



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

tirements and possible non re-election of a few people in Congress might mean to the support for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I'm also concerned about retirements and non election and what that might do to the support for Extension at the state level.

In my view, if Extension specialists and researchers feel that their marketing programs are important, they're going to have to do several things. They must work closely together and they must work closely with leaders in industry. They must communicate what they do much better with their superiors. They must organize and develop political understandings necessary at the national and state levels if they wish to continue receiving public monies. They must gain political support from the food industry and the businesses related to the food industry to help get continued public monies.

If the above list does not materialize, this is the way I see Extension in 2000 A.D. The USDA will be a small agency in some

larger federal department and that smaller agency will be concerned primarily with farm and ranch production and management. Marketing will be in another federal department, possibly the Department of Commerce. 4-H will be in health, education, and welfare; Home Economics will be in a new consumer department, and I do not think that we can play down the trends that are now becoming evident of the power of the consumer. You can talk about women's lib, the FDA, or many other things, but I believe after about 40 years now that we're coming close to the consumer department. In my experience, the larger businesses in the food distribution industry have really gone out and hired consultants for pay when they wanted some marketing information, data, analysis and it could very well be that marketing extension will be on a paid consultant basis in 2000 A.D.

Now lastly, I agree with Jarvis that a lot of hard work is needed to prepare for A.D. 2000.

\*\*\*\*\*

## EXTENSION — 2000 A.D. — COMMENTS

by  
William W. Wood, Jr.  
University of California  
Riverside, California

---

Presents an alternative view to the position paper.

---

Sample observations indicate that in 1950 there were 2.2 individuals per vehicle on Los Angeles freeways. By 1960 the number had dropped to 1.8 and by 1970 to 1.4 individuals per vehicle. The conclusion drawn by the trained observer studying transportation models was that by 1990, one out of every three vehicles on Los Angeles freeways would be empty.

The above illustration is by way of pointing out difficulties with trend projections in attempting to forecast what might be the situation at some future date. The reason for this is my disagreement with the basic assumption on which Professor Cain's paper is built, i.e., that food consumption and nutrient delivery systems in the year 2000 will be of a certain type predicated primarily upon the speed of preparation and convenience. Obviously, trends in the food purveying industry would indicate at this point in time a direction toward that end. However, I am not willing to accept

such a conclusion based in large measure upon other observations with respect to our society. These observations relate to the increasing interest in natural and organic foods, the increased attendance in cooking classes, and the increase in leisure time which will be devoted to a number of endeavors including such hobbies as food preparation.

Obviously, my disagreement with Professor Cain is not in terms of absolutes, but in terms of degree. There are changes taking place in terms of consumer preference and consumer perception of food requirements. He grants that production will still be commodity oriented, but primarily in terms of inputs for a nutrient delivery system. As a confirmed cynic, I'm not convinced that in as few as 28 years we will have made particularly large strides in educating people with respect to nutrition as against some well inbred preferences that relate in no way to the nutrient value of the items consumed.

However, let us assume that Professor Cain's crystal ball is a very clear and accurate one and mine is terribly cloudy. Thus, we will accept his assumption as to what the consumer world will be like in the year 2000 A.D. and proceed from that point. It is not my intention to take exception to Professor Cain's observation with respect to Extension and the bureaucracy involved, nor the "calcification" of program interests. The same observation could be made with respect to almost any institution not only in these United States, but elsewhere when people become involved over a period of time. In fact, your society is holding its thirteenth annual meeting and I would suspect that you are in grave danger of falling into the same sort of trap as to the approaches that seem to be appropriate. I am more optimistic than Professor Cain appears to be with respect to 1972; I see bright spots in Extension and the Land Grant Universities in general with respect to changing directions and the criteria by which priorities are established. I hasten to admit however, that these changes are rather slow in coming and their magnitude leaves considerable to be desired.

The point on which I would chide Professor Cain in his view of changing worlds

has to do with changing orientation. Very simply, and perhaps I'm overstating, Professor Cain seems to be arguing that Extension should shift its orientation away from the large producing segments of commercial purveyors in the food supply system who are systems oriented. Frankly, from my perspective, I could not care less about whether the clientele are commodity or systems oriented. The point, it seems to me, is whether or not in either context publicly supported extended education activities are directed in an appropriate fashion and to an appropriate clientele. To shift from one oligopolistic or monopolistic sector or stage of the total production system of food and fibre to another oligopolistic or monopolistic stage or segment does not seem a particularly significant shift. If, as seems to be implied, we are not adequately serving the consuming public by working with commercial agricultural producers, then I fail to see that we would any more adequately serve the consuming public by working with the large firms involved in the various aspects of marketing or the "nutrient delivery system".

The human animal seems to view change only in the context of past experience. Thus, when we view Extension some 28 years from now, we view it as it has existed since its inception in the early twentieth century. The real assets of Extension over the years, it seems to me, have been its organizational structure that has permitted direct access to the people where they are located, and a methodology for educational and research purposes that has provided a two way communication system between recipients of such efforts and a group elsewhere that has consistently provided information and answers to pertinent questions.

The problem in the years ahead for Extension seems to focus primarily on the fact that there is not an organizational structure adequate back to the Universities or local, State and Federal Governments, that will provide access to the sort of information necessary for extended education programs. I'm suggesting that by the year 2000, if an Extension type organization still exists, it will be oriented in such a fashion that it is a delivery system which has a capability of developing some of the mate-

rial that enters the delivery system between clientel wherever or whomever they may be and sources of information equally broad in interest and perspective.

This means for example, that the Extension organization in working in food distribution systems will call not only on the traditional colleges of agriculture for information, but all elements of the higher education and research system, both public and private.

An interesting analogy seems to be developing at present with respect to The Environmental Protection Agency. The decision has been made, and letters of understanding have been negotiated, that rather than an informational research delivery system with EPA, the Cooperative or Agricultural Extension Agencies across the country will serve as the delivery system with respect to environmental concerns and issues. In this context it seems highly doubtful that the sole source of information entering that delivery system will come from colleges of agriculture.

By the same token, the Extension organization at some point in the future, will not restrict itself to food and fibre areas of our society and economy, but as is already the case, concern itself with a whole host of problems that are related to people and the resources they use or within which they reside. My hypothesis with respect to the year 2000 A.D. is that we very well may view not Extension at that point, but rather the University at that point as being all encompassing with respect to an extended education structure, activity and function. In the open university context, I would view Extension as playing a very great role and perhaps the major role for the entire adult education concept.

My observation of Extension workers, while admittedly limited, suggests that it

is not the resistance to change that is a major problem on the part of working staff. As a matter of fact, I frequently come to the conclusion that the working staff not only with Agricultural Extension in California, but in a number of other states with which I am familiar, are at the forefront when there are necessary changes both with respect to programs and clientel.

The problem, with respect to change, seems to be at the administrative level, where not only does change tend to be resisted, but as positions become vacant, a resistance exists to allocating those positions to previously uninvolved subject matter areas. Even with scarce resources, as a biological or physical science position becomes available, justifications for a duplicate replacement seem to be very prolific. Rarely do you see positions of that sort shifted to the somewhat less acceptable social sciences. In fact, if you look at staffs in colleges or divisions of agriculture, one has the uneasy feeling that even the Agricultural Economist is merely tolerated as perhaps the most acceptable of the "soft sciences". You do not find industrial psychologists, anthropologists, political scientists, or an array of other disciplinary specialists employed by Extension as staff members. Nevertheless, this is the direction of change that seems to be paramount and one which if Extension is to exist in the year 2000, as more than simply a fond memory, must be recognized. I hope that Professor Cain and I are both attempting to head in the same direction, perhaps by different routes, but with the expectation of achieving a viable effort at some point in the future. The admonition that I would offer, which at least I inferred from Professor Cain's paper, is that we not shift our "allegiance" from Heggeblade-Marguleas-Tenneco to General Foods or Greyhound or some other type of large industrial organization.

\*\*\*\*\*