

TRS

The Rural Sociologist

January 1987

Volume 7, Number 1

EDITORIAL

Some Small Changes for *TRS* Bob Bealer

FORUM

The RSS: The Ties That Bind John S. Holik
and Edward W. Hassinger

Rural Infrastructure:

Research Needs Beverly A. Cigler

Blaming Self, Others, and

Situations for Failing to Return

Mail Surveys Willis Goudy and Daniel Lichter

Appalachia in the Information Age:

A New Chance for Change? Michael V. Carter
and Guy L. Osborne

COMMENTARY

Determining the Tax Status of

Assistantships Gary Williams and Mark Bain

Linking Research and Extension Agendas:

A Challenge Rusty Brooks

Testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations

Hearings on the Agency for International

Development (USAID) Cornelia Butler Flora

An Alternative Institutional Path for

Getting "Extension" to Farmers Asmatullah Khan,
Iftikhar Ahmad and Andrew J. Sofranko

From Sound Success to Optimistic

Future in China Pan Shaozhang

General Theory for Change Irving A. Spaulding

Farm and Rural Life Surveys:

Some Suggestions Emile Marx

NEWS

Employment Opportunity

Announcements

Professional Activities

THE RURAL SOCIOLOGIST

ISSN 0279-5957

A Bi-Monthly Publication of the Rural Sociological Society
January, March, May, July, September, November

SECOND-CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT
State College, PA 16801

POSTMASTER AND RSS MEMBERS:

Send address changes to Anne S. Williams, Treasurer;
Rural Sociological Society; Department of Sociology;
Montana State University; Bozeman, MT 59717.

OFFICE OF PUBLICATION:

The Rural Sociologist (TRS) is published by the Rural
Sociological Society; 206 Weaver Bldg.; Pennsylvania State
University; University Park, PA 16802

SUBSCRIPTIONS:

Members of the Rural Sociological Society receive TRS
as part of their yearly dues. Others can subscribe at the
annual rate of \$18.00 (U.S. dollars); send payment to Anne
Williams, RSS Treasurer (see above).

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:

TRS provides a forum for the exchange of views on
matters of concern to the profession of rural sociology
and disseminates news relevant to members of the Rural
Sociological Society. All materials appearing in TRS are
the responsibility of the signed author(s), subject to
editing for clarity, format, and brevity.

SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS:

All materials for TRS should be sent to Bob Bealer,
Editor; 206 Weaver Bldg.; Pennsylvania State University;
University Park, PA 16802 (phone: 814-865-0455). For
style suggestions, see the contents of this and other
issues. The deadline for material is 15 calendar days
before the month of publication; exceptions may be made
for newsworthy items. Submission of material for
possible publication in The Rural Sociologist presumes
transfer of all copyrights to the Rural Sociological
Society upon its acceptance for publication.

Printed at Grove Printing, Bellefonte, PA 16823
Copyright © 1987
Rural Sociological Society

The Rural Sociologist

January 1987

Volume 7, Number 1

Contents

EDITORIAL

- Some Small Changes for TRS.....Bob Bealer 2

FORUM

- The RSS: The Ties That Bind.....John S. Holik
and Edward W. Hassinger 3
- Rural Infrastructure:
Research Needs.....Beverly A. Cigler 19
- Blaming Self, Others, and
Situations for Failing to Return
Mail Surveys.....Willis Goudy and Daniel Lichter 35
- Appalachia in the Information Age:
A New Chance for Change?.....Michael V. Carter
and Guy L. Osborne 38

COMMENTARY

- Determining the Tax Status of
Assistantships.....Gary Williams and Mark Bain 44
- Linking Research and Extension Agendas:
A Challenge.....Rusty Brooks 48
- Testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations
Hearings on the Agency for International
Development (USAID).....Cornelia Butler Flora 52
- An Alternative Institutional Path for
Getting "Extension" to Farmers.....Asmatullah Khan,
Iftikhar Ahmad and Andrew J. Sofranko 59
- From Sound Success to Optimistic
Future in China.....Pan Shaozhang 66
- General Theory for Change.....Irving A. Spaulding 69
- Farm and Rural Life Surveys:
Some Suggestions.....Emile Marx 75

NEWS

- Employment Opportunity..... 77
- Announcements..... 77
- Professional Activities..... 79

Editorial

Some Small Changes for TRS

Hopefully, by the time each reader gets to this point, they will have been cognizant of a small change in the publication. For most people The Rural Sociologist is a bit of a mouthful. TRS is the nickname that one hears/sees ever so much more frequently. Why resist popular usage? As sociologists, we know that language is ultimately arbitrated by those who use it. TRS is what comes readily to the tongue, why not the masthead?

Going to nicknames (1) is no great innovation in the profession. ASR is simply easier to "get around" than is the American Sociological Review; ditto the AJS vis-a-vis the American Journal of Sociology. Ever since July of 1964 the AJS has announced itself thusly on the cover of the journal. Interestingly, several years later the American Sociological Review went the same route. From 1966 through 1969 that journal flew an "ASR" banner on its cover -- and then abandoned the practice.

Why the trial run for ASR did not take is unclear. Perhaps, in part, it was nothing more than poor graphics. The letters staring out at one from the sociological archives are a scrawny, convoluted mishmash. The choice made for TRS is bold, straightforward, and to the point. We would like to believe these are traits of the field and reflective of the reporting style held as the goal for this publication.

The only other change that will be apparent is in the style of citation and manner of listing references. Both are taken from forms more characteristic of the biological and physical sciences. These, rather than the humanities, are probably more relevant referents for rural sociology today. Moreover, in redoing a considerable portion of the originally planned November 1986 issue, altered because of a large crush of late-breaking news items, we found the style change could effect a better than 10% savings in space. Small economies are still economies.

And, "big" problems are still big. While manuscripts have shown a slight upturn recently, the in-box of TRS is not the proverbial cup that runneth over. Why not be kind, and consonant? As I write this editorial the Christmas season is upon us. Such times are supposed to be full of cheer. Make my day (and, maybe, yours): flood TRS with manuscripts. If nothing else, write angry letters about the style changes!

NOTE

1. Webster's dictionary tells us a nickname is "a familiar form of a proper name."

Forum

The RSS: The Ties that Bind

John S. Holik and Edward W. Hassinger
University of Missouri - Columbia

FERMENT FOR INDEPENDENCE

Serious consideration of an independent rural sociological organization unfolded at the 1935 American Sociological Society (A.S.S.) annual meeting. A motion was passed [15] in the Rural Sociology Section (RSSec.) business session instructing the incoming Executive Committee "to study the possibilities of forming an autonomous organization ... [and make] recommendations to the members of the Rural Section previous to the next annual meeting."

Accordingly, Section Chairman Lowry Nelson [21] called a special meeting of RSSec. on December 29, 1936. Discussion centered around whether or not the rural sociologists should be truly independent. Smith [21] noted that, in due course, "Dr. Dwight Sanderson moved that a committee be formed to draw up a plan for organizing an affiliated unit of the American Sociological Society." But Carl C. Taylor [21] offered "as an amendment to the motion, that the present chairman appoint a committee of three to formulate plans for the organization of rural sociologists." The amendment was accepted and the motion carried.

Lowry Nelson announced that he would appoint the said committee at the regular RSSec. business meeting next day. True to his word, Nelson appointed as members of the "Committee on Better Organization for Rural Sociologists" these persons: Dwight Sanderson (Chairman), John H. Kolb, Carl C. Taylor, B. O. Williams, and O. D. Duncan. We shall refer to this committee henceforth as the Sanderson Committee.

It cannot be ascertained from available records when the Sanderson Committee met. Most likely it was immediately following the 1936 A.S.S. annual meeting; after that it continued deliberations by correspondence. O. D. Duncan sent a letter [4] to T. Lynn Smith, dated November 27, 1937. It took strong exception to the Committee's majority view:

I fear I have been dismally defeated in my efforts to bring this committee around to recommending separation of the rural sociologists from the American Sociological Society. The vote stands 4 to 1 in favor of a more conciliatory policy. I do not even want membership in one group to have anything to do with membership in the other. Nor do I want to recognize any part of

the constitution of the parent society as having jurisdiction over the rural people.

Several people are trying to make it appear that the young fellows are trying to kick out of the harness while the old birds, so they pretend, are trying to save the day.

I was appointed on that committee when I was not even present because somebody thought I had the intestinal fortitude of my convictions. One member of the group is on the fence, and will tell me one thing and then conciliate with the other fellows. I am going to send in a minority report. I may not be at the meeting and even if I should get there they may not permit the reading of the minority report. I do not know what to do. I have sworn to fight for independence and I mean to do it regardless of the action taken this year. The question is now, are you boys with me or are you not? My position is for absolute separation save only one thing and that is we should meet at the same time and place with the American Sociological Society for our own convenience and amusement.

I am tired of the middle of the road policy which my competitors are anxious to preserve. It is time we were waking up. What do you say?

On December 10, 1937, Smith [22] responded to Duncan's plea with a letter and an enclosed memorandum signed by rural sociologists from Louisiana State University (LSU). Smith, as head of the LSU Sociology Department, wrote:

The enclosed memorandum is in response to your letter of recent date. We have tried to put in writing our own feelings on the matter and have sent a signed copy to the chairman of the committee, Dr. Dwight Sanderson. We are sending copies to other members of the committee, members of the Editorial Board of *Rural Sociology*, and to a few of the other leaders in the field. We hope this will do its part to force a positive stand on this question.

By all means you must try to make the Atlantic City meetings this year. I am willing to go to considerable lengths in urging the organization of a separate society, and our fellows here are solidly behind such a proposal.

The LSU memorandum, also dated December 10th, was as follows:

To the Committee on Better Organization for Rural Sociologists:

The undersigned [Fred C. Frey, Harold C. Hoffsommer, E. H. Lott, Edgar A. Schuler, Marion B. Smith, T. Lynn Smith] are deeply interested both in general sociology and in rural sociology. From our experience we are of the opinion that the present organization setup is not a sound basis for satisfactory working relations nor for promoting the work and interest of either group. We believe this kind of organization setup will continue to be a source of contention as long as it is maintained. We are willing to follow the procedures which a majority of the rural sociologists feel advantageous, but in order to bring about better relations between rural sociology and general sociology we propose that one or the other of the two following courses of action be adopted:

1. The organization of an entirely independent national rural sociological society.
2. The disbanding of the present Section on Rural Sociology so that rural sociologists will have the opportunity to distribute their efforts throughout the other sections of the society, thus becoming more potent in the affairs of the general society.

We believe the first of these alternatives is more desirable. Our reasons for taking this position are as follows:

1. We believe that rural sociologists are sufficiently numerous and strong to maintain a worthwhile national organization.
2. We believe that an independent organization can do much to stimulate interest in rural sociology and to increase the importance of rural sociologists in national affairs.
3. We believe that rural sociology has not benefited and cannot benefit by continuing as a section of the American Sociological Society. Indeed we believe it may be seriously hampered in many respects by continuing such an affiliation.
4. We believe that the relations between rural sociology and general sociology would be improved by the separate organization of

rural sociologists. Rural sociology would no longer arouse the antagonisms which are inevitable products of any group-within-a-group relationship. As evidence of this we would point out that, in our estimation, rural sociologists who are members of the Farm Economics Association receive a much more cordial reception there than in the American Sociological Society. We think the sociological explanation is clear.

5. We believe that most rural sociologists who are now members of the American Sociological Society would continue as members of that organization, and that their influence in the general society would be increased. Participation in the activities of the rural group would no longer prevent rural sociologists from taking an active part in the programs of the other sections. In this way they would more fully get value received for the \$6.00 membership fee charged by the general society. There is much to be gained by rural sociologists and rural sociology, through greater participation in the other sections of the society. This would afford members of the rural group better opportunities for a wider dissemination of their information and results.
6. We believe there are many people who would join and actively support a national rural sociological society who are unwilling to join the American Sociological Society.
7. We believe an independent organization could contribute much more adequately to the support and maintenance of the journal of Rural Sociology. (It is to be understood that Louisiana State University's support of Rural Sociology is in no way dependent upon the action taken with regard to this proposal.)

We favor the following procedure:

1. Calling a meeting of those interested who will immediately organize the national rural sociological society.
2. Letting the Section on Rural Sociology die a natural death by failing to elect officers for the coming year.

There need be no question of secession from the American Sociological Society. Rural

sociologists would not secede in a body. In fact most of them would continue as members of the general society, and, over a period of years, should contribute much to its programs; more than they have in the last ten years. There would be, however, a new national organization in which most members of the Section on Rural Sociology and many people who are not members of the American Sociological Society would participate.

We think that the national rural sociological society would usually want to meet at the same time and place as the American Sociological Society and the Farm Economics Association.

The LSU memorandum was mailed to members of Rural Sociology's Editorial Board, other RSSEC. committees, and assorted other leaders in rural sociology. The RSSEC. Archives contain copies of responses from Charles E. Lively, Dwight Sanderson, Carl C. Taylor, Bonney Youngblood, and B. O. Williams. Excepting Sanderson and Williams, all the responses favored the memorandum. Williams [31] noted that he had already committed himself to "Sanderson's tentative plan for an affiliated status." His opposition [31] to the formation of an independent organization of rural sociologists was expressed to Smith this way:

In the first place, I am very apprehensive as to the future of the American Sociological Society itself. As a rural sociologist, I am one who feels that sociology as a whole must be developed before we can have great prestige for our sub-interests. The friction which arose over the setting up of the American Sociological Review, the Sectional Societies which have been developed and the diversified interests within the society, other than the Rural group, seem to me to point to disintegration. The parent society has had too great a history and has done too much for the development of sociology in all its aspects for us to see it deteriorate to the level of a defunct organization. I feel very strongly on this particular point because I have attended some ten of the annual meetings and have observed the trend.

Furthermore, unless there could be a very real and substantial increase in interest and in the number in attendance, I do not believe that we could justify a separate organization. Personally, I am more interested in the development of "Rural Sociology" (Journal) than I am of a separate society. It may be that a

separate society would accomplish this purpose also but I seriously doubt it. There are some very obscure and subtle facts concerning Rural Sociology (Subject) in so far as the "place it occupies" in the Institutions. These facts make me feel that we should be sure of our "Institutional identity" before we are able to launch an independent organization. I personally feel that we have not asserted ourselves as we should in the general meetings and I believe we should do this whether we withdraw or not.

Like Williams, Sanderson [19] expressed concern for the viability of A.S.S. if various groups were to secede from it. However, Sanderson [19] amended his concern by saying, "If it is the desire of a majority of the men that we proceed to organize an entirely separate organization, I am sure that all the members of the committee, including myself, will support such a move even though it is against our best judgement."

T. Lynn Smith [23] responded immediately to Sanderson reassuring him that the LSU group was not planning to disrupt the forthcoming business meeting of RSSec.; he wrote:

I am glad to have your letter of December 14 and I hasten to reply because I am particularly anxious that there be no misunderstanding between us on the matter of our memorandum. We stated explicitly there that we were willing to follow the course desired by the majority of the rural sociologists. Accordingly, the thought that we desire to organize a rump session should be dismissed entirely.

We are vitally interested in rural sociology and general sociology. It is our firm belief that the present organization promotes ill will between rural sociologists and general sociologists. We want to reduce this friction. We believe if rural sociologists have an entirely independent organization much of the mutual dissatisfaction between the two groups can be done away with. We believe we have the interests of the American Sociological Society at heart as fully as any other member of the rural group. We propose to oppose as vigorously as we can any type of setup which in our estimation will continue to breed ill will between rural sociologists and general sociologists. However, if the majority of the rural group do not agree with us, then we will acquiesce and do all in our power to foster rural sociology through whatever type of organization is adopted.

In Atlantic City on the morning of December 29, 1937, a special meeting of the RSSec. [24] was called to order by George von Tungeln to hear the report of the Sanderson Committee. About 75 rural sociologists were in attendance. The report they heard consisted of a majority statement submitted by Kolb, Taylor, Williams, and Sanderson, plus a demur by Duncan.

The majority report [20] proposed to create a separate rural sociological society, but one affiliated with, and designated as, a section of the American Sociological Society. In order to do that, an amendment to the Constitution of the A.S.S. was required. Specifically, the majority report was as follows: [the underlined section is the "needed" amendment to the A.S.S. constitution]

Your committee, appointed to suggest a plan for the organization of a society of rural sociologists, preferably as an affiliated unit of the American Sociological Society, has given careful consideration to the problems involved and has corresponded with the officers of the American Sociological Society and through them with its executive committee. As a result, we recommend:

1. That the rural section formally propose the two following amendments to the constitution of the American Sociological Society.

"Article VIII. Section 2. A section of the society shall be composed of members of the society interested in a common field of sociological specialization, or may consist of an independent society or association devoted to a special field of sociology, a majority of whose members are members of the American Sociological Society. The constitution or by-laws of such an independent association must specify that it is a section of the American Sociological Society. Sections shall meet annually during the time of, and in the same city as the annual meeting of the Society."

Article VIII. Section 5, by inserting after the word "sections", "except as provided in Section 2 above."

These amendments should be presented at the present meeting [of the American Sociological Society] and cannot be acted upon until the following year as they must be transmitted by the secretary to all members two months before the annual meeting. The presentation at the present

time would permit full discussion and enables the members of the rural section to obtain a reaction of the members of the parent society.

2. Your committee also proposes the adoption of the attached suggested constitution and by-laws for the creation of a separate organization affiliated with the American Sociological Society. We suggest that this constitution be circulated among the members of the rural section and that its adoption be made a special order of business at the meeting of 1938, after the American Sociological Society has voted upon the proposed amendments.

Attached to the majority report also was a proposed constitution and bylaws.

The minority report [20], as might be anticipated from Duncan's previous statements, advocated complete independence from the A.S.S. In his pungent words: "This group [should] here and now declare itself to be an independent society and that as an organization its allegiance to the American Sociological Society in all matters of jurisdiction shall be regarded by this action as having come to an end."

The mimeographed version of the minutes of the special RSec. meeting [24] contains the following paragraph which summarizes what happened after the majority and minority reports were presented:

There was a lively discussion between members of the Section, including Sanderson, Kolb, Taylor, Duncan, and Zimmerman, concerning the desirability of forming a national organization. The principal point of disagreement was concerning the desirability of affiliating as a Section of the American Sociological Society as recommended in the majority report. It was pointed out by Dr. Sanderson that the question could not be settled at the time because of the provision in the constitution of the American Sociological Society which provided that all amendments to the Society's constitution must be presented at least ninety days before the next annual meeting. Accordingly, it was agreed to close the affairs of the Section on Rural Sociology, organize a new national Society, operate under a provisional constitution, and defer for one year the adoption of a permanent constitution.

T. Lynn Smith's handwritten notes [25] of the special meeting indicate that the birth of the Rural Sociological

Society of America was more complicated than the above account suggests. Thus, Smith's notes show that a motion by Carl Taylor "to organize, the American Society of Rural Sociologists here and now at Atlantic City, adopt a constitution and by-laws and elect officers; and that the elected officers of this society continue negotiations for affiliation with A.S.S.," was tabled. Still, before the morning meeting was adjourned, an informal agreement was reached to organize an independent society.

In a parliamentary maneuver to unseat the tabled motion, George von Tungeln immediately called a second special meeting to order at 11:35 a.m. [26]. The minutes show that at this session Sanderson was elected temporary chairman and T. Lynn Smith, secretary. Thence, Paul Vogt's motion, "that we form a society of rural sociologists," carried. Next, Sanderson's motion, "that the constitution, except Article 9, be provisionally adopted, and that we proceed to elect officers," also carried. Accordingly, the following persons were elected as the first officers of the Rural Sociological Society of America: Dwight Sanderson, President; John H. Kolb, Vice-President; T. Lynn Smith, Secretary-Treasurer; Carl C. Taylor and Charles E. Lively, members of the Executive Committee.

As was pointed out above, a proposed constitution was attached to the Sanderson Committee report. Correspondence between Sanderson and Smith [27] indicates that the constitution, probably with modifications as it passed through committees and scribes, had been prepared by Nathan L. Whetten in 1936.

The provisional constitution and bylaws adopted at the 1937 special meeting were published in the March, 1938 issue of Rural Sociology [28]. Interestingly, Article 3 of the constitution proposed by the Sanderson Committee was retained, although Duncan's minority report, which seemingly had prevailed, called for its removal. Also, the adoption of the proposed constitution was with the exception of Article 9. Our examination of the records has not fully resolved the intent of that exception.

Article 9 dealt with constitution amendments. There was no obvious reason for its elimination. In the provisional constitution published in Rural Sociology [28], the content of Article 9 was retained but placed, incorrectly, as Article 8, under the heading of "Annual Meeting." Therefore, there is no content statement for "Annual Meeting" which, as Article 8 in the proposed constitution, had read: "The Annual meeting shall be held at the same time and place as that of the American Sociological Society, and may consist of one or more sessions." It may have been Article 8 that was intended to be eliminated. At least, there was a copying error in the provisional constitution that placed the section on amendments under the heading "Annual Meeting."

In 1938, a permanent constitution was adopted and published in Rural Sociology [29]. The name was changed from Rural Sociological Society of America to simply the Rural Sociological Society; Article 3 read only, "This Society shall be affiliated with the American Sociological Society." That statement left off the phrase "and shall constitute a section on Rural Sociology of that Society," which had appeared in the provisional constitution. Copying errors were corrected so that articles pertaining to the annual meeting and amendments (Articles 8 and 9) were under their properly respective headings. The time and place of the annual meeting were not tied to those of the A.S.S., as they had been in the constitution proposed by the Sanderson Committee.

Activities surrounding the journal, Rural Sociology, played an important role in the press for an independent society. Rural sociologists at LSU had taken the lead in establishing and supporting the journal. Fred Frey, in his administrative position, had been especially effective in obtaining resources from the University. He made it clear, however, that continuation of those resources had contingencies. Thus, at the 1938 RSS business meeting, President Sanderson called upon Lowry Nelson, Editor of Rural Sociology, for a report [29]:

Mr. Nelson reported that agreement with the Louisiana State University for publication of the quarterly Rural Sociology terminated with the December, 1938, issue, and that new arrangements must be completed if the journal were to continue. He suggested four possible plans of action: (1) that the publication of the journal might be discontinued; (2) that the society might assume full responsibility for the publication of Rural Sociology; (3) that the Louisiana State University might be requested to continue the journal as its own publication; and (4) that a new cooperative agreement between the society and the university might be arranged and entered into. There was a brief discussion of these proposals, and the chairman asked for a statement from Fred C. Frey regarding the Louisiana State University's attitude. Mr. Frey stated that he had secured support from the university for the journal only in an endeavor to assist the development of rural sociology as a strong discipline, and that the university was willing to extend its support to the journal for two additional years on the following conditions: (1) that the Rural Sociological Society continue in every way a fully autonomous organization; and (2) that the members of the society make every effort to place the journal upon a completely self-sustaining basis. It was moved and seconded that the editorial board

of Rural Sociology was empowered to work out with the university an agreement for publishing the journal during the coming two years. Motion carried.

THE RESPONSE OF A.S.S.

The American Sociological Society's attention to regional and special area societies was forced by the action of the rural sociologists. Splintering threatened the health, perhaps the very existence, of the A.S.S. Establishing the American Sociological Review as the official journal had been a source of considerable divisiveness. Furthermore, the economic condition of the Society was perilous. Deficits were endemic [7]. The 1935 report of the A.S.S. Finance Committee had presented a plan to retire the accumulated shortfalls by selling Certificates of Indebtedness to members [30]. Sanderson and Williams, as noted earlier, expressed concern about the effects of separation on the parent society. It was not just economics. As reported by Clyde Collard [3:333], Charles Loomis noted that a reason for animosity by members of A.S.S. toward rural sociologists was that the latter's separation served as a model for the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP), "in setting up its operations and criticizing the parent body."

Be this as it may, criticism of A.S.S. by rural sociologists was not without some base. At the 1937 A.S.S. business meeting, the day after the rural sociologists had decided on a separate organization, Sanderson presented a proposal to amend that group's constitution [10:93]. The wording of the amendment was identical to that of the Sanderson Committee majority report. The proposed amendment was accepted for ostensible action at the next A.S.S. meeting and was published in the April, 1938, issue of the American Sociological Review [11]. The proposed amendment was then republished in the December, 1938, issue of the same journal with one change; "one-third" was substituted for "a majority" as the required membership of rural sociologists in A.S.S. [1:873]. A review of the minutes to the 1938 A.S.S. business meeting and to its executive committee meeting, however, shows no public mention of the RSS proposed amendment.

The official reports and proceedings, as published in the American Sociological Review, strongly suggest that President Frank H. Hankins of A.S.S. dissuaded hearing the proposed amendment because of a broader consideration to regional and special societies. An A.S.S. Committee on Regional Societies [5] was appointed in 1936 by President Henry Fairchild and was succeeded by the so-called "Committee on Organization" in 1938 [8]. The following excerpt from the recommendation of the

committee by its first name [9:261] suggests President Hankins referred the RSS amendment to that committee:

The Committee on Regional Societies this year extended its inquiry to include the organizational problems of the Society. It prepared a lengthy analysis of such problems, which has been mimeographed and made available to members of the Society attending the meetings.

The Committee feels strongly that the Society can greatly improve its usefulness and promote the science it fosters by moving in the direction of greater solidarity with respect to (a) relations with the six regional societies, (b) relations with specialized societies, and (c) professional qualifications for membership. To promote such solidarity, the Committee submits the following recommendations to the Executive Committee for transmission to the Society . . . [The third of these was pertinent to the RSS amendment.]

3. That the American Sociological Society approve in principle the extension of affiliation to specialized scientific societies within or closely related to the field of sociology which desire to meet annually or usually in conjunction with the Society, and that the Committee on Organization . . . be instructed to work out details in consultation with officers of specialized societies, to submit the plan of affiliation to an informal poll of the voting members of the Society in such form as to provide a means of guidance to the Committee, and to prepare such amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws as may be necessary.

The recommendations of the A.S.S. Committee on Organization were discussed at the 1939 business meeting of the Society [12:92]. A motion was passed that the Committee conduct a poll of the membership to determine their sentiments on the four sections of the given report. This was done. The published results [2:954] showed the A.S.S. membership approved all four sections. At the 1940 A.S.S. business meeting, the report of the Committee on Organization was approved, section by section, and a motion was passed that this committee be discharged and replaced by a committee to revise the constitution [13:83]. The report of the Committee on the Revision of the Constitution and By-Laws [6] was published in the ASR for October 1941. Formal action to revise the A.S.S. constitution was taken during the 1941 business and executive committee meetings [14]. The new constitution of the A.S.S., which went into effect the first

day of 1942, officially designated RSS as one of the affiliated societies having representation on the Executive Committee [14].

During the years 1938 through 1942, no mention was made in Rural Sociology of the affiliation issue. "News Notes and Announcements," the official channel for communication to RSS members, did -- in March, 1942 -- contain the following statement [16:121]:

The Society [A.S.S.] adopted a new constitution which, among other things, provides for greater flexibility in the arrangement of sections and programs; for election of officers by mail; and for representation of Regional and other affiliated Societies on the Executive Committee.

The following paragraph from the published minutes of the 1943 RSS annual business meeting [17:92] suggests that affiliation with the A.S.S. was discussed:

President C. E. Lively suggested the constitution be amended to provide that the representative of the [Rural] Society on the Executive Committee of the American Sociological Society be elected. Heretofore the representative has been appointed by the President. To amend the constitution it is necessary that five members propose the change. It was suggested that the President appoint two individuals to work with Kirkpatrick, Bell and Oyler to propose the amendment at the next annual meeting.

The minutes of the 1945 RSS annual business meeting [18:226] show that Lively's suggested amendment to the constitution was adopted.

POSTSCRIPT

The idea of a separate organization of rural sociologists was not a new one in the mid-1930s. The record shows that it was proposed in 1928, and probably earlier than that. Rural sociologists appeared to have a minority group complex. They saw themselves as being power deficient vis-a-vis the general sociologists; they tended to clique together at the annual professional meeting; and, they sought their rights in publication space, place on the annual program, and position in the governing councils of the A.S.S. To some degree, that society accommodated the rural sociologists in their midst. Two annual meetings (1916 and 1928) were devoted entirely to rural topics; provisions were made for publishing rural papers as one issue of the quarterly publications of A.S.S. Papers and Proceedings; and, the Section was given a position on the

A.S.S. governing council. The aspiration for a separate organization persisted, however, and events moved toward that end.

Beginning with rural sociologists who met informally in conjunction with sessions of other religious and professional organizations, the focus shifted to the annual A.S.S. meeting. Within that group, greater formality occurred: designation as a Section; formulation of bylaws; election of officers; publication of a journal; and, finally, the formation of an independent society.

Relationships with A.S.S. did not cease for rural sociologists with the formation of a separate organization. A review of A.S.S. preliminary programs for the annual meeting (published in the Official Reports and Proceedings section annually in the October *ASR*) shows, except for 1939, one or more rural sociology sessions for each year from 1938 through 1941. Then, in 1942, the entire program of the RSS was printed in the *ASR* as part of the A.S.S. program. The Rural Sociological Society historically met in the same hotel conjunctively with A.S.S. RSS continued to have a representative on the governing council of the A.S.S. (later the American Sociological Association) until 1967 when the ASA eliminated the position. Article 3 of the RSS Constitution, which was adopted in 1938 providing for affiliation with the American Sociological Society, remained unchanged until 1985; it was eliminated that year and went almost unnoticed by the RSS membership at large.

REFERENCES

[Editor's note: the asterisk, following the references to the Rural Sociological Society of America Papers, refers to Joint Collection, University of Missouri Western Historical Manuscript Collection-Columbia and State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts-Columbia, Missouri.]

1. Bain, Read (ed.). 1938. "Official reports and proceedings." *American Sociological Review* 3:873-874.
2. Bossard, James H. S. 1940. "Preliminary summary of mail ballot on the report of the Committee on Organization." *American Sociological Review* 5:954.
3. Collard, Clyde V. 1984. "The founding of Rural Sociology and the Rural Sociological Society." *The Rural Sociologist* 4:324-335.
4. Duncan, O. D. 1937. Letter to T. Lynn Smith, November 27, 1937. The Rural Sociological Society of America Papers, Folder 51.*

5. Fairchild, Henry P. 1936. "Official reports and proceedings." *American Sociological Review* 1:800-802.
6. Hertzler, J. O. 1941. "Report of the Committee on the Revision of the Constitution and By-laws of the American Sociological Society." *American Sociological Review* 6:710.
7. Karf, Maurice J. 1927. "Report of the Finance Committee." *Publications of the American Sociological Society, Papers and Proceedings* (1926 meetings), Vol. 21.
8. Krueger, E. T. (chm.). 1937. "Report of the Committee on Regional Societies." *American Sociological Review* 2:82-91.
9. Krueger, E. T. (chm.). 1939. "Recommendations of the Committee on Regional Societies." *American Sociological Review* 4:261-262.
10. Phelps, H. A. (sec.). 1938. "Business meeting of the American Sociological Society, December 30, 1937." *American Sociological Review* 3:92-94.
11. Phelps, H. A. (sec.). 1938. "Official reports and proceedings." *American Sociological Review* 3:238.
12. Phelps, H. A. (sec.). 1940. "Official reports and proceedings." *American Sociological Review* 5:91-92.
13. Phelps, H. A. (sec.). 1941. "Minutes of the third business meeting of the American Sociological Society, December 29, 1940." *American Sociological Review* 6:82-84.
14. Phelps, H. A. (sec.). 1942. "Minutes of the 1941 business and Executive Committee meetings of the American Sociological Society." *American Sociological Review* 7:68-71.
15. Polson, Robert A. 1935. The December 29, 1935, Business Meeting of the Rural Sociology Section of the American Sociological Society. The Rural Sociological Society of America Papers [Henceforth identified as RSSAP], Folder 43.*
16. Polson, Robert A. 1942. "News notes and announcements." *Rural Sociology* 7:117-118.
17. Polson, Robert A. 1944. "News notes and announcements." *Rural Sociology* 9:91-92.
18. Polson, Robert A. 1945. "News notes and announcements." *Rural Sociology* 10:224-226.
19. Sanderson, Dwight. 1937. Letter to T. Lynn Smith, December 14, 1937. RSSAP, Folder 51.*
20. Sanderson, Dwight. 1937. Report of the Committee Appointed in 1936 to Suggest a Plan for the Organization of a Society of Rural Sociologists. RSSAP, Folder 49.*
21. Smith, T. Lynn. 1936. Minutes of the December 29, 1936, Special Meeting of the Rural Sociology Section of the American Sociological Society. RSSAP, Folder 43.*
22. Smith, T. Lynn. 1937. Letter to O. D. Duncan, December 10, 1937. RSSAP, Folder 51.*

23. Smith, T. Lynn. 1937. Letter to Dwight Sanderson, December 17, 1937. RSSAP, Folder 51.*
24. Smith, T. Lynn. 1937. Mimeographed Minutes of the Special Meetings of the Section on Rural Sociology of the American Sociological Society. RSSAP, Folder 49.*
25. Smith, T. Lynn. 1937. Handwritten Notes from Which the Official Minutes of the December 29, 1937, Special Meeting of the Rural Sociology Section of A.S.S. were Prepared. RSSAP, Folder 49.*
26. Smith, T. Lynn. 1937. Typewritten Minutes of the Special Meetings of the Section on Rural Sociology of the American Sociological Society. RSSAP, Folder 49.*
27. Smith, T. Lynn. 1937. Letter to Dwight Sanderson, October 18, 1937. RSSAP, Folder 50.*
28. Smith, T. Lynn. 1938. "News notes and announcements." Rural Sociology 3:124-126.
29. Smith, T. Lynn. 1939. "News notes and announcements." Rural Sociology 4:128-130.
30. Todd, Arthur J. (chm.). 1936. "Report of the Finance Committee." American Sociological Review 1:120.
31. Williams, B. O. 1937. Letter to T. Lynn Smith, December 15, 1937. RSSAP, Folder 51.*

Rural Infrastructure: Research Needs

Beverly A. Cigler
North Carolina State University

This paper highlights two broad areas of research need for rural infrastructure policy: data generation/classification; and, analyses that link the allocation of responsibilities among governments with alternative financing for service delivery, and rural community management capacity. It does so by taking a comprehensive view of pertinent literature (1).

DATA GENERATION/CLASSIFICATION

The literature on "infrastructure" -- the word commonly used to designate this nation's vast and vital network of public works facilities necessary to produce and deliver public services -- contains a wealth of descriptive studies by professional and municipal associations, research institutes, and consulting firms, but far less concern for the kinds of taxonomies necessary for policy relevance [3, 5, 14, 23, 36, 56, 63]. Studies by the national government tend to offer greater specification of policy options [2, 20, 21, 22, 44, 45, 46, 86, 87, 89].

In 1983 the Congressional Budget [20] highlighted three key sets of problems related to declining investments in public facilities in general: deterioration; technological obsolescence; and insufficient capacity to serve future growth. Also noted were the adverse effects of declining infrastructural investment, that is: higher costs borne by users of inadequate or deteriorated facilities; higher life-cycle construction costs for facilities that are not properly maintained; and, potentially significant constraints on economic development.

This kind of categorization can help focus research efforts directed at studying community facilities problems that differ in kind; they suggest that alternative policy approaches for financing, managing, and allocating responsibilities may be necessary. Here, "how-to-do-it" books, addressed primarily to state and local officials, offer some useful first steps in structuring such research [33, 52, 62, 64, 83, 95, 96, 99, 102].

Several studies specifically addressed to rural community facilities are important in demonstrating that rural needs are considerable. For example, under contract