose of The Study

This study is intended to determine:

1. The extent to which fifty Negro farmers of Rusk County, Texas are engaged in the various types of farming that are best suited or adapted to their area.
2. Whether the fifty Negro farmers studied are using their factors of production to the best advantage, in order to realize the highest possible farm income.

Scope of The Study

This study is based on data received from fifty Negro farmers engaged in permanent agriculture in Rusk County, Texas. It covers the type of farming and the farm incomes of the fifty Negro farmers chosen for the study.

Method of Collecting Data

The material for this study was collected by personal survey, the assistance from the Negro County extension agent of Rusk County, Texas, plus some library references. The fifty Negro farmers representing a cross-section of Rusk County, were very cooperative in providing the writer with the necessary information.

Part II

FARM AREA

The concept of a farm -- According to common American usage a farm consists of all land, with appropriate equipment, that is operated by an individual, partnership or corporation for the production of agricultural products. When two or more distinct tracts are operated from a common center, each tract may or may not be a farm. In comparison with this common usage, the census defines a farm as: "All the land which is directly farmed by one person either by his own labor alone or with assistance of members of his household or hired employees." The land operated by a partnership is also a farm. A farm consists of a single tract of land, or a number of seperate tracts, and these separate tracts may be held under different tenures, as where one tract is owned by the farmer and the other tracts are rented by him. When a land lord has one or more tenants, croppers, or managers, the land operated by each is considered a farm.[1]

The farm area of the total number of farms studied by the writer were 3,630 acres. The larger percentage of this

---

[1]Forster, G. W. Farm Organization and Management. New York, The Prentice-Hall Inc., 1946, P. 2.

acreage was in crops with permanent pasture coming next in the size of acreage. It was revealed that several acres of land that could have been cultivated were lying out. There was a small percentage of land cash rented by the fifty farmers studied. There are one hundred and sixty six (166) acres rented and these acres were used primarily for cotton production.

TABLE I

THE SIZE OF THE FARM AREAS

Groups	Size of Acres	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Farms
1	20 - 57	21	42
2	58 - 90	18	36
3	91 - 120	2	4
4	121 - 173	8	16
5	174 - 235	1	2
Total	3,630	50	100

According to Table I, slightly less than one-half (42%) of the total farmers studied had a farm acreage ranging from twenty to fifty seven acres. It shows that slightly more than one-third (36%) of the farmers had a farm size ranging from fifty eight to ninety acres. Only four per cent (4%) of the farm sizes ranged between ninety one and one hundred and twenty acres. Out of the three thousand six hundred

and thirty (3,630) acres surveyed Cotton and Corn lead all other crops in acreage of production.

TABLE II

THE DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL FARM AREAS

Groups		Number of Acres	Per Cent of Acres
1	Acres in Open Pasture Not Tillable	535	15
2	Acres in Permenent Pasture	777	21
3	Acres in Tillable Land Lying Out	400	11
4	Acres in Crops	1,918	53
Total		3,630	100

According to Table II, slightly less than one-sixth (15%) of the farm acreage is in open pasture. It is shown that slightly more than one-fifth (21%) of the total acreage was in permanent pasture. A little more than one-tenth (11%) of the land studied was in tillable land lying out. Table II shows that more than one-half (53%) of the land surveyed was planted in crops, with permanent pasture coming second. It was observed that the introduction of beef cattle made for the expansion of permanent pasture.

Part III

TYPES OF FARMING

Types of farming is a term used to designate the chief products or combination of products grown on a typical farm in a given area. Thus we say that this is a dairy farming area or this is a corn farming area. As a rule this does not mean that one area produces only dairy products and the other only corn but each of these is the main product. Some farmers have two or more main products and may be designated for an example, as fruit and vegetable farms or as beef cattle and hog farms.

Farms were classified into types of farming by the 1930 United States Census. Twelve major types and five sub-types were used. The twelve major types are as follows: general, cash grain, cotton, crop specialty, fruit, truck, dairy, animal specialty, stock ranch, poultry, self-sufficing and abnormal. The sub-types were as follows: institution or county, state, part-time, boarding and lodging, forest products and horse-farm, feeding-lot or livestock dealer.[1]

---

[1] Hudleson, Robert R. Farm Management, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944. P.

Each area of farming in the United States is adapted to some particular crop or livestock enterprise. The individual farmer must settle for himself which type of farming will be most agreeable to him. Some men are attracted by fruit goowing, others by vegetable gardening, some by cotton and corn raising, and others by small grain raising. Under certain conditions livestock raising is attractive. Many farmers can not raise all kinds of livestock, therefore, a choice has to be made. It will be necessary to determine the possibilities for margeting dairy products and beef cattle products and a decision must be made between cattle raising or horse raising as the main business. Sheep raising and swine production need careful consideration before either becomes the major enterprise. Such factors as the popular breed, personal preference, adaptability, soil, climate, resistance to pests and diseases and the availability of capital need to be considered before a particular type of farming is chosen.

Types of farming is usually classified on the basis of the source of income, i. e., whether from wheat, or from corn, or from livestock, or some other form of produce. The type may be classified on several other bases such as: (1) The relation of fertility to maintenance, where it is spoken of as exploitive farming, if no attempt is made to maintain soil fertility; (2) On the intensity of land operation, whether extensive, as wheat and flax growing on

large acreage on the prairies, or intensive, as adapted to truck growing of various kinds; (3) On the density of crops or products, thus we have single crop farming as cotton raising or tabacco growing; and the dormant crop farming, where some crop is made the leading line of production and is supported by two or more supplementary crops.[1]

This study made by the writer reveals the facts that although varying crops and livestock enterprises were apparent from one to another, the writer was inclined to conclude that the type of farming common to the total number of farmers, was of a general type. Some farmers had the beginning of livestock enterprises, some had outstanding crop enterprises, but judging from the community standpoint and from the source of the farmers' income, general type farming is very apparent.

Truck farming is classified under crop growing. Truck gardening must be intensive and because it is usually necessary to locate a truck farm in the vicinity of a large city or in a particularly favored locality, it calls for high capitalization. Large amounts of labor are required on a truck farm and land may be limited and the area may be highly cultivated, because of high capitalization. This type of farming requires two to ten acres of land per family. The profits from this type of farming are somewhat

---

[1] Boss, Andrew. Farm Management. New York: The Prentice Hall Company, Inc., 1914, Pp. 39-41.

large under favorable conditions. One of the advantages lies in the quick returns from the capital investment.[1]

TABLE III

ANNUAL CROP RECEIPTS FOR ALL FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Receipts in Dollars	Numbers of Farmers	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	200 - 500	8	16
2	501 - 800	6	12
3	801 - 1100	5	10
4	1101 - 1400	4	8
5	1401 - 1700	11	22
6	1701 - 2000	11	22
7	2001 - 2300	2	4
8	2301 - 2700	3	6
Total	66,865	50	100

According to Table III, a little more than two-fifths (44%) of the total farmers studied received between fourteen hundred and two thousand dollars from their crops in 1951. It is shown that a little less than one-sixth (16%) received between two hundred and five hundred dollars. One tenth (10%) of the farmers studied had a crop income ranging from eight hundred and one dollars to eleven hundred dollars. Only six per cent of the total farmers studied had crops receipts ranging from two thousand three hundred

and one dollars to two thousand seven hundred dollars.

TABLE IV

ANNUAL LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS RECEIPTS

Groups	Receipt in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farms Studied
1	0 - 175	21	42
2	176 - 400	25	50
3	401 - 700	2	4
4	701 - 1700	2	4
Total	12,672	50	100

Table IV shows that more than two-fifths (42%) of the farmers studied had an annual Livestock and Livestock product receipt of one hundred and seventy five dollars or less. One-half (50%) of the farmers studied received from livestock and livestock products between one hundred and seventy six dollars and four hundred dollars. The above table shows also that, only four per cent of the farmers studied had a receipt from livestock and livestock products ranging from seven hundred and one dollars to seventeen hundred dollars in 1951.

TABLE V

ANNUAL FARM RECEIPTS OF OTHER FARM INCOME

Groups	Receipts in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farms Studied
1	0 - 300	37	74
2	301 - 600	6	12
3	601 - 1000	4	8
4	1001 - 1300	3	6
Total	11,810	50	100

According to Table V, slightly less than three-fourths (74%) of the total farmers studied had other farm income of three hundred dollars or less. A little less than one eight (12%) had other farm income ranging from three hundred and one dollars to six hundred dollars. It is shown above that slightly more than one twentieth (6%) had other farm income ranging from one thousand and one dollars to thirteen hundred dollars.

Table VI shows that thirty per cent (30%) of the farmers studied received two hundred dollars or less from other sources of income. Slightly less than one-third (32%) of the farmers had other income ranging from four hundred and one dollars to six hundred dollars.

TABLE VI

ANNUAL RECEIPTS OF OTHER SOURCES OF INCOME

Groups	Receipts in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farms Studied
1	0 - 200	15	30
2	201 - 400	7	14
3	401 - 600	16	32
4	601 - 800	9	18
5	801 - 1000	3	6
Total	20,100	50	100

It is shown above that almost one fifth (18%) received between six hundred and one dollars and eight hundred dollars other than from the farm. This table shows that six per cent (6%) of the total farmers received between eight hundred and one dollars and one thousand dollars from sources other than farming during 1951.

According to following table a little less than seven eights (86%) of the total farmers studied spent two hundred dollars or less for feed. It is shown that one-tneth (10%) of the farmers spent within the range between two hundred and one dollars and three hundred dollars for feed. Only four per cent of the total farmers studied had a spending range between three hundred and one dollars to

six hundred dollars for feed during the year 1951.

TABLE VII

ANNUAL FEED PURCHASED FOR ALL FARMS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	0 - 200	43	86
2	201 - 300	5	10
3	301 - 400	1	2
4	401 - 600	1	2
Total	5,217	50	100

TABLE VIII

ANNUAL CROP EXPENSE FOR ALL FARMS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	0 - 200	38	76
2	201 - 400	10	20
3	401 - 600	1	2
4	601 - 800	1	2
Total	9,515	50	100

Table VIII shows that slightly more than three-fourths (76%) of the farmers studied had a crop expense of two hundred dollars or less. It is shown by the preceding table that one-fifth (20%) of the farmers studied had a crop expense ranging from two hundred dollars to four hundred dollars. Only one-twenty fifth (4%) of the farmers had a crop expense ranging between four hundred and one dollars and eight hundred dollars.

TABLE IX

ANNUAL AUTO & TRUCK EXPENSE FOR ALL FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	0 - 50	15	30
2	51 - 100	9	18
3	101 - 200	16	32
4	201 - 300	10	20
Total	5,752	50	100

According to Table IX thirty per cent (30%) of the farmers studied had an expense of fifty dollars or less for autoes and trucks in the production of their crops in 1951. It shows also that slightly less than one-third (32%) spent between one hundred and one dollars and two

hundred dollars for the use of automobiles and trucks. One-fifth (20%) of the farmers studied had an expense ranging from two hundred and one dollars to three hundred dollars.

TABLE X

ANNUAL TRACTOR EXPENSE FOR THE NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	0 - 50	44	88
2	51 - 100	5	10
3	101 - 150	1	2
Total	908	50	100

According to Table X, seven eights (88%) of the total farmers studied had a tractor expense of fifty dollars or less. It is shown above that one-tenth (10%) of the farmers had tractors expenses ranging from fifty dollars to one hundred dollars. Only two per cent (2%) of the total farmers studied in this survey had a tractor expense of one hundred or more dollars.

TABLE XI

ANNUAL HIRED LABOR EXPENSE FOR THE FIFTY FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	0 - 50	36	72
2	51 - 100	10	20
3	101 - 200	3	6
4	201 - 350	1	2
Total	1,968	50	100

According to Table XI, a little less than three-fourths (72%) of the farmers studied had an expense of fifty dollars or less. The table shows that one-fifth (20%) of the total farmers studied had a hired labor expense ranging from fifty one dollars to one hundred dollars. Only two per cent (2%) of the farmers had hired labor expense ranging from two hundred and one dollars to three hundred and fifty dollars.

According to Table XII which follows, a little more than two-thirds (68%) of the total farmers studied had an expense of twenty five dollars or less for taxes and insurance. The table also shows that three-tenths (30%) of the farmers studied had a tax and insurance expense ranging from twenty six dollars to fifty dollars. Just two

per cent (2%) of the total farmers studied had a tax insurance expense ranging from fifty one dollars to seventy five dollars.

TABLE XII

TAX AND INSURANCE EXPENSE FOR THE FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	0 - 25	34	68
2	26 - 50	15	30
3	51 - 75	1	2
Total	$806.40	50	100

According to Table XIII, more than one-half (52%) of the total farmers studied had a food expense ranging from four hundred and fifty one dollars to six hundred dollars. The table shows that three-tenths (30%) of the farmers studied had a food expense ranging from six hundred and one dollars to seven hundred and fifty dollars. Only four per cent (4%) of the farmers studied had a food expense ranging from one hundred and fifty dollars to four hundred and fifty dollars in 1951.

TABLE XIII

ANNUAL FOOD EXPENSE FOR ALL FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	150 - 300	1	2
2	301 - 450	1	2
3	451 - 600	26	52
4	601 - 750	15	30
5	751 - 900	6	12
6	901 - 1050	0	0
7	1051 - 1200	0	0
8	1201 - 1350	0	0
9	1351 - 1500	1	2
Total	31,028	50	100

TABLE XIV

ANNUAL CLOTHING EXPENSE FOR THE NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	50 - 150	6	12
2	151 - 200	7	14
3	201 - 300	17	34
4	301 - 400	16	32
5	401 - 500	4	8
Total	13,591	50	100

According to Table XIV, a little more than one-third (34%) of the number of farmers studied had a clothing expense ranging from two hundred and one dollars to three hundred dollars. A little more than three tenths (32%) had a clothing expense ranging from three hundred and one dollars to four hundred dollars. A little than one eight (12%) had a clothing expense ranging as low as fifty dollars to one hundred and fifty dollars. Only eight per cent (8%) had a clothing expense ranging from four hundred and one dollars to five hundred dollars in 1951.

TABLE XV

ANNUAL PERSONAL AND MEDICAL EXPENSE FOR THE NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	0 - 50	14	28
2	51 - 70	7	14
3	71 - 100	20	40
4	101 - 170	9	18
Total	3,820	50	100

According to Table XV, almost three-tenths of the farmers studied had a personal and medical expense of fifty dollars or less. Two-fifths (40%) of the farmers studied had a personal and medical expense ranging from seventy one dollars to one hundred dollars. The above table shows that less than one-fifth of the farmers studied had a personal and medical expense ranging from one hundred dollars to one hundred and seventy dollars during the year of 1951.

According to Table XVI which follows, one-tenth (10%) of the farmers studied had a household operation expense of one hundred dollars or less. It is shown that a little more than three-fourths (76%) of the farmers studied had

TABLE XVI

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD OPERATION EXPENSE FOR THE NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	0 - 100	5	10
2	101 - 300	38	76
3	301 - 500	5	10
4	501 - 800	2	4
Total	11,877.75	50	100

a household operation expense ranging from one hundred and one dollars to three hundred dollars. Four per cent (4%) of the farmers studied had a household operation expense ranging from five hundred and one dollars to eight hundred dollars.

According to Table XVII, a little less than two-fifths (38%) of the farmers studied had a capital expenditure ranging from one hundred and one dollars to two hundred dollars. It is shown that almost one eight of the farmers studied had a capital expenditure of fifty dollars or less. One-tenth (10%) had a capital expenditure ranging from three hundred and one dollars to four hundred dollars . Only eight per cent (8%) had a capital expenditure ranging from eight hundred dollars to one thosand nine hundred dollars.

TABLE XVII

ANNUAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR THE NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	0 - 50	8	16
2	51 - 100	2	4
3	101 - 200	19	38
4	201 - 300	7	14
5	301 - 400	4	8
6	401 - 500	5	10
7	501 - 600	0	0
8	601 - 700	0	0
9	701 - 800	1	2
10	801 - 900	4	8
Total	15,388	50	100

According to Table XVIII which follows, a little less than three-fourths (74%) of the total number of farmers studied made any earnings or profit at all in 1951. Out of this seventy four per cent of the farmers studied, slightly more than one-third (34%) had an earning ranging from five hundred and one dollars to nine hundred dollars. This table shows also than one-tenth (10%) of the farmers studied had an earning ranging from nine hundred and one

TABLE XVIII

THE FARM INCOME OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED

Groups	Earnings in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Per Cent of Total Farmers Studied
1	1701 - 1900	1	2
2	1501 - 1700	0	0
3	1301 - 1500	0	0
4	1101 - 1300	2	4
5	901 - 1100	3	6
6	701 - 900	5	10
7	501 - 700	6	12
8	301 - 500	6	12
9	201 - 300	2	4
10	101 - 200	5	10
11	25 - 100	5	10
12	4 - 25	2	4
13	0 - 4	0	0
	Minus or in the red		
14	0 - 7	0	0
15	7 - 100	2	4
16	101 - 200	3	6
17	201 - 400	5	10
18	401 - 800	1	2
19	801 - 1280	2	4
Total	24,180.35	50	100

dollars to thirteen hundred dollars. Only two per cent of the farmers studied had an earning above seventeen hundred dollars. A little more than one-fourth (26%) of the farmers studied did not make a single penny. Slightly less than one-eight (12%) of this group came out in the red from two hundred and one dollars to eight hundred dollars. Only four per cent of this group of farmers came out in the red ranging from eight hundred and one dollars to twelve hundred and eighty dollars.

PART VIII

THE TYPICAL FARM OF RUSK COUNTY, TEXAS

The writer observed through his study of the fifty Negro farms of this area that they varied in size, number of acres devoted to certain crops, the income received from those crops, livestock, other sources of income and the educational background of the farmers and their families.

The average quantity of cultivated acres of the fifty Negro farmers studied is about fifty-five. The number of cultivated acres varied due to such factors as the kinds of crops grown, type of soil and the location of farms. The average farmer in this study would have many more acres rented than were used either firectly of indirectly in acquiring his income for the year of 1951. Due to the topography of the land in some sections of this area, some waste land will be seen on almost every farm. On some of the farms it can be observed that this waste land is being converted into timber production, using pine trees principally.

The average farm will have crops of a diversified nature. A farm with fifty-five acres in cultivation will

have this acreage divided among the common crops of the area studies ad follows: thirty-five acres in cotton, fifteen acres in corn, two acres in peas, two acres in small grain, two acres in some hay crop (either permanent or temporaryly), with watermelons, irish potatoes, sweet potatoes ranging from one half to two acres. The Home Garden will occupy from about one-eight to one fourth acre. It was observed by the writer that the farmers studied did devote more land to truck crops on the average farm when the farm was located where a market for these crops was easily secured.

The writer noticed that the typical or average farm studied had a small quantity of livestock. This was due to two major factors; first the use of machinery in production and second the transit life the farmers lived.

The average farm would have about eight animals, fifty hens, a few turkeys and guineas. The animals are divided thus: two work animals, five cows and calves, one brood sow and pigs or two shoats (two hogs for butcher). The average farm would sell and use for the family from seventy-five to one hundred and fifty fryers. From thirty dollars to seventy-five dollars are gotten from the sale of eggs. This farm would receive about two hundred dollars from the sale of calves.

It was observed from the study of the fifty Negro farmers of this area that the average farm would have about

twenty five acres of land devoted to permanent pasture. With the introduction of beef cattle enterprises into this area many farmers are converting land lying idle, range land and semi-timbered lands into permanent and temporary pasture. It was observed by the writer that several of the tenants of the area were adding temporary pasture and in a few instances permanent pasture to their standard enterprises as an avenue of added farm income. It was brought to the writer's attention that some landlords would give special consideration to a tenant making pasture improvements and sometime this was included in the rental contract.

It was observed that the average farmers studied received some income from the farm other than from the sale of crops, livestock and livestock products produced or raised on the farm in 1951. The average farmer received some income from either land rental rights, timber, pasture rental or labor. One or several of the above mentioned items had a definite influence on the total farm income of the total number of farmers studied. In one case about one-third of the total farm income of that farmer came from one of the soucces previously mentioned. Many of the farmers called the writer's attention to the fact that some of the sources of income mentioned above was the deciding

factor in the outcome of their farm operations.

It was brought to the writer's attention that the average farmer of this area received an income from sources other than the farm. When these farmers were located near some industrial center the father and older son would seek employment in some industry in this industrial center during the slack season on the farm or in some instances during one-half of the year. It was noticed that several of the farmers studied would go into other counties of the state and into other states even, seeking employment during the season in which they were not gainfully employed on their farms. This type of employment increased the total family income by one-third in some cases, ranging from seven hundred dollars to twelve hundred dollars. The increase in income from these industrial sources has lowered some of the farmers interest in depending entirely on farming for their livelyhood.

The average home of the total number of farmers studied was an unpainted or an old painted building made of one of twelve boards, locally known as a box house with four rooms; covered with corrugated sheet metal roofing. In cases where the tenants were landowners and renters the house would be a painted frame building, equipped with modern furniture and appliances including many of the popular brands of the modern type. It was common to see Gas Ranges, Washing Machines,

Refrigerators and furniture of a corresponding nature. It was observed by the writer that the average home had no lawn or flower garden as such, but an attempt was being made to beautify their home surroundings in some cases.

The writer observed trom the fifty Negro farmers studied that they had an average educational training of the eight grade. Some had gone as far as second year high school. It was quite interesting to the writer to observe the degree of interest shown by the average farmer in the training of his children. This is probably due to the fact that of all the farmers studied their children were in easy reach of an accredited Senior High School either by School Bus or walking distance. In some instances these farmers were parents of college graduates who have children in attendance at some of the leading Colleges and Universities of the nation. The writer observed in this study of the fifty Negro farm families of Rusk County that Texas may produce one or more of the outstanding personalities of the Negro Race.

PART IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The findings in this study show that in communities typical of the one studied by the writer, the types of farming carried on are pretty hard to determine. It was brought out in this study that the bulk of annual receipts of the total number of farmers studied showed that sales from crops led all other sales. However, in attempting to determine the particular crop or crops being responsible for such high sales, one will find that there is no significant crop or combination of crops that was a direct source of fifty per cent of the farm income.

The farm type is largely determined by physical and economic factors not under the control of the individual, such as climate, soil and topography. There are many minor factors that will determine the type of farming such as follows, capital, supply and demand, types of labor, availibility of labor, risk and competition, insect pests, plant diseases, perishibility of products, waste in harvesting and numerous others.

The writer found out through his study that the farmers studied were engaged in diversified farming. It is quite common to see this kind of farming in this county when one takes into consideration the fact that Henderson is one of the leading trading centers of this section. The writer found through his study that the general type of farming prevailing among the fifty farmers studied was due to type of soil and limited acreage.

There was also noted the fact that twenty-six per cent (26%) of the total farmers studied failed to come out even in their last years of farm business. Those farmers making up this unfortunate group were those having none or very little income from other sources than the farm. The writer was informed that the prime factors contributing to the unpleasant status of twenty-six per cent (26%) of the farmers in this study, was the purchase of high cost machinery, household equipment and appliances on the one hand and the lack of modern machinery on the other. The writer observed that many farmers did not take advantage offered in marketing excess farm products such as potatoes, tomatoes, peas and other common crops.

The writer's findings showed that living standards were good on those farms near centers offering employment to the farmers during their off season periods. This employment serves to supplement their income when their income from the farm was not sufficient. In some cases this employment was

used to supplement or enlarge their farm business.

PART X

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It was noted by the writer that some of the people interviewed were hesitant in giving the necessary information when the writer was not a personal friend or acquaintance of the person. It was also noted with the exception of a few veterans attending vocational schools and a few others that there were not any records kept as such of the farm business; therefore, the writer recommends that the vocational agriculture teachers and the county agents encourage and stress the importance of keeping farm records.
2. With the expansion of beef cattle and dairy herds in Rusk County, the writer recommends that the farmers replace as rapidly as possible the crossbreeds of poor quality with pure bred cattle.
3. Due to an increased demand for small grains and truck crops, the farmers of Rusk County should use some of the acres formerly used in cotton for the production of small grains and truck crops.
4. The demand for livestock and livestock products are

so great that the farmers studied by the writer should begin in some cases to expand their livestock enterprices.

5. Because of the type of soil and its fertility in this area, the writer recommends the growing of some soil building crops. This would lower the number of none tillable acres of land in this area.
6. Since beef cattle production is a new and advancing enterprise of this area, the writer recommends the improving of permanent pastures and the production of some hay crops of high nutritive value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

App, Frank. Farm Economics: Management and Distribution. Philadelphia, Chicago and London: The J. P. Lippincott Company, 1924.

Bizell, William. Rural Texas. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924.

Black, John D. Introduction To Production Economics. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1926.

Boyle, James E. Agricultural Economics. Philadelphia, Chicago and London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1928.

Carey, Lewis. A Guide In Farm Organization and Management. Minneapolis, Minnesota: The Burgess Company, 1928.

Forster, G. W. Farm Organization and Management. New York: The Prentice-Hall Company, Inc., 1926.

Getman, Arthur K. The Young Man In Farming. New York: The Wiley Company, 1933.

Hart, Van Breed. Farm Management and Marketing. New York: John Wiley and Company, 1942.

Holtzclaw, Henry F. Agriculture Marketing. New York: The Ronald Company, 1931.

Hopkins, John Abel. Elements Of Farm Management. New York: Prentice-Hall Company, Inc., 1938.

Howe, Frank W. Farm Economics. New York: American Book Company, 1926.

Hudlason, Robert G. Farm Management. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944.

Kains, Maurice C. Five Acres and Independence. New York: Greenberg Company, 1935.

Taylor, Henry C. Outline of Agriculture Economics. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931.

The Texas Almanac, Published by the Dallas Morning News, 1949.

APPENDIX

SURVEY FORM

I. Form No. _____

II. Farm Areas: 1. Acres Owned_____; 2. Acres Cash Rented_____; 3. Acres Rented Out_____; 4. Acres in Crop_____; 5. Acres in Tillable Land Lying Out_____; 6. Acres in Permanent Pasture_____; 7. Acres in Open Pasture not Tillable_____.

III. Types of Farming: 8. General_____; 9. Truck_____; 10. Livestock_____; 11. Poultry_____.

IV. Annual Farm Receipts: 12. Crop Sold$_____; 13. Livestock and Livestock Products_____: A. Poultry $_____; B. Eggs $_____; C. Dairy Products $_____; D. Cattle $_____; E. Hogs $_____; F. Others $_____; 14. Other Farm Income $_____; $_____; $_____; $_____; 15. Other not Farm Income $_____; $_____; $_____; $_____; 16. Loans Received $_____; $_____; $_____; $_____;

V. Annual Farm Operating Expenses: 17. Feed Purchased $_____; $_____; $_____; $_____; 18. Crop Expenses $_____; 19. Machinery Repair $_____; 20. Auto and Truck Expenses $_____; 21. Tractor $_____; 22. Buildings and Land $_____; 23. Miscellaneous Livestock Expenses $_____;

24. Hired Labor $_____; 25. Taxes and Insurance $_____; 26. Rent $_____; 27. Others $_____; $_____; $_____; $_____;

VI. Annual Family Operating Expenses: 28. Food $_____; 29. Clothing $_____. 30. Personal Care $_____; 31. Medical Care $_____; 32. Household Operation $_____; 33. Minor Housing $_____; 34. Minor Furnishing and Equipment $_____. 35. School, Church Gifts and Recreation $_____; 36. Transportation $_____; 37. Life Insurance $_____; 38. Others $_____; $_____; 39. Total $_____.

VII. Annual Capital Expenditures and Debt Payment: 40. New Buildings $_____; 41. Land Improvement $_____; 42. Machinery and Equipment Purchase $_____; 43. Livestock Purchase $_____; 44. Poultry Purchase $_____; 45. Others $_____; 46. Major House Improvement $_____; 47. Major Furniture and Equipment $_____ 48. Total $_____. 49. Debt Payment: A. Principal $_____; B. Interest $_____;50. Total $_____.