



PROCEEDINGS

Thirteenth Annual Meeting
of the
Southern Weed Conference

January 20, 21, 22, 1960
Biloxi, Mississippi

MAY 4 1960

PREFACE

These Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Southern Weed Conference held January 20, 21, and 22, 1960, in Biloxi, Mississippi, include formal papers, the report of the Research Committee, minutes of the business meeting and lists of registrants and sustaining members.

Additional copies of these Proceedings are available at \$3.50 per copy from the Conference Secretary-Treasurer. Proceedings of the conference meetings held in 1950, 1953, and 1954 are available at \$2.00 per copy.

Permission to reproduce any part of the Research Committee Report should be secured from the Executive Board. Permission to reproduce data from papers in any proceedings of the Southern Weed Conference should be secured from the respective author(s).

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

V. S. Searcy
President, Southern Weed Conference

Since you bestowed on me the highest honor that can come to an individual in this conference, I have pondered many times what I should say to you that would be timely, informative, and that, I hope would express to you my sincere appreciation for the honor and this opportunity.

The more I thought about it the more I realized it was not an easy undertaking. By tradition no one assigns or even suggests a topic for this occasion. Therefore, what I am about to say falls under several headings.

First, I shall discuss the status of weed workers as I see them. Weed workers have been organized in this country for only a relatively few years--the southern weed workers for thirteen years, some regions for a slightly longer period, and the Weed Society of America only since 1956. Everyone who talks about weed control as we know it today proclaims the great advances that have been made in these few years. Most people in this field agree that chemical weed control and its ramifications is a scientific discipline. I am in full agreement and I am sure that most of you are. But I ask you who else really believes it? Have we really convinced anyone but ourselves? I will admit that the ARS-USDA recognizes the discipline, since they have two weed sections, but are their workers classified as weedologists? We started as a hodgepodge of several disciplines and we are still largely a hodgepodge. Do you know of an institution of higher learning that offers any kind of degree in weedology? How many agricultural experiment stations concentrate their weed workers in one group or department where their efforts can be coordinated and their facilities fully utilized? I do not believe that anyone would agree to put plant pathologists or entomologists in various departments. Yet this is just as logical as having weed workers in various departments.

I am not offering this as a criticism of any person or persons outside of weed workers, but rather a criticism of our own group. I wonder how many of us, when we have the opportunity, take the time to explain this dilemma to anyone outside our own group. Are we satisfied with present arrangements? Or are we afraid we might be shifted where we think we might not want to be? How much does petty jealousy and selfishness enter into the picture? I cannot give you an answer to these questions, but I do know that if we are ever to achieve full recognition as a scientific discipline, we must tell our story every time we have the opportunity. I believe most land-grant universities will eventually award advanced degrees in weedology just as they do in

plant pathology and entomology, but not until we prove to them there is a need. We cannot be satisfied with status quo and expect much more recognition than we now have.

I am a great believer in freedom of choice. I believe a man is born a free agent, to choose as he pleases. I also believe that once a man has made a choice he is not free to ignore it. You are free to choose your wife, but once you have made the choice you are not free to do as you please. You may choose to go fishing or hunting Saturday, but your wife may decide that you are going to rake leaves in the yard or go shopping with her. I assume most of you chose to be a weed worker of some kind and once that choice was made it carried responsibilities.

I am proud to say that I do not know of any member of this conference who refused to perform any duty asked of him and this has been reflected in the fine conferences we have had and in the one we are now engaged. But, it is not enough just to do what we are asked to do. We must take advantage of every opportunity to present to the public and our co-workers the importance of and the place of weedology. It is not too difficult to show the importance of weed control in crops to a farmer, but how many of us take the time to explain to the general public that weed control is vitally important to them. I am sure that very few people realize that the cost of weed control or the lack of weed control is included in their light, water, gas, doctor, highway, food, clothing and freight bills. Without weed control what would our recreational areas, parks, and lawns look like? These are some of the things that I do not believe the general public understands, and I believe it is our responsibility to inform them. I also believe that it is our responsibility to inform them that we are not in this business for the sole purpose of increasing agriculture production as such, but rather to be more efficient in controlling weeds in all of the areas just mentioned, thereby reducing cost and man hours. The consuming public always benefits from this kind of savings.

This brings to mind another responsibility that all agricultural workers have and that is to inform everyone with whom they come in contact the importance of agriculture to every person in this country. In general, agriculture has a bad press. Agricultural magazines are exceptions and I realize there are exceptions in other news media and thank God for those exceptions. I believe this bad press to be due to a large degree to ignorance, indifference, special interests, and sensationalism. How many newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations have an agricultural editor trained in agriculture on their staff? I cannot answer this, but I do know the percentage is small. There are two sides to every story or question, but too frequently only one side is given when it concerns agriculture.

One of the best examples I can site is Life Magazine of November 30, 1959. There is a 10-page spread with the title "The Farm Surplus

You're Paying For." Those 10 pages are made up mostly of photographs showing exceptions rather than the rule. The farmer shown on the last two pages "is worth several million dollars." In the first 150 words of copy the farm problem is mentioned five times. With the exception of the first sentence I shall quote the first paragraph: "In this strange land of plenty, its storage bins already spilling from unending crop surpluses, a new bumper yield was a familiar catastrophe. But it served forcibly to remind the U.S. that its most dismaying domestic trouble--the farm problem--had reached an advanced state of economic and political crisis." I ask you, since when in the entire history of mankind has it been considered a catastrophe--an advanced state of economic and political crisis--to produce an abundance of food and fiber by any nation in the world. In contrast to this so-called catastrophe for producing an abundance of agricultural commodities in this country I should like to quote part of an item I saw in the Birmingham News, second section, page 15. "Moscow, Dec. 22 -- (AP) -- The Communist Central Committee began a plenary meeting at the Kremlin today to discuss Soviet agriculture.

"Tass reported that Soviet premier Khrushchey, who never tires of appealing for increased farm production, opened the meeting."

It is obvious that the atheist dictator of Soviet Russia realizes that they must have an abundance of food and fiber if they are to remain a world power.

There are two more sentences I should like to quote from the issue of Life Magazine I mentioned earlier. From the third paragraph, first sentence I quote, "The problem is the result of a government subsidy program that has sprouted into a national scandal." From the fourth paragraph, first sentence, "This year the bumper corn and wheat crops dramatically exposed the extravagant folly of the government's subsidy program." Why is Life Magazine as well as many others, trying to inflame the public against farm subsidies? Is it an attempt to blind them to the subsidies received by magazines, education, railroads, highways, air lines, utilities, shipping industry, oil industry, fast tax write-off for other industry, tariffs and many others. For the past 50 years farmers have received only five dollars for every 1000 dollars the government has paid in subsidies. I would be the last to say that these subsidies were not for the benefit of all our people. But, I do resent being told that the farm subsidy is a national scandal without any mention of other subsidies. Farmers are just as entitled to a fair return on their capital, intelligence, education, and effort as any other group. How many people realize that the first direct subsidy by the Federal Government was paid in 1845 when congress authorized the postmaster general to award mail subsidies. Why don't we find magazine articles on the extravagant folly of the government's subsidy to those just mentioned and reveal how many billions of dollars they have received and are receiving now. For Gods sake who has blessed us with

plenty, for this great nation of ours and for mankind let us tell the whole truth, the whole story, about our wonderful agriculture.

Presenting only one side of a story is the same as a half truth or the same as the research worker who skews his results. It is worse than none. The most notorious half truth that I can think of and which I do not consider worthy of discussion with this group was the handling of the amitrol-cranberry incident and I shall not mention it again. We should never let the public forget that this is the best fed and clothed country in the world--that it requires less labor to buy a loaf of bread, a dozen eggs, a quart of milk and almost any other agricultural product than any other major country in the world, and that it requires less labor to buy these items today in this country than any time in the past several decades. We can and should be proud of this achievement.

The efficient production of agricultural commodities has released labor for industry to make this country the biggest producer of industrial and consumer goods the world has ever seen. A hungry man cannot produce much of anything, nor can he produce when his children are crying from hunger. His one thought is food. Most people in our country cannot appreciate this since few have known hunger. In times of national and international crisis, a country will rise or fall on its ability to produce an abundance of food and fiber and I hope I shall never see a time when we do not have a surplus of both. History tells us a nation that allows its agriculture to become worn out is soon a second, third, or fourth rate nation. We should get on our knees every night and thank God for our abundance. There will be a catastrophe when we fail to produce an abundance of food and fiber.

I am sure that weed workers have contributed substantially to the efficient production of farm commodities, to the reduced cost of maintaining of highways, railroads, utilities, industrial sites, recreational areas, water systems, and many other areas. I am also sure that greater advances will be made in the future, but the rapidity of the advance will be measured by how we as individuals, and collectively assume the responsibilities that we now face. I am confident we will accept these responsibilities.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN AGRICULTURE

Louis H. Wilson
Secretary and Director of Information
National Plant Food Institute, Washington 6, D. C.

Sometime ago, the Dean of one of our great land-grant colleges gave me the definition of "good public relations"...and this is the way he put it: "Good public relations is living right...and getting credit for it."

The Dean's definition affords me the opportunity of saying that virtually all segments in our agricultural economy are "living right"... but they are not "getting credit for it."

Too many American farmers are in the consumer's dog-house. They deserve better treatment.

But...before delving into the important subject..."Public Relations in Agriculture"...I would like to talk briefly with you about your own public relations. I don't intend to become "bogged down" in the cranberry episode...I'm going to be still about stilbestrol...and I'm not "pent up" about penicillin...but very seriously speaking...sometimes we are innocent by-standers to a bad public relations situation. I would presume that few here today would disagree with the premise that the pesticides industry is the victim of a bad press... and I think there are many things we can do to turn this negative condition into a positive one behalf of the industry.

First of all...you have a challenge to tell the consumer, as well as the agricultural public, about the vast economic benefits to be had through the proper, efficient, and adequate use of weed killers. In fact...you have more than a challenge...you have a responsibility, which becomes of significant economic importance when your industry suffers because of inadequate public relations in the field of pesticides or weed killers.

I like a press release...issued by my good friends in the National Agricultural Chemicals Association recently: "Weeds," the release states, "are the thieves and gangsters of the plant world. They steal water, food and sunlight from desirable plants. Some poison livestock and cause diseases in men. One...the African witch weed...actually kills corn and other grass plants by feeding on their roots."

This is the prelude to a discussion that followed some recent Washington developments.

One of the best "tools" you have to combat poor public relations with in your industry...is the truth about the products you sell...the

benefits that are provided to the user...and the tremendous value your products have in maintaining our comfortable standard of living.

A few years ago...the Department of Agriculture estimated that weeds cost farmers four billion dollars a year.

NAC tells us that today it is possible to kill as many as twenty million weeds in an hour in many crops with tractor-drawn spray equipment. A vast contrast to the man with a hoe of not so many years ago.

I'm not going to insult your intelligence by enumerating ways and means whereby you can utilize your knowledge and conduct your job more effectively...but I can't resist saying that a "bad press" does not mature in a good public relations climate. To use a chemical analogy...some pre-emergence measures must be adopted.

Because of the vast misunderstanding as to the economic value and the general importance of weed killers...a good public relations program assumes great significance. Therefore...you profitably can solicit, and in most instances attain, a sympathetic understanding of weed control problems...with a personal visit to your newspaper...television or radio station...your farm magazine editor...and others responsible for keeping the public informed.

I'll wager that all too few people in agricultural communications...or in any other kind of communications...think of weeds in terms of billion dollar losses.

While I do not wish to be presumptuous...I do believe recent events make it imperative for you to strengthen your educational program in terms of informing users of weed control chemicals about the importance of following directions...observing rigid safety requirements...and in using practices that do not do violence to common sense. The job is not easy...but it is essential, if you are to maintain a reputation commensurate with the service you perform.

Finally...and this is not what the lawyers call a "self-serving declaration"...I would urge you to support your trade association...and utilize the services of your land-grant colleges. These agencies have wide acceptability...are staffed with competent men...and they have a "stake" in telling a forthright story on the importance of adequate weed control.

I would like to use just one elemental example, with apologies...and I picked up this information in a conference with officials of the National Agricultural Chemicals Association...and I quote:

"It is very important that herbicides be used according to label directions for best results. 'Read and follow the label' should be repeated over and over in releases, speeches, etc. until every farmer realizes that proper use is the best use. Although herbicides do not

present the hazards to humans that other agricultural chemicals may present, nonetheless, extreme care must be exercised to prevent damage to susceptible plants through drift, improper application, or other poor practices."

I used the word...elemental...advisedly...because the cornerstone of a good public relations program for you hinges on the elemental practices.

Now...I'd like to be more specific in discussing the public relations problems of a man very close to us...the American farmer.

Some attention is being given to the fact that farmers are becoming a smaller group, numerically...and consequently, politically. Mind you...I didn't say, "farmers are becoming less important." On the contrary...they are becoming increasingly important in our national economy...but their public relations is in poor repair. Too much attention has been given to the numerical significance of the farm population. We are constantly told that farmers only represent about 10 per cent of our population. The fact is, that four out of ten workers in the United States are employed in agriculture and related industries. Here are the facts. Out of 62 million workers, 25 million are in agriculture and related industries: 10 million work on farms; 6 million produce for or service farmers; and 9 million process or distribute farm products. In addition...250 thousand scientists are working on projects related to agriculture. These facts...reported by one of our great farm magazines...give us a little better picture of the importance of agriculture in our economy.

But, let's go farther...how many folks know that the average value of assets per farm is \$41,500.00?

That the investment per paid worker on farms is 3 times as great as the investment per production worker in the manufacturing industry? (\$25,000.00 compared to \$8,000.00.)

Farmers are one of the biggest customers of industry...they use 50 million tons of chemicals annually...they use enough steel each year to manufacture 4,300,000 automobiles...they use enough rubber each year to put tires on 6 million cars...and agriculture buys more petroleum each year than any other industry.

Notwithstanding his importance to the well-being of the Nation...the American farmer is a greatly misunderstood man. He has a good story to tell...and the story needs telling.

Most of us concerned with agriculture or its problems...either have not had the time...or the inclination to delve into the public relations position of the farmer. It is a fascinating story...one replete with achievements.

Dr. Russell Coleman...Executive Vice President of the National Plant Food Institute...was asked recently why consumers don't understand the farm problem. Here's part of his reply:

"I think it's because the American public has never been hungry. We take food for granted. We don't think of its production as essential and important. We have always had a plentiful supply of food.

"Perhaps a 24-hour shortage of food would do more than anything else to convince the American people that food production is equally as important to our security as are the latest armaments. Khrushchev considers it so in Russia."

At the beginning...I told you that too many farmers are in the "consumer's dog house." That's not only my opinion, but the opinion of some of the leading educators in the country. When I attended the annual meeting of the National Association County Agricultural Agents in Kansas City recently, I heard Dr. Arthur D. Weber...Dean of Agriculture, Kansas State University...make this statement...and I quote:

"Those who take food for granted and make snide remarks about farmers forget that few other people in the world can indulge in such extravagances. They overlook, too, that were it not for the application of science and technology to agricultural problems, they, themselves, quite likely would be groveling out a bare subsistence by tilling a small plot of land.

"The cold, hard fact is that never have agricultural public relations been at a lower ebb than now. The distressing fact also is that there was never less real justification for misunderstanding of the motives and objectives of farm people, nor for misinterpretation of agricultural problems than there is today.

"The difficulty, perhaps, is that never before have so few been able to provide food for so many. Unfortunately...farmers...now a small minority group...have not got their true story to the urban, non-farm population. Doing that...in my judgment...is a major responsibility which agricultural extension workers must share with agricultural scientists, teachers, farmers and friends of agriculture generally."

Frankly...too much emphasis cannot be placed on the observations of Dean Weber. We must all share the responsibility of telling the farmer's story...but...having an earnest desire to help tell agriculture's story is not enough. There are facts to be assembled and we must not be guilty of talking to ourselves. However...at the risk of being contradictory...we, ourselves, must be informed before we can tell the story of agriculture to others. Getting the facts is not an easy job...but they are available...in the United States Department of Agriculture...in the land-grant colleges...and in our great farm organizations.

Facts like these...paraded by one of the great Midwestern farm paper editors and I quote:

"First, we should not discount the importance of farming to the nation just because we have no worries about food or because farmers presumably are always caught in price troubles. Per capita income on farms is about half the income of non-farm employment. This is disparity. A way to change it must be found.

"Agriculture is the biggest buyer...seller...and borrower in the United States.

"The inventory of farm machinery alone is greater than the assets of the American steel industry and five times that of the automobile industry.

"Each year farmers purchase farm supplies worth about 16 billion dollars.

"The agricultural plant each year increases its use of capital, of science and technology, of management and research.

"In its dilemma...agriculture requires the understanding of the urban population. In fact, it also demands greater understanding from farmers themselves. Agriculture is involved in vast changes..declining farm population, the increase in the size of farms and mechanization. The changes bring problems of adaption of technology, of staggering surpluses and increased costs. The complex situation perplexes the experts."

And now...if you'll pardon a cliche..."Gold is where you find it." I found a wealth of sound judgment and information in a talk recently delivered by Dr. L. L. Rummell...Dean of the College of Agriculture...Ohio State University. He was talking on "Communication in Public Relations"...at a meeting of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities...a little over a year ago.

He said that communication aspects of public relations in land-grant colleges include two kinds of problems, namely: (1) Public understanding, recognition and support of agricultural research and education, and (2) means to bring scientific and educational knowledge of the institutions before the public. He emphasized that both functions merit attention of top administrative authority in the institutions...and here I would include agricultural industries and others having a concern for the welfare of farming.

Here is a potent statement from his address and I quote:

"In an age of jets, satellites and atomic power, we in agricultural education and research still depend too much upon concepts and agencies of communication characteristic of the horse age."

He further states that:

"Public relations is part of the life-stream of industry. It gets executive attention. Coupled with market research and sales promotion, it keeps the public reasonably dissatisfied with new models of automobiles, and thus we (or our wives) wish for a new car each year. It tests our reaction to air travel, soap or tooth paste, our ideas on chain stores and supermarkets, big business and labor unions, political candidates--and shapes our thinking accordingly.

"Yet we who teach the ingredients of public relations--with one of the greatest products (research and education) in all the world to merchandise--have failed to communicate adequately with the public.

"That's harsh--unjustified--you say?

"With all our mass communication media--bulletins, extension, field days, fairs, films, farm press, news releases, radio and TV--still many of our farmers think agricultural research is done by the feed or machinery company, or by extension, and one out of five does not even venture a guess as to who does it."

Now...let me remind you that these conclusions are those of Dean Rummell...a respected educator from one of our great land-grant colleges. But...I would go one step farther and say that while the agricultural colleges, themselves, must share a large part of the responsibility for telling the farmer's story...we, in industries wherein farmers are our customers, also have a responsibility. The least we can do is to give agricultural leaders...agricultural workers...and agricultural affiliates the facts which they can use advantageously to bring the contributions of farmers in focus.

Dean Rummell makes the statement that "we have modestly withheld our own story, or else have failed to communicate in the right way to the right people."

I would hazard the opinion that the Dean concludes we have spent too much time talking to ourselves. Now...maybe I'm guilty too..because I'm talking to an audience who is not unappreciative of the American farmer. But...I rationalize the presentation of these facts as giving you ammunition...a challenge to use the ammunition...a series of self-serving declarations...which you can use to improve the public relations position of agriculture.

There's an old saying to the effect that...in the presence of trouble...some people grow wings, others buy crutches. But...as is so well illustrated in the following stanza...it's all up to us:

Isn't it strange that princes and kings
And clowns that caper in sawdust rings
And common folk like you and me
Are builders of eternity.

To each is given a bag of tools
A shapeless mass, a book of rules
And each must make ere life is flown
A stumbling block or a stepping stone.

You are the fellow who has to decide
Whether you'll do it or toss it aside.
You are the fellow who makes up your mind
Whether you'll lead or linger behind.

Whether you'll try for this goal that's afar,
Or just be contented to stay where you are.

Take it or leave it--here's something to do.
Just think it over--it's all up to you.

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING
SOUTHERN WEED CONFERENCE

Buena Vista Hotel
Biloxi, Mississippi
January 21, 1960

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Searcy, President of the Southern Weed Conference at 1:15 p.m.

Dr. Porter moved that the minutes of the 1959 meeting be approved as printed and distributed. The motion was seconded. The motion passed.

President Searcy requested that the Treasurer's Report be presented. The report was presented by Dr. Porter.

Southern Weed Conference
Financial Statement
Conference Year 1959

ASSETS:

I. Carry Over		\$2799.46	
II. Receipts 1959 Meeting			
A. Banquet	\$409.50		
B. Registration Desk	989.00		
Total		1398.50	
III. Sale of Proc. After Meeting		488.32	
IV. Sustaining Members		710.00	
V. Refund, 1958 President		4.40	
	TOTAL		\$5400.68

EXPENDITURES:

1959 Meeting			
A. Banquet	409.50		
B. Registration	41.03		
Total		450.53	
Production of 1959 Proceedings		717.06	
Stamps - Secretary		69.68	
1959 Program		56.85	
1960 Badges		21.00	
Service Contract		22.66	
Local Arrangements		19.87	
President's Office		4.90	

Carried Forward

Brought Forward:

\$1362.55

Bank Charge

0.35

Stamp Pad

5.10

Preparation of 1960 Research Reports

629.35

1960 Program

75.96

TOTAL

\$2073.31

Total in Bank

3327.37

TOTAL

\$5400.68

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Walter K. Porter, Jr.

W. K. Porter, Jr.

Secretary-Treasurer

APPROVED:

Auditing Committee:

/s/ Henry Andrews

/s/ O. E. Rud

It was moved and seconded that Dr. Porter's report be accepted.
The motion passed.

President Searcy requested that Mr. Andrews, chairman of the Auditing Committee, present the Auditor's Report. Mr. Andrews reported that the Treasurer's Report was found to be in order. Mr. Andrews then moved that his report be accepted. The motion was seconded. The motion passed.

President Searcy then gave a report of the Executive Board meeting. After discussing various actions of the Executive Board with the conference, President Searcy requested discussion on the matter of whether or not the conference meeting should be held every two years so as not to coincide with the Weed Society of America. After some discussion, Dr. Davis moved that in view of the quality of the program that was being conducted at Biloxi and the value of the papers presented, that the Southern Weed Conference should meet annually as it has been doing in the past. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

President Searcy then reported that the 1961 meeting would be held in the Soreno Hotel, St. Petersburg, Florida, January 18, 19, and 20, and that the 1962 meeting be held at the Hotel Patten, Chattanooga, Tennessee, on January 17, 18, and 19.

President Searcy then called for a report of the Legislative Committee by Dr. Darrow.

Dr. Holstun moved the acceptance of his report which was seconded. The motion carried unanimously. Dr. Rodgers then moved that the proposals made in the report be approved by the conference. The motion was seconded. The original motion was amended to delete a reference to the first common name proposed being designated as "T" and that the WSA Committee be requested to devise temporary common names that would be useable before the final acceptance of a common name by WSA. The amendment was accepted. The amendment and the original motion both passed unanimously. (The report of this Committee as presented herein, includes the amendments referred to.)

President Searcy then called for the report of the Public Relations Committee. Leonard Lett gave the report.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The committee developed preliminary plans for publicizing the 1960 Southern Weed Conference prior to the meeting of the conference Program Committee on July 27, 1959 at Fayetteville, Ark.

The chairman of the Public Relations Committee attended this meeting and presented the proposed plans for publicizing the conference. The committee approved the following procedures for handling the publicity of the conference:

Three press releases giving pertinent facts on the conference were to be prepared and mailed to the following agencies and organizations prior to the conference: major farm and trade publications, directors of information at land-grant colleges, and selected local papers in the area where the meeting is to be held.

Two releases summarizing the papers presented during the meeting, and information concerning new officers and future meetings of the conference will be made available during the conference.

The Public Relations Committee would like to present the following recommendations for consideration: (1) That the Chairman or a representative of the Public Relations Committee meet with the Program Committee prior to the conference each year; (2) that the Public Relations Committee, as appointed by the new president, be given permission to contact public relation directors representing the land-grant college system, farm publications, farm or commodity organizations, to obtain suggestions for formulating a definite plan for publicizing the Southern Weed Conference. The arrangements would be subject to the approval of the officers of the Southern Weed Conference before taking action.

The Public Relations Committee would like to thank the program participants who contributed copies or abstracts of their papers used in publicizing the conference, and Dr. Don Davis for his assistance in assembling these papers.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard Lett, Chairman
Jack Dreessen
Fred Elliott

Mr. Lett moved the acceptance of his report. The motion was seconded, and approved.

President Searcy called for the report of the Program chairman. Dr. Davis stated that he had no report to be given. The committee was commended by the President for the excellent program that was developed for this conference.

The President then asked for the report of the Resolutions Committee. This report was given by Dr. Porter. Dr. Porter moved that a resolution of thanks to the hotel be approved and that the Secretary so inform the hotel. This motion was seconded and passed unanimously. This resolution is shown separately.

President Searcy then asked for the report of the Local Arrangements Committee. Dr. McWhorter reported briefly on the activities of his committee during the year in planning for the conference. Dr. McWhorter moved the acceptance of his report. This motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Mr. Searcy then asked for the report of the Constitutional Amendment Committee to be presented by Dr. Rodgers. Dr. Rodgers reported briefly upon the recent constitutional amendments which were accepted by the conference by a mailed ballot, and that this revised Constitution would be put into the Proceedings of the Conference. Dr. Rodgers then moved the acceptance of his report which was seconded and was passed unanimously. The revised Constitution is as follows:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION OF STUDENT INTEREST

BY THE
SOUTHERN WEED CONFERENCE

I. Purpose of the Committee

To formulate in detail the general program approved at the 1959 meeting of the Conference.

II. Findings of the Committee

The committee has developed what it believes to be a worthy program. It is hereby submitted to the President for action, subject to its approval by the Executive Committee.

The complete program is as follows:

A. Informal encouragement and motivation

It is highly recommended by the Committee that each member of the Southern Weed Conference take every opportunity to explain the scope and details of possibilities for careers in the general field of weed control to high school and college students. It is likely that a large number of excellent workers will be lost to us simply because they do not realize that we too need mathematicians, physicists, engineers, chemists, botanists, extension specialists, economists, and many others whose relation to weed control may not be self-apparent.

B. Formal interest program

1. The Committee recommends that a series of graduate scholarships be made available on a competitive basis to college students. Such a program would have three objectives:
 - a. To arouse interest in college students in the varied careers offered by the general field of weed control
 - b. To stimulate thought in relation to needed course work by students in the early phases of their education.
 - c. To provide limited financial assistance, at the graduate level, to capable students interested in pursuing a career in weed control.
2. This program could be conducted as follows:

A contest would be held between eligible participants from the schools of natural sciences in all of the four-year colleges of the states in the Southern Weed Conference. This contest would consist of papers containing the following:

- a. A review of literature of from 1 to 12 double-spaced pages in which a minimum of 20 references from reputable journals are cited, on any one of the following topics:
 - (1) Basic chemical, physical, engineering, physiological, or botanical studies on any specific herbicide or specialized weed-control equipment.
 - (2) Control of weeds in general in any specific crop or specific non-agricultural situation.
 - (3) Control of any specific weed.
 - (4) Any topic that the participant can clearly relate to a significant degree to the general field of weed control.
- b. An original composition of from 1 to 6 double-spaced pages on any specific career in the general field of weed control, and covering the following three points:
 - (1) Relation of the career selected to weed control.
(Examples
 - a. Discuss the work done by an extension weed specialist in the transfer of research findings to the public.
 - b. Discuss the work of an agricultural chemicals technical fieldman or a sales representative in assimilating research findings from Experiment Stations, USDA, and Industry for application to specific situations.
 - c. Describe the work of an agronomist conducting research on weed control, or in teaching.)
 - (2) Preparation by an individual for the selected career (discuss formal course work, experience, etc. needed in the chosen career).
 - (3) Personal reasons for selection of such a career with inclusion of its disadvantages.

3. Operational procedure and rules would be as follows:

- a. The contest would be opened by enlisting the aid of the College President or Deans of the Schools of Natural Sciences at each four-year college in the area of the Southern Weed Conference. Each would be requested to have the announcement and rules posted on local bulletin boards.
- b. The first contest would be announced in February of 19 x*. Entries to be received from May 1, 19 x to October 1, 19 x. Judging to be completed by December 10, 19 x. Winners to be notified by January, 19 x +1.

c. Awards would be as follows:

1st Place - One \$500 scholarship for graduate study in a field clearly related to weed control and travel expenses up to \$50 for the purpose of attending the 19 x +1 meeting of the Southern Weed Conference.

The recipient of the scholarship must attain admittance to a recognized graduate school for graduate study in a field clearly related to weed-control research. In the event the first contestant fails to meet this and other requirements or elects not to accept the scholarship, it will go to the contestant with the next highest score, and so on down the line. If none of the top 5 contestants qualifies, the scholarship's money will revert to the general scholarship fund of the SWC.

2nd through 5th places - Travel expenses to the 19 x +1 SWC up to \$50.

All winners will be invited to present their papers in the appropriate section of the 19 x + 1 SWC, and all winning winning papers will be published by the SWC as part of its proceedings. All contestants will become honorary members of the SWC for one year. All entries become the property of the SWC, and none will be returned. The Executive Committee of the SWC will be the final authority for any rulings on the eligibility of contestants.

- d. Awards will be announced at the first SWC meeting following the close of the contest.

*February 19 x is the first February after the necessary funds have been made available.

e. Administration

Upon adoption of the program the President of the Southern Weed Conference will establish a Scholarship Committee and authorize the Secretary to initiate action for the raising of the necessary funds. All members of the Southern Weed Conference will be asked to contribute voluntarily to the scholarship's fund. If funds remain after the program is discontinued, they will revert to the general treasury of the Conference. Five dollars per member will be suggested as a reasonable donation for individual members. Donations from industry and individuals will be appreciated in whatever amounts offered. The scholarship program will be announced and initiated by the Chairman of the Scholarship Committee in the first February after a fund of \$1000 has been established.

The Scholarship Committee will consist of the Chairman, a team of elimination judges (one judge from each state to be rotated between Research, Teaching, Industry, and Extension, and staggered so as to have a balance between the four categories), and a finals team of three judges (one each from Research, Teaching or Extension, and Industry). It will be responsible for one complete scholarship program unless re-appointed for a second one.

All entries will be mailed to the Chairman of the Scholarship Committee of the SWC. He will assign each entry a number and remove all other identification from it. After closing date of the contest he will make random groups of equal numbers of entries, and forward one group to each elimination judge.

Each eliminations judge will grade each entry in his group and forward a report by entry number to the Chairman of the Scholarship Committee, but not record this grading on any entry other than to indicate the top two entries. He will then return all entries to the Chairman with his top two being clearly indicated and tied separately.

The Chairman will then forward all of the elimination judges' choices to one of the finals judges. Each finals judge will grade each entry, send a report of his grading by entry number to the Chairman, and forward the entries on to the next judge for grading. In no case will a judge mark an entry in such a way to indicate his grading nor in any way that might influence a following judge. The last judge will return all entries to the Chairman who will select the winners by averaging scores given each entry by the finals judges.

No entry having an average score of less than 70 will be considered. In the event that eligible entries are fewer than 5, the number of awards will be reduced accordingly.

All entries will be graded according to the following weighting of points:

(1) <u>Literature review</u>	Maximum points
(a) Grammatical accuracy	15
(b) Technical accuracy and thoroughness	15
(c) Organization, clarity, and style	15
(d) Evidence of selection, interpretation, and evaluation of papers included in the literature review	15
(2) <u>Composition</u>	
(a) Grammatical accuracy	10
(b) Organization, clarity, and style	10
(c) Originality	10
(d) Evidence of sincerity and depth of thinking	<u>10</u>
Total for (1) and (2)	100

In grading the entries, it is suggested that the judges bear in mind that the contestants will be inexperienced, and that the standards set should be in keeping with the level of training of the contestants. In the event of ties the Chairman of the Scholarship Committee will break such tie by assuming the position of the post-finals judge.

f. Eligibility for contestants

It shall be the responsibility of the Scholarship Committee to set the eligibility requirements in such a way as to restrict the contest to those students having scholastic records that generally are acceptable for admission requirements by recognized schools for graduate study.

- g. A sample announcement and a set of rules are attached to this report and present further details.

Respectfully submitted,

J. T. Holstun, Jr., Chairman

H. H. Morton

R. F. Richards

Dr. Holstun moved that the report as given be accepted and that the entire proposal be initiated as outlined in Section 2-E as soon as possible by this conference. This motion was seconded. Dr. Holstun was requested to withdraw the original motion and that his report as presented to the conference be accepted. This was seconded, and passed unanimously. Dr. Burt then moved that the conference approve the report as given by Dr. Holstun. This motion was seconded. Dr. Burt then moved that his original motion be amended as recommended by the Executive Board as follows:

AMENDMENT TO STUDENT INTEREST REPORT

The Executive Board shall be given the authority to transfer funds from the general treasury to the Student Scholarship Fund, once enough voluntary contributions have been received to indicate whole-hearted support for this endeavor. The transfer of such funds shall be in such a manner as to not jeopardize the normal operation of the conference.

Dr. Davis moved that the original motion also be amended to read that the original increment of contributions made be returned to the individuals if there were not enough support from the conference as a whole to institute this program. Both amendments were accepted, and the original motion was then passed unanimously.

President Searcy then requested that Dr. Wolf report upon the new Sustaining Membership Committee as appointed by President Searcy. Dr. Wolf noted a list of sustaining members on the back of the program and pointed out that since this list was made up the Monsanto Chemical Company had joined the conference as a sustaining member and should be added to this list. Dr. Wolf invited more industrial companies to become members of the conference and to contact him if they so wished membership in the conference. Dr. Davis moved that the report be accepted and that the chairman of this new committee be commended. This motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Burt then made the report of the Nominating Committee and presented the following slate of officers: President, Dr. Darrow; Vice-President, Dr. Porter; Members-at-Large of the Executive Committee, Vernon C. Harris, Russell F. Richards, and Ellis W. Hauser; Delegates to the WSA Executive Board, V. S. Searcy and Alternate Robert A. Darrow, both to serve if WSA calls for two delegates -- only the primary delegate if WSA calls for one delegate. Mr. Mann moved that the nominations stand and that the slate of officers as presented be elected unanimously. The motion carried.

The President then called for the Research Report which was presented by Dr. R. A. Darrow, chairman. Vice President Darrow moved that the Research Report be accepted by the conference with the changes as pointed out to the conference. This motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

President Searcy then thanked his committee chairmen and their co-workers for their assistance in the work that they had done during the past year.

The meeting was then adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

R. E. Frans,
Secretary-Treasurer