



Courtesy of Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association  
 FOOD FOR HIS FAMILY  
 (Minneapolis Subsistence Gardens)

# COMMUNITY PROGRAMS FOR SUBSISTENCE GARDENS

BY  
 JOANNA C. COLCORD  
 AND  
 MARY JOHNSTON  
 CHARITY ORGANIZATION DEPARTMENT  
 RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION



NEW YORK  
 RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION  
 1933



Copyright, 1933, by  
RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	5
I. INTRODUCTION	9
Subsistence Gardens in 1930-1932	9
State Plans for 1933	10
Two Approaches to a Garden Program	11
II. FIRST STEPS IN SETTING UP A GARDEN PROGRAM	15
Organizing the Committee	15
Financing the Program	22
Executive and Other Personnel	23
III. MAIN PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION	26
Assignment of Gardens	26
Securing Suitable Land	30
Preparing Land for Cultivation	30
Providing Seeds and Plants	32
Providing Tools	34
IV. WORKING CONDITIONS AND SUPERVISION	36
Transportation	36
Shelters, Toolhouses, and Other Buildings	38
Water Supply	39
Protection of Crops	39
Identification of Workers	40
Disciplinary Problems	41
Competition and Prizes	42
Use of Printed Matter	42
Lectures and Demonstrations	43
V. CANNING AND STORAGE	45
VI. FINANCIAL RETURNS FROM SUBSISTENCE GARDENS	50
APPENDIX I. QUESTIONNAIRE, WITH LIST OF CITIES AND STATES THAT REPLIED	59
APPENDIX II. FORMS USED IN VARIOUS PROJECTS	65

## FOREWORD

THIS pamphlet is intended as a suggestive guide to relief committees which may be undertaking to promote a plan of subsistence gardens of one or more types. Only the organization problems which may be encountered are dealt with here; the authors pretend to no familiarity with the horticultural problems. How to grow vegetables, once the project is under way, is a problem for the man with practical farming experience whom we suppose to be acting as field director, and for the agricultural educators and experts who may be called in to advise him.

No field visits were made solely for the purposes of this pamphlet, although garden projects have been examined from time to time in connection with other studies of the Department. In gathering the material for the pamphlet, the questionnaire shown on page 59 was sent to 108 garden committees and industrial firms. Sixty-nine of these questionnaires have been filled in and returned.

Through the co-operation of the West Virginia Agricultural Extension Service, the Agricultural Extension Department of Ohio State University, and the New York Temporary Emergency Relief Administration quite detailed information has been secured for 9 additional cities in West Virginia, 9 in Ohio, and 36 in New York.

The information which has been obtained in these two ways deals chiefly with garden programs in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New York, but questionnaires have also been received from one or more cities in 17 other states scattered throughout the country.

The authors wish to express at this point their appreciation of the assistance thus given, and their astonishment at the wealth of material submitted and the pains taken to

make the answers comprehensive and revealing. The enthusiasm, skill, and community spirit which are being put into the development of subsistence gardens receive eloquent testimony in the material which has been sent us.

The problems discussed are those which have been encountered in actual practice; the methods suggested, those which have been tested in actual operation. Of one thing we feel assured; that with practical skill and contagious enthusiasm on the part of those directing such a project, minor defects of organization will not greatly matter; but that the most perfect scheme that can be developed will not be a success without these qualities in the management. A garden is not a mechanical thing; a subtle co-operation between the soil and those who till it seems to be necessary to success; and unless interest and inclination are present in the gardeners, or can be taught and developed by the supervisors, the project will not prosper.

An objection to the proposal to establish subsistence gardens is likely to be raised by local market gardeners and dealers in produce, who see in these plans a threat to their normal production. That this is not entirely a bugaboo is recognized by the United States Department of Agriculture, which stated on January 16, 1933:

Home gardening in eastern and central States has already reduced the demand for commercially grown truck crops, it is believed by marketing specialists of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

The Bureau has no statistics on the quantity of food produced in home gardens, but it is known that rail shipments of fresh fruits and vegetables last year were markedly below those in 1931. Some of the decrease is accounted for by increased transportation by motor truck, but no inconsiderable part of the reduction is attributed to lessened consumer buying on account of home gardening.<sup>1</sup>

In answer to this argument, if and when raised, local bodies responsible for relief should point to the fact that

<sup>1</sup> United States Daily, January 17, 1933.

with diminishing resources, relief-distributing agencies will perform less and less potential purchasers of the produce raised by commercial truck-gardeners. The unemployed, of course, have no independent purchasing power so long as they remain unemployed. No citizen, whatever his occupation, should wish to see curtailed any activity of the unemployed which looks toward the production of necessities for their own use. The utmost that can be demanded of such a project is that the goods so produced be rigidly kept off the market; and it is the duty of any group sponsoring a subsistence garden plan to take every precaution that legitimate trade, for which a market exists, be not interfered with by the sale for cash of any of the foodstuffs produced.

Assisted gardening, besides being one of the most easily organized forms of relief, is one of the most economical. For a cash outlay of from \$5 to \$10 per plot, depending on its size and the amount of contributed material and services, the average family can be supplied with all the greenstuffs needed for summer consumption, and with canned and root vegetables sufficient for the greater part of the winter's supply. As a program it is deservedly popular, and is increasing rapidly in importance.

Yet it should not be supposed that a garden program can be developed to such a degree as to replace other forms of relief. It has yet to be proved that "back-to-the-soil" for total support is at all feasible for the unemployed of this country. It is only reasonable to look upon gardens as *supplemental* to relief, in the same way that they have always been supplemental to other income among employed people. Enthusiasm should not, therefore, carry a committee to the point of making promises to the community that the gardens will obviate the need for work relief or home relief or both. They can only lessen the burden, not remove it altogether.

## I. INTRODUCTION

*Subsistence Gardens in 1930-1932.* During the summer of 1930 there was little resort to organized community gardening as a relief measure. In 1931 a few communities, located in not more than five or six states, undertook garden programs, which were for the most part expansions of activities already under way. The various state agricultural extension services, which for years had been active, and had done much toward establishing more and better gardens, then stepped into the breach and aided communities in putting their garden efforts on a broader basis. Many "war garden" clubs were still functioning, and these together with the leaders of other similar clubs which had disbanded were pressed into service to plan new community activities.

In areas which had suffered from recent droughts, especially in the southern states, the American Red Cross had aided home gardeners, and some organization to promote garden activities was already established. Several industrial firms, which for some years had encouraged gardening and home beautification among their employes by providing land and promoting yard and garden contests, enlarged their programs, secured more land, and in many communities led the way in showing how large-scale gardens could be successfully organized and operated.

Except for the efforts of these industrial firms and those of a few cities, chiefly in Ohio and Indiana, which also experimented with the large-area garden, the 1931 community garden programs were for backyard or vacant lot gardens.

In 1932, however, owing to the rapidly growing need for relief, there was a large increase both in the number and acreage of these subsistence gardens; in Ohio it was estimated that there was a threefold increase over the preceding

year. A new factor somewhat affected the organization of these projects, in that some state money became available to supplement local funds for the purchase of seeds, plants and tools. In Wisconsin, \$13,262, the state's share of the net proceeds of a special football game, was supplemented by money from a discretionary fund and used to purchase seeds for 43,560 families. In May, 1932, the Temporary Emergency Relief Administration of New York State announced the policy of refunding 40 per cent of expenditures by home-relief bureaus for seeds, plants and tools, and of approving as work-relief projects the preparation of the land for garden projects.

An even greater increase in garden programs is to be expected during 1933 because of the still greater need for relief and because of the increasing tendency to allow the use of public funds for the purchase of seeds. In January the Reconstruction Finance Corporation ruled that in any state where the governor deemed it advisable, federal relief funds may be used for the purchase of seeds.

*State Plans for 1933.* Already the State Relief Administrations of Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, and Virginia are working on state garden plans. In Arkansas the project is part of a huge undertaking which includes community farming projects and a back-to-the-farm movement. One part of the plan calls for family gardens ranging from one-fourth to one-third of an acre, while whole fields will be used for industrial group projects in the cultivation of such crops as Irish and sweet potatoes, corn, peas, and other staple products. Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Pennsylvania have launched programs for individual gardens.

The Illinois Emergency Relief Commission (Federal) is embarking upon a definite policy for the promotion and assistance of subsistence gardens in the state. While the program has not been completely worked out, distribution of seeds will be made through the county organizations to persons who are on their relief lists. There are 102 counties

in the state, and at the present time 65 are receiving monthly allocations from the Commission. In addition to this material help, there will be a degree of supervision provided through the appointment of a director of subsistence gardening, who will co-operate with the local committees in the state. Guidance in the technique of horticulture will also be provided through literature and, as far as possible, through personal contacts with those directly in charge of the projects.

In Virginia the State Emergency Relief Committee has ordered the local committees to co-operate with the county farm and home demonstration agents in working out an estimate of the number of persons to be furnished seeds and the approximate cost thereof, together with the general program, and submit it at the earliest opportunity for approval to the chairman of the State Emergency Relief Committee. It is urged that special attention be given to this program in order that those now receiving work relief (which will soon be discontinued) may be made independent as soon as possible. Where there is no farm or home demonstration agent, the Committee itself will submit its estimate of cost and outline of program.

*Two Approaches to a Garden Program.* Two widely divergent opinions are held toward the use of gardens as a measure of unemployment relief. The first stresses the benefit to the individual gardener and holds that it gives an opportunity to provide not only food but work to those who because of unemployment are losing or have lost their self-respect and their morale; that it allows them to achieve again that feeling of success that is so necessary to anyone's well-being; and that people who have lost jobs, savings, and in many cases homes, should be given once more the joy of possession by having as a reward of their labor all the produce from their own particular garden plot.

The other opinion is in terms of immediate advantage to the community as a whole. The needs for direct relief are increasing by leaps and bounds, the shortage of relief funds is becoming increasingly great and the relief situation is so

critical that it is imperative for the community to use the garden plan which will produce the greatest amount of food for the greatest number of people. Proponents of this opinion assert that this is the large-unit community garden plan, in which all garden produce is given to the agency dispensing relief, and in which the men are paid for their work either in cash or in "kind" (orders on stores for necessities). They also point out that this plan is being used chiefly in industrial cities in which the great majority of relief applicants know nothing of gardening; where in their daily work they are not accustomed to take the responsibility of seeing a piece of work through to a finish, but are used to performing one operation in the company of others who are doing exactly the same thing. Such persons enjoy success through feeling themselves in the swing of an organization which is functioning well and whose accomplishment is measured in terms of output. The claim is also made that when the men are paid in kind, this plan materially reduces the amount of public relief applied for at the various relief offices.

These two points of view as carried out in practice have been evaluated by one who was in close touch with many examples of both. V. H. Davis, in charge of the industrial gardening project throughout Ohio, says in an unpublished report for 1932:

Both the individual type and the large-unit or community type of gardens have their advantages and disadvantages. The first type allows more independence and places the responsibility for results on the individual. Supervision is more difficult, especially when the plots are scattered over large areas. However, a number of cities and industries are demonstrating that where large tracts are subdivided into individual gardens, supervision is possible. The difficulty in the past has been that in most cases those agencies sponsoring the individual gardens assumed that the gardens would run themselves without any supervision, while in the case of the large-tract, community type of garden the necessity for supervision has been taken as a matter of course.

Given the same opportunity, organization, direction and super-

vision, both types of gardens will be effective and satisfactory from the standpoint of the individuals concerned as well as from that of the community as a whole. One group, perhaps more inoculated with the spirit of group action and mass production, will respond more readily to the plan which permits them to work in groups under the direction of a foreman. Another group, more independent in thought and action, will very much prefer their own individual gardens. In both cases there will be some irresponsible workers who will always need direction and supervision whatever they undertake. There will also be a considerable number of the gardeners who are undertaking the work for the first time and need much direction and help.

It seems to us, however, that the large-unit plan which involves no individual return to the gardener in no wise differs from other work-relief or "work-for-relief" projects which our communities have sponsored. When men are mobilized to work in gangs, it makes little difference whether they are set to dig ditches or weed crops, as far as their own participation or interest in the project is concerned; although, because growing plants are easily injured while ditch-walls are not, the former job would call for closer and more unremitting supervision than the latter. When, however, the actual return to the individual gardener depends on his own management of his own plot, we might expect to find more of the men taking a vital interest in the tasks to be performed.

It remains to be proved whether the large-unit plan in which the actual foodstuffs produced are eventually divided among the participants in proportion to the time worked by each one will prove to have the same advantages as the method of individual-plot gardening. Such a scheme is being experimented with in a few localities, and according to a recently issued report has operated successfully in a large industrial gardening experiment in Akron, Ohio.<sup>1</sup>

In some communities the emphasis has been placed on home gardens, which as the name implies are on the property of the gardener or located near his home. Their great ad-

<sup>1</sup> See Industrial Cooperative Gardening, by the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, 1933.

vantages are that they can be cultivated daily and the entire family can work in them. They are accessible to tools and to water. They eliminate the expenditure of carfare and time in going long distances to the large public gardens. Theft is prevented by proximity to the gardeners' homes, and the produce suffers no deterioration between the garden and the table, being gathered only as needed.

Only two serious shortcomings have been mentioned in the reports, each of which can be remedied to some degree. Warren, Ohio, points out that its backyard gardens were not used as intensively as they might have been, and that the space which was used for early vegetables might have been replanted for later crops. This objection will be overcome in Warren in 1933, by starting earlier and setting up some sort of a definite planting scheme.

The other weakness mentioned is that home gardens are difficult to supervise. This is true, but there were a few cities in which this was remedied through the co-operation of members of garden clubs, for example. Again quoting the Warren report, "Our committee organized a group from the local garden club which was divided up so that each person had a number of gardens which they directed and supervised."

Chicago, in 1932, operating on a much larger scale, and therefore needing a more elaborate system of inspection, reports:

In order to learn how well these home gardens were planted, the Committee was very fortunate in securing the co-operation of the Chicago Women's Club and some of the outlying Garden Clubs, whose members personally inspected 1,708 of these gardens in August and September. While at the garden, each inspector filled out a questionnaire which had been carefully prepared by our Committee. The results as shown by these reports were very satisfactory:

	Number	Per Cent
Gardens well planted and well tended	1,527	89
Gardens poorly planted	181	11

## II. FIRST STEPS IN SETTING UP A GARDEN PROGRAM

Few other forms of community enterprise can be made to appeal to the general public as much as a garden project. It has three great advantages: It provides opportunities for participation in many different ways by a large number of people without making too great demands on their time, their energy or their pocketbooks; with reasonable care it is almost certain to succeed; and there are tangible results for the work done, which come within a short period of time. The success of such a project should be measured in terms of general community participation as well as in families provided for and garden produce raised, for it is an opportunity to interest the general public in its unemployment relief program which no municipality can afford to lose.

*Organizing the Committee.* The first step in setting up a program is to canvass the agencies and individuals who will be interested on account of their other activities, or who have weight in community councils. The county demonstration agents in agriculture and home economics, as well as any other available persons with expert agricultural knowledge to contribute, are an important factor. Executives of public and private relief agencies are equally needed. If the community boasts a Garden Club, its co-operation should be sought. Among business leaders of the community special effort should be made to enlist those who have farms or gardens of their own. If successful farmers or truck gardeners are available who have time to serve on such a committee, their help will be invaluable. Often a men's "service club" or an organization of women can be induced to accept some part in the program as their special concern. The women's organizations in Louisville directed the whole program, through a central committee made up of delegates from each



club. The newspaper having the most vital interest in agricultural concerns can be induced to send a representative to the meetings, and to assist in informing the community about the project. If school gardens are part of the educational system, the supervisor should be added. The available personnel differs in different communities, so these are merely suggestions. The point to be kept in mind is that the membership of the committee should provide professional knowledge, both in agricultural methods and in the handling of relief problems, and should command the confidence of the community, through the caliber and standing of the lay members it enlists.

At the very outset the aid of the local representative of the State Agricultural Extension Service should be secured, which, as Mr. Davis suggests in the Ohio report previously quoted, may assist in the following ways:

1. Guiding the selection of the location for the garden and determining its adaptability for the purpose by observation and soil analysis.
2. Suggesting a desirable soil improvement program—proper drainage, liming, fertilizing, desirable cover crops, etc.
3. Planning and laying out the garden, and providing much free literature for this purpose.
4. Advising on kinds and varieties of vegetables best adapted to soils and locality.
5. Conducting schools or meetings for prospective gardeners in which specific directions for planting, cultivation, fertilizing, spraying, etc., are discussed.
6. Seasonal instruction and demonstrations in canning, drying and storing surplus vegetables for winter use.
7. Actual visitation and check up with the men in charge of the gardens, and, insofar as practical, with the individual gardeners.
8. Providing disinterested and competent judges when prizes are offered for best gardens.

The Garden Committee may be a separate body or it may be the subcommittee of some sponsoring group. As is pointed out in one of the reports of the President's Emer-

gency Committee for Employment,<sup>1</sup> it will usually be most effective to place garden projects under the direction of a special subcommittee of the emergency unemployment committee. As communities differ so much in regard to their organization for unemployment relief, it is not possible to outline here any general method of procedure. Whatever plan is made to enlist the aid of those whose co-operation and expert advice are needed to meet the special problems of a garden project should as far as possible be fitted into the community's existing scheme of organization, and no more new administrative machinery than is necessary should be set up.

The Garden Committee may decide to function through several subcommittees each responsible for a definite part of the work, or it may place the whole responsibility for the project in the hands of its executive committee. Either plan will work well, if there is real enthusiasm for what is being done, and if the group includes leaders who have the gift of arousing in others the enthusiasm they themselves experience. They will be, as it were, public relations counselors, interpreting to the public at large the work which is being undertaken, and in this way they will enlist the co-operation and help of all in carrying out the plan.

It will be worthwhile at this point to examine the ways in which some cities have met this problem. Two cities, one large and one small, namely, St. Louis, Missouri, and Taunton, Massachusetts, organized garden projects in 1932 as part of the work of their city-wide relief committees. The statement from St. Louis reads as follows:

For several weeks prior to the establishment of the garden, the press urged that garden projects be established for the benefit of the unemployed. The Citizens' Committee on Relief and Employment, therefore, determined to experiment with such a plan and organized a Community Garden Committee to develop the project. This consisted of the County Farm Agent, the head of a real

<sup>1</sup> Home Gardens for Employment and Food. The President's Emergency Committee for Employment, Washington, 1931.

estate company operating in Saint Louis, the head of the Agricultural Department of the Board of Education, a representative of the Missouri Botanical Gardens, surveying engineers, representatives of the Citizens' Committee on Relief and Employment, and two gardening experts.

The statement from Taunton, a city of about 37,000 population, is as follows:

The Thrift Garden Committee in Taunton was a direct outgrowth of the Unemployment Relief Committee. In fact, the general chairman of the latter group introduced this proposition to his executive committee early in the program activities of the local relief project. The Chairman suggested gardens as a possible solution for the future situation which was bound to arise at the termination of the unemployment relief program and asked his committee to think over this possibility for future consideration.

At the final meeting in April, 1932, the garden plan was re-submitted and elaborated upon and the committee unanimously accepted the plan and instructed the general chairman to proceed with his organization. Furthermore, it was decided that the remaining funds would render a more general benefit if expended in sponsoring of gardens, rather than sending a final group to work, and then abruptly terminating this civic relief program.

On the evening of April 15th the Chairman called together a group of citizens experienced in gardening, and in most instances directly connected with that occupation, for the purpose of outlining the plan and making preliminary arrangements. After a lengthy discussion the following officers and committees were deemed necessary: Chairman, Director, Supervisor, Committees on Land, Seed and Fertilizer, Land Preparation, Publicity, Rules and Regulations, Canning, and Transportation. It was decided at this time that regular weekly meetings would be necessary until the garden plan was well under way.

In two cities, Detroit and Cleveland, the organization of garden projects was effected by a municipal committee or commission appointed by the Mayor. In Cleveland the project was carried out as a service of and for the Associated Charities which administers practically all local relief. In

Detroit the Mayor's Unemployment Committee administered the project. Cleveland reports:

On February 27, 1932, an outline of a workable plan for relief gardens for both backyard and vacant properties was presented to the Employment Relief Commission with the result that the Home Garden division only of the plan was adopted with the provision that the City of Cleveland, the Board of Education and the Associated Charities would co-operate in the development of the project. A Garden Committee, with eight subcommittees, was organized with a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, and treasurer. A survey was made approximating the number of families of the twelve Associated Charity districts who were agreeable to the plan. Twenty-four schools were offered by the Board of Education as centers for the distribution of materials by volunteer gardeners and Associated Charity district workers. Before the Home Garden project was far under way, the distressing need for upbuilding the morale of the tenement dwellers of the congested areas compelled the committee to urge the reconsideration of the subject by the Commission. They authorized a new field garden project, which had to include the expensive item of transporting most of the 2,318 registrants from the city to ten areas at the terminals of street car lines. The Associated Charities underwrote the project and members of garden clubs donated \$1,819.

Detroit's was even more strictly a municipal project:

On March 6, 1931, the Mayor's Unemployment Committee invited a number of persons interested in gardens to meet at the office of the Commissioner of Parks to discuss ways and means of organizing a gardening project. A lengthy discussion was held and the following officers and chairmen were considered necessary: Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Director, Secretary, Supervisors, Committees on Land, Seeds and Plants, Land Preparation, Publicity and Organization, Rules and Regulations, Contest and Prizes, Protection and Transportation. Each committee was instructed to submit plans on their phase of the work at the next general meeting. Meetings were held at first every week, later every two weeks and finally monthly as the need decided. The Secretary had an office at the Mayor's Unemployment Committee Headquarters, where all requests for gardens were made. Applicants were not limited

to clients of the Department of Public Welfare. Two supervisors were loaned by the Department of Parks and Boulevards.

In both Minneapolis and St. Paul the family welfare societies took an active part in carrying on the garden projects.

In Minneapolis, in order to centralize the widespread sentiment in behalf of this plan, the president of the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association called a conference of interested persons on May 19, 1931, which adopted a definite program and laid upon an Executive Committee the responsibility for executing it. The allotment of families was under the jurisdiction of the Family Welfare Society. Included in the membership of the committee were representatives of the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, the University of Minnesota and the University Farm School, the Family Welfare Society and the Real Estate Board. This committee aroused interest through newspaper publicity and raised money to finance the project partly by means of personal calls by prominent members of the committee and by letters of solicitation to a selected list. In 1931, approximately \$4,600 was thus raised and in 1932, approximately \$4,300.

In the report from St. Paul, the general secretary of the United Charities says:

In developing the idea of the Thrift Garden (1932) for our city we had several lengthy discussions with our Board members and those of the Community Chest. Later a small committee was appointed with representatives from our Board, the Chest Board, market gardeners, farmers and the County Farm Agent. Letters and newspaper publicity were used in arousing public interest. We were fortunate here in view of the fact that our announcement of a Thrift Garden program followed an editorial in one of our leading papers urging that such a project be undertaken. Naturally the paper felt some responsibility for supporting the movement.

In Superior, a city of about 36,000 population in the neighboring state of Wisconsin, the garden project in 1932 was closely related to the work of the public relief department.

The plans for the garden project were outlined by the director of relief. The Coordinating Committee, which was functioning at

that time, was requested to appoint a garden committee to work with the relief office. Personnel of this committee consisted of a representative from the Chamber of Commerce, County Board, City Council, Realty Board and the County Agricultural Agent. A newspaper publicity program was charted and given to the local newspaper. Editorials and news articles were written. The garden committee developed the general plans.

In large cities the very size of the city may be a handicap to good community organization. To overcome this handicap and in order to mobilize all its resources to meet its unemployment relief needs, Pittsburgh in 1932 organized community councils in each of its 19 districts, with a central council known as the Pittsburgh Community Council to serve the city as a whole. The garden project was organized as part of its program.

The preliminary organization necessary was that of electing Gardening Chairmen in each of the nineteen local districts of the Pittsburgh Community Council to co-operate with the Thrift Garden Committee of the Allegheny County Emergency Association. The Community Council had full charge of all home and group gardens within the city. Applications were taken at local community council offices. Seeds and plants were also distributed from these points. This project was brought to the attention of the public by announcements through the community council offices, to the churches, schools, clubs, settlements, city-wide and local newspapers, and largely by the persons who first received seed telling their friends and neighbors.

In addition to the large central garden program, there are certain social agencies that often want to put on supplementary programs of their own. If public or centrally raised funds are being used to finance garden projects, the question arises whether these agencies may be allotted a share of the funds. With an organization similar to that in Pittsburgh, such a problem could be easily met, for adequate supervision of such activities could be given through the local Councils.

In Chicago, in 1932, the Joint Emergency Relief Fund as part of its program supplied seeds to organizations such as

the Salvation Army, Brookfield Welfare Association, Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare (in Calumet City), Lillydale Community Club, and Western Electric Company, which had land and equipment. The report on this part of their work is as follows:

A representative of the Committee inspected these gardens and found that they were in excellent condition and produced a very substantial quantity of vegetables. As they were under the direction of the organizations which had applied for the seed, the Committee had no means of determining the quantity of vegetables produced. In a few instances where the plan was not well organized the gardens were not satisfactory. Some of the organizations which applied last year will probably not participate in 1933.

In New York State, during 1932, the employe gardens of three industrial firms were placed under the supervision of the local committee of the Temporary Emergency Relief Administration in order that they might secure a share of state funds.

All the reports cited up to this point have been from urban centers. In Lane County, Oregon, a predominantly rural county, the secretary of the County Chapter of the American Red Cross used the already existing social organizations in the various communities in the county as centers through which to arouse interest in a county-wide garden program. The aid of the farm agent and the home demonstration agent was secured. Local committees were formed in each district and one representative from each was included in the membership of the central committee for the county as a whole.

*Financing the Program.* Many garden projects have been financed entirely from local sources. Sometimes part of the funds which have been contributed or set aside from tax sources as a work-relief fund have been applied to this purpose. Sometimes the expenses of the Committee have been underwritten by the Community Chest, or by a service club. Direct contributions in money or in goods have been secured in many instances. Free office quarters, personnel, gifts of tools, seeds and plants have been secured from firms and

individuals. City equipment such as tools and wheelbarrows can often be borrowed from the municipal park department. Dealers in agricultural machinery have been induced to plow and harrow the large plots, securing what advertising value they can from their participation.

The availability of help from state sources should not lessen the Committee's efforts to obtain local support. Nothing so arouses the community's interest as the opportunity to participate in tangible form. No state assistance is likely to be so great as to cover all the costs. In Pennsylvania, for instance, the State Relief Committee proposes to advance \$2.50 per individual garden to the county committees, but this is specifically allowed only for preparing the soil and for seeds and fertilizer.

One of the first tasks that face a garden committee is therefore the preparation of a reasonable budget, taking into consideration the number of persons for whom this assistance should be provided, the amount available from state sources, and the contributed land, materials, and services which can be secured.

*Executive and Other Personnel.* The size of the project should determine whether the necessary executive duties can be carried out by unpaid members of the Committee, or whether the services of a full-time executive officer will be needed. The time of a man to organize the project will sometimes be lent by his employer; and necessary clerical service can frequently be secured in the same way. If an office and application center is to be maintained, it can usually be secured rent-free through the efforts of committee members. Arrangements can be made with local social agencies to register new applicants in the Confidential Exchange and make whatever preliminary investigation is necessary.

The outstanding need for the success of the project is, however, that the Committee should secure a capable man to supervise the actual gardening. Experience has shown that he should be a man with good farming or gardening experience and that he should give full time to the work.

The qualifications of a competent supervisor are aptly stated in the Phillipsburg, New Jersey, report:

First and last you need an intelligent active head, who must be a diplomat. A first-class gardener supervised all operations in our project, and this is absolutely necessary.

Additional evidence as to the importance of good supervision comes from St. Paul, Minnesota:

I would say that our greatest success was due to the supervisor who was an experienced market gardener and county agent for years, and thoroughly acquainted with handling large groups of people. His patience and willingness to get out and work with the families played an important part in our program.

The chairman in Elizabeth, New Jersey, which had a well-organized garden program last year, wrote:

If this project is to be repeated, I am convinced that to be successful we must again have a supervisor who is a practical farmer and who can keep in touch with the gardeners almost daily.

There is also the question of using volunteers for this work. The experience of one state supervisor leads him to express this opinion:

The year's work has convinced us of the necessity of having a complete organization working on the garden program as well as the advisability of having a paid worker who understands garden work in each industrial county. The need for assistance in gardening among the unemployed is so great and continuous that volunteers cannot be expected to see the work through. Where we had paid trained men in the field, the work has been especially fine.

The number of supervisors used per project in 1932 varied greatly in different cities. In Rochester, New York, a supervisor was employed wherever groups of 30 or more were gardening in one tract. In Belvidere, Illinois, a city of 8,123 population, the Welfare Organization hired a capable man to supervise, advise, and direct the work. In Allentown, Pennsylvania, a regular supervisor was in charge of each

section. In Minneapolis, Minnesota, one supervisor and an assistant were engaged for each tract. These were practical men who had also a considerable theoretical knowledge of gardening. In St. Louis the community gardens were located on a tract of land containing 43 acres owned by the General Electric Company. Their garden personnel included a superintendent, two field foremen, one "utility man," two watchmen, and two laborers for about one-half time. Duties of the personnel were such as pertained to their respective offices.

Unemployed men familiar with gardening were used as supervisors in the project carried on by Brooks House at Hammond, Indiana. The use of unemployed men as supervisors was a special feature of the work at Superior, Wisconsin, where the relief office assigned 10 men to cover the city. The agricultural agent conducted a school on gardening methods for these men. They also held weekly meetings at which reports were made, and plans were laid to meet the problems that developed.

Field supervisors on full time cannot usually be borrowed from other agencies, but must be paid by the Committee. State funds can generally be spent only for materials, so that the problem of finding money to pay such salaries must usually be assumed by the local committee.

### III. MAIN PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION

The Garden Committee or whatever group is responsible for planning the project will next have to face three main problems. The first is, to whom gardens may be assigned; the second has to do with securing suitable land for the project; and the third takes up the question of securing seeds, plants, fertilizer, and tools.

*Assignment of Gardens.* An important question to be decided is whether the gardens are to be assigned only to those persons already receiving relief. If so, no arrangements for ascertaining the need of applicants will be necessary, as the agencies already in touch with them will do the recruiting.

Relief applicants are not always ready to try garden work, however. One state agricultural extension service, in an unpublished report states:

The welfare organizations had a real problem throughout the winter caring for their needy, and we undertook a garden program with them. Many of these destitute families had been out of work and on relief so long that they had become pauperized to the extent that they would not do much to help themselves. We found it necessary to work out more forceful plans for these organizations.

The Welfare Department of the Community Chest in one of our largest cities sent a questionnaire to each of its 700 dependent families asking them:

1. Have you ever grown a garden?
2. Do you plan to have a garden this year?
3. If we supply a garden site, seed, and instructions will you plant and care for a garden?
4. If not, why not?

The result was that only 15 out of the 700 said they would plant a garden. The remainder either did not reply or gave excuses as to why they would not plant a garden. Their answers clearly showed

that many families have lost their pride and self-respect to the extent where they are satisfied to live off charity.

We should like to point out, however, that this unwillingness to attempt gardens is not quite so simply explained as the report indicates. In the first place, people who have never tilled the soil feel no competence to undertake even a small garden. The suggestion is unfamiliar and comes frequently from a source with which they have no acquaintance. In the second place, people long out of employment have often developed attitudes of distrust toward proposals to substitute something else for the relief which gives them such scant security as they have. They fear that they may be worse off under the new scheme than the old—that it is a clever trick on someone's part to shift yet more of the burden of unemployment back onto their own shoulders.

It is important to understand that these attitudes are not just the casual expressions of sheer cussedness (as some people still believe), not the earmarks of a chronically disgruntled personality. They are, instead, the signs that John Jones and his wife are inwardly frantic with fear and are nearing the end of their rope in the struggle to adjust their needs for food and shelter, as well as their conceptions of themselves, their normal wills-to-power and their self-esteem to the thwarting that loss of job necessitates. These attitudes (defiance, suspicion, depression, etc.) are just as infallible symptoms of a state of mental health that is beginning to crack under the strain of trying to adjust, as physical pain or fever are symptoms of some approaching bodily illness.<sup>1</sup>

The questionnaire quoted on page 26 is abrupt and forbidding in its phraseology, especially in the final question, which seems to carry a threatening flavor. There was no indication that continued advice and supervision would be forthcoming; and persons not familiar with the printed word scarcely know how to interpret "instructions." There was no opportunity offered to ask questions and discuss the novel suggestion. "Are you going to raise a garden? If not,

<sup>1</sup> Pratt, George K., *Morale. The Mental Hygiene of Unemployment.* National Committee for Mental Hygiene, New York, 1933.

why not?" Resentment is the natural human reaction to such a method.

If in the city mentioned, the plan had been widely explained through the newspapers, and an invitation issued to unemployed persons to attend a meeting where they could ask questions, listen to simply phrased explanations, and be told how to make application; if the workers in agencies dealing with those on relief had explained verbally to their clients and asked them to attend such a meeting, and if the speakers had been enthusiastic, persuasive, and well-informed; we feel sure that much of the hesitancy and suspicion that inevitably greeted the questionnaire would have been dispelled at the start.

It must not be supposed or expected that because a plan is socially desirable it can be imposed on people without the necessity of explanation or persuasion, and with penalties applied if it is not immediately accepted by those for whom it was designed. The necessity which some states and communities have felt to adopt the slogan "No garden—no relief,"<sup>1</sup> or to put less direct pressure on relief recipients by eliminating greenstuffs from their grocery orders during the summer months, after offering facilities for gardening to all and sundry of their clients, may find some justification in the anxiety of the communities over their growing relief loads; but it also indicates that they have not realized the necessity of individualized educational effort if the co-operation of the unemployed group is to be secured.

It is not, however, necessary to confine applications to those already receiving relief. Gardens have a valuable service to offer in *keeping families off relief*; and it is from the unemployed who feel themselves approaching the necessity of applying for aid that the most enthusiastic response to a

<sup>1</sup> In some of the southern states there has been an insistence by the relief administrations that "share-croppers" break with their traditional practice of tending only cash crops, such as cotton, corn, and cane, and plant subsistence gardens to prevent a recurrence of last winter's wholesale dependence upon relief. This insistence has been aimed, in part, at the planter-landlords who in the past have urged the "cropper" to devote his full attention to the cash crop in which, of course, the planter shared.

garden program is often met. If applications from this group are to be encouraged, the Committee must face in advance, however, the certainty that some thrifty home gardeners who expect to buy their seeds and fertilizer will be attracted to apply to a center where they can be obtained free. Some "means test" will have to be applied to each new applicant, to be sure that each needs the relief available; and the method of accomplishing this can best be set up in consultation with the regular relief agencies. The publicity given out should stress the fact that the funds employed are relief funds; that the need of the applicants will have to be ascertained; and that no one should apply who is not prepared to substantiate his claim to needing the assistance offered.

Summarizing the experience of many cities it may be said that in the assignment of gardens, preference is usually given to the relief family and especially to the relief family with children, but other unemployed and part-time workers are also considered eligible. Gardening experience is made a prerequisite in only a few cities, although several secure information on this point to aid them in deciding how much supervision will be required. Willingness on the part of the applicant to have a garden and to operate it according to instructions is considered important. It is also considered most important that formal application should be made and an agreement signed before any garden is assigned. These agreements differ somewhat from city to city. Samples of some of the forms used are given in Appendix II. Often the form is planned to include any other information which it is necessary to have on file. In general, these agreements bind the applicant:

1. To plant and to weed and care for his garden.
2. To conform to the rules and regulations and to work in harmony with the other gardeners.
3. Not to sell any produce from the garden.
4. To forfeit the use of the garden if the agreement is violated.

Toledo, Ohio, adds another clause by which the applicant agrees not to make any claim against the city for damages resulting from any injury received in the garden.

*Securing Suitable Land.* Securing suitable land and having it made ready for cultivation gives the organizing group many opportunities of drawing on the special resources of the community and of calling for community teamwork. Citizens may be asked to give the use of their land. This probably can best be done through the Real Estate Board or by real estate men, for they will know not only the location of land which is likely to be available but also something of the character of its soil. The Detroit report points out that it was felt advisable to obtain leases to safeguard the gardeners from any danger of losing their crops through sale of the property. The necessity of this requirement has been confirmed by other cities.

City authorities are often ready to make available, property which has been taken for delinquent taxes or assessments. Some cities rent part of the land used for gardens, but they are the exception rather than the rule. Akron secured good farm land free except for taxes paid by the Garden Committee.

Quality of the soil and accessibility are the two main requirements. A quick inspection by a soil expert eliminates many lots and leaves time for a more careful examination and testing of the soil in others. For large areas, it may be possible as it was in St. Paul for the County Farm Agent to check with the previous owners as to the use of the land in the past and its fertility.

If, in an effort to provide gardens that are easily accessible, it is found that vacant lots well scattered over the city cannot be secured, a partial solution of the difficulty may be effected by providing a large-area garden for each of the larger districts of the city.

*Preparing Land for Cultivation.* In few instances was the preparation of the land a serious expense to the Garden Committee or other organizing group. Home gardeners

were expected to spade their own plots. In some instances the local committee in charge of work relief undertook the preparation of the area as one of its projects. In not a few cities, farm implement companies or large industrial firms generously bore the whole expense, in others they lent all the necessary equipment, requiring only that experienced men should be used to operate it. Toledo used government tractors from nearby stations for plowing, the only expense incurred being for transportation, gasoline, oil, and some small repairs. Sometimes oil companies donated the gasoline and oil.

In other cities, garden committees turned to one of the city departments for assistance. Often the Park Department co-operated either by taking the whole responsibility for some of the areas or by lending equipment.

At present there seems to be a growing tendency to make the preparation of the land a work-relief project, especially in those cities which are reimbursed by the state for part of their expenditures for work relief.

As the land was cultivated it was also fertilized. In a few instances a committee like that of St. Paul was fortunate in securing rich soil; others had a sufficient amount of fertilizer contributed. In Birmingham, for example, fertilizer was presented by three large chemical companies with local plants and by two steel industries. Three hundred dollars' worth was given by a new out-of-town concern for the advertising value. In the remaining cities the cost was either borne by the Committee or the land went unfertilized. This brings up an important point. A large part of the land being used for garden projects has lain uncultivated for years. Such land needs plenty of fertilizer to insure satisfactory crops, but it is difficult to persuade committee members that this additional cost is necessary, and consequently some gardens had last year a very low yield.

Marking off the land into plots of uniform size was usually done by the City Engineer's Department or by the Public Works Department as their contribution to the garden pro-



gram. Plots were planned to be of a size which would meet the needs of the average family but opinion has differed as to whether 40 by 100 feet or 50 by 100 feet was the better size. Minneapolis in its first year had only lots measuring 90 by 90 feet. In its second year two sizes were used, 90 by 90 feet and 45 by 90 feet. Cleveland arbitrarily set the size of its lots at 40 by 50 feet, but heads of families capable of managing them were given from one to three lots extra. Superior, Wisconsin, gave each man a plot 66 feet square, and in addition one-quarter of an acre in a large field in which only potatoes were planted. In this way spraying costs were kept at a minimum. Akron is following a similar plan this year. Blueprints were made of each field garden and plots were designated by number. Copies of this map were kept for reference in each garden office.

*Providing Seeds and Plants.* In facing the question of the amount and kind of seed which should be given to their prospective gardeners, the Committee has expert advice on which it may rely. It probably includes in its membership persons trained in horticulture as well as an experienced man in the capacity of field supervisor. The state Agricultural Extension Service also stands ready to advise as to kinds and varieties of vegetables best adapted to soils and locality and in special instances will do even more. E. C. Humphrey in his unpublished report on last year's work in West Virginia says:

It seemed necessary to work out a seed package which would fit our garden planting plan and furnish varieties suitable to West Virginia conditions and to make this seed available at the lowest possible cost. A list was made up and submitted to the Horticulture and Home Economics Departments to get a package which would furnish early and continuous vegetables through the season, and provide as great a variety as possible of the necessary food nutrients and a package of seeds at as economical a price as possible. This list was submitted to the leading seed companies and the contract awarded to the lowest bidder. More than 10,000 of these packages of seed were purchased by employees

receiving very short time work, who were not subjects of charity and not eligible to receive Red Cross seeds. This package cost 92 cents and represented a retail value of approximately \$5.00. It proved very satisfactory and a check-up made at the end of the year preparatory to making up seed packages for 1933 shows little if any change necessary.

Other state groups are doing similar work. Last year the American Red Cross distributed a great deal of free seed in Alabama, but this year the Alabama Relief Administration, through its Advisory Committee on Subsistence Gardens, has already arranged that family packages of garden seeds (approved by the Agricultural Extension Service as to varieties, quality and quantity) may be sent to disbursing officers for 48 cents a package and payment for them made from relief funds lent by the federal government. The Mississippi State Board of Public Welfare has distributed seeds to approximately 165,000 persons, and similar plans are being made by other states.

A standard ration of seed with some adjustment if larger plots are assigned has been adopted in most of the subsistence garden projects. In some instances it is recognized that there should be some opportunity for deviation and for expression of personal preference by the gardener, but this is more often done by setting aside a certain space in each plot in which he may plant what he wishes, providing his own seed. In other instances this same objective was attained by allowing a good deal of latitude in planting individual gardens. In Akron foreign-born gardeners were encouraged to follow the methods of cultivation which they had learned in their homeland. Mechanical regularity of appearance was sacrificed in order to develop a more personal pride and interest in the men's individual plots.

Garden committees who prefer to buy seed in quantity rather than to use a standard package have found that a considerable saving may be effected by buying in bulk and having the seed put in packages by volunteers, or by the unemployed as a work-relief project.

There is little agreement in opinion as to what part of each garden plot should be given to perishable crops and what part to root crops and to vegetables which can be canned. In several similarly located northern cities, the percentage of perishable crops planted in subsistence gardens ranged from almost zero to 50 per cent, with  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent fairly representative of general practice.

Cabbage and tomato plants as well as seeds are usually given to gardeners with plots in the large-field gardens, and sometimes also to home gardeners. Many of these are given to the Committee, and the remainder are bought from local merchants. A number of cities, of which Minneapolis is an example, bought their plants the first year, but the second year grew them in hotbeds. This method was found surprisingly satisfactory, and is of course more economical. In Pittsburgh one of the public conservatories with all its facilities has been turned over to the Thrift Garden Committee, and two million tomato, cabbage, and pepper plant seedlings will be grown there for this year's use.

*Providing Tools.* In home garden projects hand tools are usually furnished by the gardeners, but in field projects in three out of four cases they are furnished by the Committee. This is especially true if public funds are being used to finance the project. The equipment supplied is usually limited to a hoe and a rake. If these items are bought at wholesale, the expense is not great.

In Portland, Oregon, an effort was made by one of the daily papers to have surplus tools left at fire stations to be lent to those unable to procure them otherwise. This was of some assistance, but it did not meet with a great deal of response. A similar drive in Warren, Ohio, urging collection of tools by the Boy Scouts met with much the same lack of response.

Some cities require gardeners to provide their own tools. Birmingham, which falls in this category, states that:

Families were required to furnish their own tools, or to exchange tools with neighbors in return for labor for their own backyard

gardens and for their individual plots in community gardens. An appropriation of \$200 was made out of local Chest funds for the purchase of hand tools used to cultivate plots and acreage as work for relief projects. Many satisfactory tools were made in a blacksmith shop, which is a work project. The handles were made by the woodwork shop and the tool itself hammered out of scrap iron. This has developed to a larger extent for this year.

#### IV. WORKING CONDITIONS AND SUPERVISION

When large groups of people are working all day during the summer months, in open fields at long distances from their homes, the very nature of the situation necessitates the taking of certain steps to insure satisfactory working conditions. The protection of their crops from theft is also important.

There is the question of getting the people to and from work, of providing in each field garden a shelter which may be used in case of sudden storms, an easily accessible supply of drinking water, and comfort stations. The shelter may also serve as a central office or headquarters where the supervisor may keep his records, where supplies may be given out, and where tools may be locked up. When the crops begin to ripen, watchmen will be needed at night.

*Transportation.* Among the special problems of the large-area gardens, one of the most difficult to handle is that of transportation and the plans of more than one garden committee have been wrecked because of the prohibitive cost involved.

Committees try to provide plots as close as possible to the homes of their gardeners, but in the larger cities great numbers of these people come from the poorer congested districts where no available land is within reach. These people have to be taken care of by opening up large-field gardens near the outskirts of the city and adequate transportation must be provided. Many ways of doing this have been devised.

In Warren, Ohio, a city truck took the workers back and forth morning and night. In Jeffersonville, Indiana, the Quartermaster's Depot Truck was routed over the city to take gardeners to their plots of ground in the morning and

to their homes at the end of the working day. For the township gardens in Hammond, Indiana, a motor coach company provided one coach two days a week. In Omaha, Nebraska, the Catholic Charities issued carfare or gave money for gas to the few men who had old cars.

It is interesting to contrast the methods used by four very large cities. In Cleveland a large proportion of the gardeners had to be transported from their homes to the gardens and return. This was done by means of a special garden pass issued by the Cleveland Railway Company, which was good for 10 round trips a month and cost the Committee 85 cents monthly for each person. This one item accounted for approximately one-half of the expenditures of the Committee.

In Pittsburgh special street cars were at first provided to transport the gardeners, but this proved too expensive, so a truck lent by one of the large companies was substituted. Free license plates were secured from the state, and insurance and maintenance cost was paid by the Thrift Garden Committee. A driver on work relief was assigned by the Allegheny County Emergency Association. The truck operated on schedule, taking each gardener to his plot twice a week.

In Chicago each gardener was given two street-car tokens weekly, enabling him by the use of transfers to get to the end of the car line, at which point the men were taken by trucks to the gardens five miles away. About 200 gardeners were carried each day. Over 20 business concerns donated the use of their trucks for this purpose. The report states: "Some of the gardeners brought their children with them now and then to give them a day's outing. They brought their lunch and spent the day in the Forest Preserve, which was adjacent to this tract of land."

In Detroit free transportation was not provided in 1932, but in 1931 the Department of Street Railways lent the Garden Committee three motor coaches which were not in use, providing drivers and insurance coverage, while the Committee met the operating expense. The buses ran on a regular schedule, and passage was given free to one

person per garden on presentation of his garden badge and number.

Another angle to the transportation problem is that of getting to the gardeners' homes the produce they have grown.

In St. Louis clients were expected to take home their daily harvests, and large paper bags were provided for that purpose. Occasionally several clients would secure the services of a neighbor with an automobile and haul home surplus produce. On the whole, however, the daily system of gathering harvest and taking it home proved satisfactory.

In St. Paul unemployed clients and their trucks were used to transport the produce after harvest in those instances where gardeners did not have satisfactory transportation for themselves.

In Chicago most of the men had more vegetables than they could carry home on the days when they came to their gardens, and at the end of the season the Committee delivered about 1,000 sacks to their homes. After the gardeners had taken all they could use, men were sent out who gathered 450 more sacks and delivered them to the Shelter Committee and other relief organizations.

*Shelters, Toolhouses, and Other Buildings.* Little is said in any of the reports about the construction of buildings which were used as general offices, shelters for equipment, and places in which to hold meetings. In St. Louis lumber was bought from local dealers, and they were built by local carpenters. The Garden Committee in Cleveland secured the loan of 15 portable voting booths from the city for this purpose. In Chicago a two-car garage was donated by a leading mail order house.

The question of comfort stations for men and women was unfortunately omitted from our questionnaire; and only two projects specifically reported making such provision. The need for such facilities in remote field gardens is so obvious that without doubt many cities provided them. This need should be recognized and planned for by any committee operating large-scale gardens.

*Water Supply.* If the gardens were located within the city limits the Garden Committee secured permission from the city water or fire departments to use water from hydrants. Valves were usually attached to permit this being done more easily. The water was used chiefly for drinking purposes, however, as carrying water from the hydrants to the plots was a slow and wearisome business. In a few instances a volunteer fire department was formed and by using fire hose the gardens were given a thorough soaking once or twice during the season. Minneapolis hit upon another way of meeting the difficulty. "We used a discarded city sprinkler cart and hauled water from the nearest hydrant several blocks away. The plot holders who desired to use it, however, were obliged to carry it from the cart or from one of the four stock tanks which were filled from the cart and placed at strategic points around the edge of the plot."

If, however, the gardens were located outside the city limits, any provision made was limited to drinking water. In several of the gardens wells were sunk. For Chicago's large-field garden drinking water was obtained from an adjacent suburb by laying a special pipe and attaching faucets. Often the kindness and co-operation of neighbors was relied upon. In this connection Birmingham reports: "Drinking water for those working was secured from individual property owners in the neighborhoods. Water boys were placed on each project. We feared this would bring difficulty; but we believe it caused more interest to be aroused in the immediate vicinity of the gardens."

*Protection of Crops.* Protection of the gardens and their crops has not been one of the more difficult problems to handle. The police departments everywhere have given the fullest co-operation and in some instances have assigned additional police protection to the gardens. Sheriffs have also co-operated to the fullest extent. In Cleveland the State Highway Department provided and erected snow-fences around all tracts which seemed to need protection; and this plan proved effective.

As the crops begin to ripen additional precautions must be taken. Garden authorities have usually taken care of this in one of two ways; either paid watchmen are put on night duty; or the gardeners in the various tracts are assigned or are asked to volunteer for this service. The latter plan has proved particularly successful. The men are proud to be chosen and live up to the responsibility put upon them. A considerable saving is also effected. In several instances the watchmen as well as supervisors were deputized as police officers or deputy sheriffs.

Chicago had an interesting plan. "We had to contend with some thieving from one plot to another and by outsiders. We got five army tents from the government, which accommodated five cots in each tent, and asked some of the better type of gardeners to live in these tents. This plan was successful and practically eliminated any further thieving."

*Identification of Workers.* Each worker in a sizable garden project should be given some form of identification either to be worn or to be shown on request. Toledo and Reading required each gardener to carry an identification card. (See Appendix II.) Detroit issued a metal badge and included in the agreement signed by every gardener the following clause: "I agree to wear my badge, which shall be provided by the Detroit Thrift Gardens in a conspicuous place at all times when I am working in the garden." As these badges bore the number of the plot assigned to the gardener, they enabled the supervisor to check whether or not each man was at his own plot.

St. Louis worked out a scheme which simplified very much the keeping of a daily attendance record and helped to check the giving out of supplies and the return of tools to the office.

Clients were furnished a garden plot card. The garden office was furnished with two copies of this card, which were filed, one alphabetically and the other by garden number.

The cards contained garden rules, name, and address of client,

agency assigning garden and work periods. Each client was assigned a garden and number on his first visit.

When the client reported for work his card was taken up and he was furnished with a metal check bearing his garden number, and with tools, seeds, and fertilizer. On leaving the garden the metal check and tools were taken up, and the garden card returned to the client, thus giving a daily record of attendance.

*Disciplinary Problems.* Three main problems of discipline are met with in every garden project: stealing, interference with others, and neglect of garden. The methods of handling the first two are much the same in every project. When gardeners are discovered stealing from others, their gardens are taken from them. They may be given a warning and one more chance, but in many places they are penalized at once, to discourage others from following their example. Interference if persisted in is usually handled in the same way.

Neglect is the most commonly met problem. A promise to weed and care for the garden is included in practically every agreement, and is usually enforced. Gardens that are not weeded within a reasonable length of time are given to someone else by the supervisor. Sometimes five days of grace are allowed and sometimes ten.

The force of public opinion is also brought to bear upon the careless ones. One report speaking of this difficulty says: "A few families were lazy about getting their work done, but these were pushed pretty hard by public opinion, as the committees handling the work were local persons."

This same result has been achieved by building up an intra-garden public opinion. The Fort Wayne report tells how this was done in one project:

We had special supervision on our thirty acre plots. Each of the four thirty acre plots had its own organization and this community plan seemed to function very nicely. There were several who failed to weed and cultivate their lots, and these were turned over, with the consent of the original party to other persons.

*Competition and Prizes.* Interesting devices were tried to encourage the workers to have better gardens. From St. Paul comes this account:

Local merchants offered prizes for the best garden in each row of plots. In this way everyone had something to work for as there was a real possibility of winning a prize even though one particular row of plots was not in as good shape as others. This helped considerably in meeting discipline problems. We also established a "merit board." Gardens in poor shape received a red tag; those in fair shape a blue, and well-cared-for gardens a white tag. There was real competition among the 265 families to have their garden white-tagged at all times.

In Cleveland, during the harvesting of the crops in October, a Fall Festival held by the Garden Forum afforded opportunity for an exhibit and the awarding of prizes given to the 10 gardeners of each area and for the best produce shown. The pride taken in their gardens by the majority of the men and their insistence on keeping their gardens another year has been an inspiration to those offering their services in the administration of the work.

In Gary, West Virginia, the garden project was sponsored by an industrial firm. The Annual Garden Contest seems to have been the prime factor in encouraging this project. For years the company has offered a first prize of \$10, a second prize of \$5.00, and a third prize of \$2.50 for the highest scoring gardens in each of its 12 camps. In addition it has given to the prize winners a certificate of award which the winners prize more than they do the money. They soon spend the money but the certificates can be framed, and remain real evidence of their skill and attainment.

*Use of Printed Matter.* In large garden projects it has been generally accepted practice that with his assortment of seeds each client was given a planting chart and a set of instructions which he was expected to follow. The charts indicated where each kind of seed was to be sown in the plot. Many included additional information such as dates of planting, distance to be left between rows, depth of seed in the ground

and other similar items, until in some cases, so much was included that the chart was difficult to read.

As this chart and the accompanying instructions contained the basic information to which the gardeners often referred it was important to have it in usable form. Detroit achieved this by printing the garden plans on large, heavy sheets of paper 11 by 17 inches and printing on the reverse side certain general and specific rules for planting, together with the rules and regulations of the Detroit Thrift Gardens. This sheet folded into a size convenient for the gardener to carry in his pocket.

Much of the material given out by garden committees was mimeographed, but as it was on soft paper, it soon tore. Providing suitable literature for general distribution has been a very real problem to most committees. This year the wholesale seed houses are helping them meet this difficulty. Several of these firms have prepared four or six page bulletins especially for subsistence gardeners. These folders are attractive in appearance and contain several pictures of successful gardens as well as a chart and general directions for planting. The seed houses are willing to provide them in quantity for garden committees which purchase their seeds.

The bulletins of the state agricultural extension services have also proved particularly helpful. In nearly every state there are one or two of these bulletins dealing specifically with vegetable gardening. They are usually available for free distribution within the state.

*Lectures and Demonstrations.* Two effective means of instruction have been the planting of model gardens and the holding of garden meetings to discuss problems arising in the course of the work.

Model gardens serve as demonstrations of how planting and cultivating should be done. One of these gardens should be in each tract and the larger field gardens should average one for every 20 to 30 individual plots.

Detroit found that a great deal of interest was created by holding field meetings to discuss the care and cultivation of

the crops. The gardeners were given the privilege of calling special meetings by posting notices of their own as long as these meetings were for business pertaining to their gardens. Detroit also experimented with holding lectures on gardening at various schoolhouses during April but found they were not well attended.

#### V. CANNING AND STORAGE

Plans for the canning of surplus perishable crops were associated with nearly all the garden projects reported. Some provision for securing a large supply of additional jars is a necessary part of every canning program, as many families with gardens have no containers in which to put their vegetables. Since canning comes later in the season when garden funds are running low, the Committee is seldom in a position to meet this new expense. Newspaper drives have been the most effective way of meeting the problem. Women's clubs, parents' associations, and church groups are usually ready to do their share. In many cities the Boy Scouts have been responsible for the collection of the jars. New rubbers and some additional covers to replace those which have been lost or broken will also be needed.

Types of canning programs differ greatly. In many cities a rather simple program may suffice; others will need more publicity, more demonstrations and perhaps the establishment of canning centers.

In a small city it may be enough to arouse such enthusiasm that every woman is ready to do her share. Lakewood, New Jersey, has an interesting report.

Great stress was laid on the canning and preserving of foodstuff for the winter. Instructions were furnished to those requiring the same. In some cases cans were provided, and as far as possible one-half of the amount canned was returned to the State Emergency Relief for winter distribution. In Lakewood alone with a population of eight thousand people, we have a record of the canning of over 10,000 one-quart jars in the different homes. Also 5,000 jars were donated to the State Emergency Relief for distribution. In addition 2,300 jars of jelly were made.

Simple but effective ways of helping those who needed assistance and advice in canning were worked out in the three following cities:

In Cedar Rapids, Iowa, canning supervisors were appointed in each garden area from among the women themselves. The names of these women were published on the garden bulletin boards, giving their addresses, and stating that anyone needing their services could call upon them. Canning demonstrations were held in each center. A campaign for donated jars was put on.

The Catholic Charities of Omaha, Nebraska, states that the families knew how to can, having all previously done it. Groups of six families were assembled at public park ovens and kitchens and canning and cooking done by direction on articles hitherto unhandled.

The county home economist of Reading, Pennsylvania, organized classes in the homes of the gardeners, and glass jars were secured by an appeal to the citizens. The Woman's Club did some canning of surplus crops.

Demonstrations played a large part in the canning program in Pittsburgh.

In order that some of the produce might be conserved for winter use, the community council arranged for a series of Canning Demonstrations in the various districts. Through the co-operation of the educational authorities, twenty school buildings were opened and the use of the Home Economics room in each was made available for twenty canning demonstrations, which were held from July 18th to July 30th, with the Home Economics representative from State College as instructor.

The community council aided by publicity in the city and local newspapers carried on a campaign for the collection of jars. Boy Scouts aided in the collection and private cars and trucks were used to take the jars to a central place in each district where they could be called for by the gardeners. The jar rings and lids were paid for by the Thrift Garden Committee of the Allegheny County Emergency Association. The total number of jars collected was 12,491. Reports show that the individual gardeners stored a total of 36,899 quarts of canned goods for the winter.

Accounts of canning centers which were established are given by three cities:

In Superior, Wisconsin, a canning program was the logical result of the garden project. Materials for canning were purchased by the Outdoor Relief Department. A check was made at the end of the season, by clients selected for the purpose, and it was found that 49,875 quarts of fruits and vegetables had been canned in 913 relief families. The local chapter of the American Red Cross cooperated with the relief department in setting up canning centers. The Outdoor Relief Department employed an instructor to teach canning methods. Five public school buildings were used as canning demonstration centers.

Hammond, Indiana, reports: "A canning machine was purchased by Brooks House and installed in their building, where truck loads of fruit and vegetables were canned, each gardener doing his own canning, under supervision."

In Birmingham, Alabama, part of the surplus in 1932 was canned at the plant of a local pipe manufactory, with equipment which they had used the previous year exclusively for their own unemployed. Much canning was done in 1932 by volunteers under the direction of the Home Demonstration Agent in the school kitchens. A canning institute was held previous to the canning season in several different sections of the county. Of the two held in the city, one was for whites and the other for negroes.

Provision for canning to be done at the gardens was made by at least three cities. This enabled utilization of the produce as soon as it was picked.

St. Paul, Minnesota, relates that in the fall a large tent was secured from a local company, a commercial gas company furnished gas and ranges, a local wholesale company furnished pressure cookers and a public campaign was launched for jars. This program, together with the aid of volunteers and the local home demonstration agent, assisted the families in canning the vegetables on the site of the gardens. Surplus vegetables were solicited from market gardeners and farms and were canned by unemployed families at the "kitchen" on a share basis, one



out of every five jars going to the family. A small exchange program was carried out in some instances where families had a surplus of one vegetable. The organization's share of this surplus food was stored and is being distributed this winter; 16,484 full quarts of vegetables were canned on the garden site and of course many more quarts were canned in the homes of the clients. We discouraged home canning as much as possible but found some unwilling to work in the large project.

A small canning plant was established at the gardens in Saint Louis, Missouri, and clients and their wives did the canning. Surplus products were canned and dried for winter use. These products were harvested by the clients, cleaned, cooked and put in cans. The filled cans were sealed by one person who was responsible for this work. A sanitary open top tin can was used, and the cans were sealed by crimping the lids on. Acid vegetables were canned, and alkaline vegetables were desiccated. Tomatoes were put in No. 3 cans; onions (pickled), beets, various green tomatoes, relishes and pickles, and chili sauce were canned in No. 2 cans, No. 3 cans and quart jars.

Canning facilities were set up in Minneapolis, Minnesota, with the assistance of the Hennepin County Home Demonstration Department and the Family Welfare Association. A commercial firm presented the committee with made-to-order side walls for the canning tent, and the Boy Scout troop No. 9 loaned a top and stakes. A gas company generously donated the use of stoves, aggregating seventeen burners and the gas. The Board of Park Commissioners loaned tables, benches and a heating stove.

From the Board of Education the committee obtained the use of pressure cookers during the school vacation. The public solved one pressing financial problem by donating more than 5,000 jars. These were loaned to the plot-holders unable to provide their own. The number of jars filled at the tract itself was 5,135, eighty-one of the families being obliged to do all their canning there because of lack of facilities at home. It is estimated that about 15,000 jars of produce from this tract were put up by the remaining gardeners in their homes.

In Lane County, Oregon, which extends from the Sierras to the Pacific, the canning program was broadened to include canning of other than the garden produce.

The county bought a portable canner which was moved from district to district according to schedule. This canner was supervised by the same committees who were responsible for the gardens, each person's produce being carefully kept separate. Every person was urged to gather his crops and work for enough other produce to put up 350 cans for each four persons in the family. The committees kept close watch of this, finding places where the clients could work on shares for other crops than they raised. Between times, when the canner was in another district, any client was allowed to take out a dozen fruit jars from the Red Cross office, with the agreement that he return three jars filled as pay for the dozen. On the Coast we canned salmon, while inland we canned many varieties of fruit and vegetables not found on the Coast. When we were all through we traded any produce the individual family wished to trade.

Few communities have found it necessary to do much about crop storage. In Minneapolis, where the severe climate precludes outdoor storage, it was expected that many families would have no place to keep root crops, and the Committee offered free storage along with its own vegetables from its large-scale garden projects, in a basement room. The gardeners' crops were placed in gunny sacks tagged with the owner's name, and placed on racks to permit circulation of air. Free access to his own crops was permitted each gardener, a stock-clerk being always on duty at the store-room who checked the goods in and out. Only about 200 bushels belonging to individual gardeners were so stored, however, the majority finding facilities nearer home.

In Fort Wayne, Indiana, where the garden project was managed by the Federated Relief Agencies, gardeners who had no storage room for their surplus crops were allowed to "trade them out" at the Thrift Center maintained by the organization, for sugar, flour, and other foodstuffs. The surplus garden produce was then used in food orders to families receiving home relief.

## VI. FINANCIAL RETURNS FROM SUBSISTENCE GARDENS

To give a full statement as to the profits in dollars and cents of a garden program, information is needed on total costs and on total value of crops raised. But these facts were not readily forthcoming, even from garden committees with a good system of records. Actual cash expenditures were generally kept with scrupulous care, but frequently no value was assigned to donated goods, and there is evidence that value of crops raised was often very sketchily estimated.

Any statement of costs should include the estimated value of contributed supplies and services, as well as cash expenditures. In every city the garden project is to some extent a joint enterprise in which the participants contribute in various ways. The more fully this takes place, the more difficult it is to secure any summary account of costs involved. The use of land rent-free, its preparation for cultivation without charge, contributions of such necessary supplies as seeds, fertilizer or tools, lending of buses to carry gardeners to their work, and volunteer supervision contributed by individuals, organizations, commercial firms or city and state departments, obviated the necessity of spending much money; and yet in few cities was anything more than the figure for cash expenditures included in their statement of total costs.

Cleveland is the only city which has furnished data showing the estimated value of donations as well as cash expenditures. These figures are presented in Table 1.

It seems appropriate to raise the question in connection with this table as to whether the donations represented in every case absolute essentials. The tendency would probably be to accept and utilize whatever was offered free of cost;

and for this reason, the totals may represent a slight overstatement of necessary costs.

TABLE 1.—CASH EXPENDITURES AND ESTIMATED VALUE OF DONATIONS USED FOR HOME AND FIELD GARDEN PROJECTS IN CLEVELAND, 1932

	Home gardens			Field gardens		
	Estimated value of donations	Cash expenditures	Total estimated expenditures	Estimated value of donations	Cash expenditures	Total estimated expenditures
Supervisors and foremen					\$2,160	\$2,160
Office, clerical, meeting space	\$305		\$305	\$150	459	609
Printing, postage, telephone				25	326	351
Land conditioning				6,797		6,797
Seeds		\$264	264	18	726	744
Plants	119	33	152	110	123	233
Fertilizer	930		930	800	1,710	2,510
Tools	1,250		1,250	370	908	1,278
Transportation (men and materials)				1,177	6,751	7,928
Miscellaneous	175		175	211	81	292
Total	\$2,779	\$297	\$3,076	\$9,658	\$13,244	\$22,902
Per cent of total cost	90	10	100	42	58	100

The table shows that in Cleveland 90 per cent of the costs for home gardens and 42 per cent of those for field gardens are met by contributions. Although there are no statistical data to show whether or not these figures are representative for other cities having similar programs, there is an abundance of non-statistical material showing that donations of supplies and services have played an important part in almost all the cities from which we have received questionnaires. It is important, therefore, that garden committees in planning the financing of such projects should think in terms of much higher figures than those usually quoted as total costs.

Figures for total value of crops raised are just as inadequate as those for total costs. Estimates of the amount of produce grown were made by the gardeners. Records of the crops harvested at the end of the season were probably com-

TABLE 2.—SUMMARY OF INFORMATION CONCERNING COSTS AND ESTIMATED

City	Number of families	Size of individual gardens	Provision of seeds, plants, fertilizer, and tools
<b>GROUP 1.—PROGRAMS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF LESS THAN \$500</b>			
Elizabeth, N. J.	145	— <sup>a</sup>	\$32 for seeds and \$55 for plants from committee funds.
Hammond, Ind. <sup>b</sup>	264	— <sup>a</sup>	Seeds from committee funds. No fertilizer or tools provided.
Reading, Pa.	664	20' x 40'	Some seeds contributed. Other seeds and fertilizer from committee funds. No tools provided.
<b>GROUP 2.—PROGRAMS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF \$500-\$999</b>			
Evansville, Ind.	1,000	50' x 100'	Seeds, plants, and fertilizer from committee funds. No tools provided.
Jeffersonville, Ind.	850	40' x 263'	Seeds, plants, fertilizer, and tools from committee funds.
Lima, Ohio	841	50' x 100'	Seeds from committee funds. No fertilizer or tools provided.
Oil City, Pa.	832	35' x 200'	Seeds contributed. Fertilizer and tools from committee funds.
<b>GROUP 3.—PROGRAMS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF \$1,000-\$4,999</b>			
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	1,063	50' x 150'	Seeds from committee funds. No fertilizer provided. Some tools contributed.
Kenosha, Wis.	2,200	50' x 120'	Seeds and fertilizer from relief funds. Tools lent.
St. Paul, Minn.	265	1/8 acre	Seeds, plants, and tools from committee funds. No fertilizer needed.
Superior, Wis.	1,200	66' x 66' <sup>d</sup>	Some seeds from state funds, and some from committee funds. No fertilizer or tools provided.
<b>GROUP 4.—PROGRAMS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF \$5,000-\$9,999</b>			
Chicago, Ill. <sup>a</sup>	1,121	50' x 150'	Seeds, plants and tools from committee funds.
St. Louis, Mo.	300 white 150 colored	50' x 75'	Seeds, plants, fertilizer, and tools from committee funds.
Toledo, Ohio Home gardens	1,519	----	\$2,437 for seeds, plants and seed potatoes from committee funds.
Field gardens	1,715	50' x 100'	\$2,276 for seeds, plants and seed potatoes from committee funds, and also \$50 for tools.
<b>GROUP 5.—PROGRAMS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF \$10,000 OR OVER</b>			
Cleveland, Ohio Home gardens	1,360	----	\$297 for seeds and plants from committee funds, some plants, fertilizer, and tools contributed. <sup>a</sup>
Field gardens	2,318	40' x 50' <sup>b</sup>	\$3,467 for seeds, plants, fertilizer, and tools from committee funds. Some contributed. <sup>a</sup>
Detroit, Mich. Home gardens	3,016	----	Seeds from committee funds.
Field gardens	3,184	40' x 100'	Seeds, plants, fertilizer, and tools from committee funds.
Pittsburgh, Pa. Combined program	6,300	50' x 50'	Seeds, fertilizer, and tools from public relief funds.
Rochester, N. Y.	1,997	50' x 100'	Seeds, plants, fertilizer, and tools from Home Relief funds. T. E. R. A. reimbursing city and county 40 per cent.

<sup>a</sup> Not stated.<sup>b</sup> Township garden project.<sup>c</sup> Estimated at wholesale prices.<sup>d</sup> Each family was also required to plant one-quarter of an acre of potatoes.

RETURNS FROM SUBSISTENCE GARDEN PROGRAMS IN 18 CITIES IN 1932

Preparation of land	Transportation of gardeners	Supervision	Total cash expenditures	Estimated returns from gardens
WORK RELIEF PROJECTS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF LESS THAN \$500				
Work relief project	Not provided	\$280 paid from committee funds	\$367	— <sup>a</sup>
Contributed	Contributed	Volunteer	350	\$20,520
Largely contributed, but some at committee's expense	Not provided	No regular supervision	368	— <sup>a</sup>
PROGRAMS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF \$500-\$999				
Spaded by gardeners	Not provided	No supervision	\$500	\$20,000
Contributed	Contributed	Supervised by township trustee	650	5,340 <sup>c</sup>
Contributed	Not provided	Volunteer	550	6,500
At committee's expense	Not provided	No regular supervision	500	4,500
PROGRAMS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF \$1,000-\$4,999				
Some spaded by gardeners. Some at committee's expense.	Not provided	Full-time supervisor	\$1,000	\$30,000
At committee's expense	Not provided	No supervision	1,800	— <sup>a</sup>
Largely contributed. Small amount from committee funds	From committee funds	Paid supervisor	2,738	8,095 <sup>c</sup>
At committee's expense	Not provided	Paid supervisors	3,773	13,715
PROGRAMS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF \$5,000-\$9,999				
Largely contributed	Largely from committee funds. Some contributions	Paid supervisors	\$5,800	\$44,000 <sup>d</sup>
Largely at committee's expense	When necessary, paid by agency assigning family	Paid supervisors	8,529	11,729
----	----	----	2,581	} \$12 to \$20 per garden
\$2,407 from committee funds, remainder contributed	Not provided	\$2,336 for paid supervisors	7,231	
PROGRAMS INVOLVING TOTAL CASH EXPENDITURES OF \$10,000 OR OVER				
----	----	----	\$297	— <sup>a</sup>
Contributed*	\$6,750 from committee funds—some contributions*	\$2,159 for paid supervisors from committee funds	13,244	\$53,411
Spaded by gardeners	----	----	3,016	} 310,000
From committee funds	Not provided	Paid supervisors	14,138	
From public relief funds	From committee funds	Volunteer	11,604	86,385
Work relief project	Not provided	Paid supervisors	15,250	42,440

<sup>a</sup> Report of field garden only—no data for home gardens.<sup>b</sup> Estimated at retail prices.<sup>c</sup> Amount contributed for this purpose given in Table 1, p. 51.<sup>d</sup> Additional plots were assigned to some families.

plete, but it is doubtful whether full records were kept of the vegetables taken home during the season. In some cities there were no records of the produce grown in home gardens.

Cities in which relief was given in the form of grocery orders usually estimated the value of the crops in wholesale prices, the others in retail prices. The estimated values as reported on our questionnaire seem unnecessarily conservative in some instances and unduly high in others.

It should also be remembered in considering costs and returns from garden projects that the information returned on the questionnaires related only to those projects which had some measure of success, and that little or nothing is known of those projects which were partial or complete failures, on account of lack of fertilizer, poor supervision, or adverse weather conditions.

Only meager statistical data on the subject of subsistence gardens are available. Therefore we have included in Table 2, in addition to the total cash outlay for these projects and the estimated value of the returns, a statement of how costs were met in cities for which the information submitted was complete enough to give a fairly clear picture.

Cities have been grouped according to total cash expenditures, as this classification brings together those places which, on the whole, had somewhat similar programs. The information on expenditures is listed under four headings: provision of seeds, plants, fertilizer, and tools; preparation of land; transportation of gardeners; and supervision. There are, of course, other items which do not fall under these headings, but they represent a comparatively small part of the total expense. To permit uniform phrasing in the table the group sponsoring the garden project is always spoken of as "the committee."

A recently issued New York State report furnishes additional information on costs of and returns from subsistence gardens. In 1932 the Temporary Emergency Relief Administration sponsored a state-wide garden program. In it were included all types of gardens, but municipal gardens

formed the major part of the program, the term municipal being applied to those large tracts divided into individual gardens which were under city auspices. The report describes the organization of these projects:

Most of the municipal garden projects were carried on through the office of the Commissioner of Public Welfare. In many cases where the projects were large enough to warrant, a full-time person was employed for supervision. In this type of project the plowing and fitting of the land was usually done as a work project.

... Fuel for tractors was purchased with city money from the city's general fund. The men operating the machine and supervisors of the gardens were paid for their labor on a work-relief basis. ... Seeds and tools were furnished by the Commissioner of Public Welfare through home relief.<sup>1</sup>

The report shows that in the 37 cities organizing municipal garden projects in 1932, there were 9,005 individual gardens. Only two projects involving 112 gardens were complete failures and this was due to drought. For the 37 cities the average cost per garden was \$4.47 and the average gross return per garden was \$24.50. Both the costs and gross returns of the two projects which were operated by private organizations were relatively high.

<sup>1</sup> Subsistence Gardens in New York State in 1932. Temporary Emergency Relief Administration, Albany, 1933, p. 7.

APPENDIX I  
QUESTIONNAIRE, WITH LIST OF CITIES AND  
STATES THAT REPLIED

## GARDEN PROJECTS

Name of organization.....City and State.....

Report made by (name).....

1. What preliminary organization was necessary and to what extent and by what publicity methods was popular interest in the project developed?
2. How was the land for the project secured?  
What was the quality of the land?  
By what past agricultural performance was it chosen?  
Was any expert opinion secured on its suitability?
3. How was the allotment of families managed?  
Was previous agricultural or gardening experience made a necessity?  
What test of eligibility to receive a plot was applied?
4. How was the size of the plot determined?
5. How was the land plowed and made ready for cultivation?
6. How were the seeds, fertilizer, and necessary hand tools secured?
7. What provisions were there for
  - (a) watering plots
  - (b) drinking water for those working (this is in case the plots were all together and at some distance from the city).
8. Were the people allowed to determine how the plots should be utilized?  
Was a standard ration of seeds and plants issued? Of what did it consist?  
What was the proportion between perishable summer crops and root crops to be preserved for winter use?
9. Was any supervision supplied for those not hitherto familiar with gardening operations?
10. How were disciplinary problems handled? (Failure to keep plots weeded and cultivated, interference with the work of other people, stealing of crops, and so forth.)

11. As the crops ripened what precautions, if any, were provided against theft?
12. What provisions were necessary for
  - (a) carfare or other transportation to take workers to their plots?
  - (b) transporting the produce after harvesting?
13. Were there any particular storage facilities provided for root crops, in case the client had no space for them?
14. Was there a program for canning surplus summer crops? Please describe it.
15. If the vegetables or canned goods were centrally pooled was there
  - (a) a system of keeping track of what belonged to whom?
  - or
  - (b) some plan for the exchange of different varieties among the owners?
16. Was there any system of barter or self-help developed in connection with the project?
17. How many different families profited by the arrangements?
18. What was the amount and value of the produce?
19. What was the actual money cost of the project to the agency supervising it?
20. If there were problems which were met other than those indicated above, will you not comment on them?

## CITIES THAT REPLIED TO QUESTIONNAIRE

ALABAMA	MISSOURI
Birmingham	Kansas City
GEORGIA	St. Louis
Savannah	NEBRASKA
ILLINOIS	Lincoln
Belvidere	Omaha <sup>1</sup>
Cairo	NEW JERSEY
Chicago <sup>1</sup>	Elizabeth
Decatur	Lakewood
Granite City	Phillipsburg
Peoria	NEW YORK
Rockford	Rochester
Springfield	OHIO
INDIANA	Akron <sup>2</sup>
Anderson	Barberton
East Chicago <sup>2</sup>	Cleveland
Elkhart	Columbus
Evansville	Lima
Fort Wayne <sup>1</sup>	Toledo
Hammond <sup>1</sup>	Warren
Jeffersonville	OREGON
Muncie	Lane County
IOWA	Portland
Cedar Rapids	PENNSYLVANIA
KENTUCKY	Allentown
Harlan County	Erie
Louisville	Oil City
LOUISIANA	Pittsburgh
Bogalusa	Reading
MASSACHUSETTS	TENNESSEE
Lawrence	Memphis
Taunton	VERMONT
MICHIGAN	Wallingford
Detroit	WASHINGTON
MINNESOTA	Longview
Minneapolis	WEST VIRGINIA
St. Paul	Fayetteville
MISSISSIPPI	Mount Hope
Morton	WISCONSIN
Okolona	Kenosha
Tupelo	Superior

<sup>1</sup> Two replies were received from this city.<sup>2</sup> Five replies were received from this city.<sup>3</sup> Three replies were received from this city.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL ON STATE PROGRAMS  
FOR SUBSISTENCE GARDENS WAS  
FURNISHED BY:

Alabama—Alabama Relief Administration, Montgomery  
Alabama Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture and  
Home Economics, Auburn  
Arkansas—State Emergency Relief Administration, Little Rock  
Illinois—Illinois Emergency Relief Commission (Federal), Chicago  
University of Illinois, College of Agriculture, Agricultural  
Experiment Station, Urbana  
Indiana—Purdue University, Department of Agricultural Extension,  
Lafayette  
Kentucky—Kentucky Relief Commission, Louisville  
University of Kentucky, College of Agriculture, Agricultural  
Extension Service, Lexington  
Louisiana—Unemployment Relief Committee of Louisiana, New  
Orleans  
Massachusetts—Essex County Agricultural School, Hathorne  
Mississippi—State Board of Public Welfare, Jackson  
Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture and  
Home Economics, State College  
New Jersey—State Emergency Relief Administration, Newark  
New York—New York State Temporary Emergency Relief Administration,  
New York City  
Ohio—Ohio State University, College of Agriculture, Extension  
Service, Columbus  
Pennsylvania—State Emergency Relief Board, Harrisburg  
Texas—Texas Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture and  
Home Economics, College Station  
Virginia—State Department of Public Welfare, Richmond  
West Virginia—West Virginia Cooperative Extension Service in  
Agriculture and Home Economics, Morgantown

APPENDIX II  
FORMS USED IN VARIOUS PROJECTS



# DETROIT THRIFT GARDENS, 176 E. JEFFERSON AVE.

1. PRINT NAME		GARDEN NO.	
2. MARRIED	SINGLE	WIDOWER	
3. HOW MANY IN FAMILY?			
4. HOW MANY WORKING?			
5. WHERE?			
6. HOURS PER WEEK?			
7. HOW MANY SCHOOL AGE?			
8. HOW MANY CAN GARDEN?			
9. HOW LONG IN DETROIT?			
10. HAVE YOU USE OF CAR?			
11. NATIONALITY?		AGE?	
12. HOW LONG IN U.S.A.?			
13. ARE YOU A CITIZEN?			
14. HAS WELFARE EVER HELPED YOU?			
15. ARE YOU NOW RECEIVING HELP?			
16. EDUCATION?			

  

NEW ADDRESS		CASE NO.	
DATE OF APP.	BY	DATE ASSIGNED	BY
HOME GARDEN, LOCATION			
LOCATION OF GARDEN ASSIGNED			
WHAT EXPERIENCE		HOW LONG	
{ FARM { TRUCK { HOME			
DID YOU HAVE A THRIFT GARDEN IN 1917			
I HAVE READ THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE DETROIT THRIFT GARDENS AND WILL ABIDE BY THEM TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY.			
SIGN HERE		FULL NAME	

PRESENT THIS SLIP TO THE FIELD OVERSEER

AT \_\_\_\_\_

BETWEEN \_\_\_\_\_

AND \_\_\_\_\_

BETWEEN \_\_\_\_\_ AND \_\_\_\_\_  
GARDEN NOT HELD AFTER LAST DATE

**FURNISH YOUR OWN TOOLS**

1 HOE      50 FEET GARDEN LINE      1 RAKE      1 SHOVEL

**NO TRANSPORTATION WILL BE PROVIDED BY THE  
GARDEN COMMITTEE**

ASSIGNMENT CARD, DETROIT, MICHIGAN

TO: PERSONS RECEIVING RED CROSS ASSISTANCE

FROM:

It is our plan that every person receiving aid from the Jefferson County Red Cross who can secure a suitable garden plot be given garden seed. We will require definite proof that this plot is available before any seed can be allotted. Please fill out application No. 1 if you have a plot and want seed.

**No. 1 APPLICATION FOR SPRING GARDEN SEED**

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Color \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ No. in Family \_\_\_\_\_

I desire seed for planting my garden, size \_\_\_\_\_

Kind of seed and amount \_\_\_\_\_

LOT \_\_\_\_\_ BACKYARD \_\_\_\_\_ ACREAGE \_\_\_\_\_

Visitor \_\_\_\_\_ Dist. No. \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

If you do not have a lot, but think it would be possible for you to secure one near you, fill out application No. 2

**NO. 2 APPLICATION FOR GARDEN PLOT FOR SPRING GARDEN**

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Color \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ No. in Family \_\_\_\_\_

I have no suitable garden plot but wish to make a garden if you can furnish me with a plot, and I promise to work same to the best advantage, under the supervision of the Garden Supervisor.

There is a vacant lot near me I would like to work. The Lot is located at \_\_\_\_\_

Size of the Lot is \_\_\_\_\_

Visitor \_\_\_\_\_ Dist. No. \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

NOTE: Return this sheet to this office as soon as possible, either by mail or by giving it to some person at the Intake Desk. Filling out this form does not mean that we are promising you seed. It simply means that we will take under consideration your request.

APPLICATION FORMS, BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

ASSIGNMENT CARD—1932 Garden

APPLICATION FOR 1932 GARDEN      Record of Assignment

Date of Application      Section      No. of Lot      Date

Last Name      Man's First Name      Wife's First Name

Present Address      Nationality-Race

Total Number in family      Children and Parents      Weekly Family Income

Does the family receive relief      From whom

Is the head of the family employed      If so, how many days per week

Do other members of the family have employment

Do you have other garden space      Did you have one of these gardens last year      Do you want the same lot this year

Referred by      Agency

Agency Worker's Name      Signature of Applicant

Remarks on other side

Name      Address      Section      Lot No.      Date

Committee Member

This card to be retained by garden holder and shown upon request.

68

APPLICATION FORM AND ASSIGNMENT CARD, READING, PENNSYLVANIA

**MUNICIPAL GARDEN ASSIGNMENT**

This is to certify that

(Name)      (Address)

has been assigned to Plat No.      Lot No.      (Address)

(Supervisor)

**Commission of Warehouses & Supplies  
Welfare Dept.      City of Toledo**

ASSIGNMENT CARD, TOLEDO, OHIO

SPECIAL APPLICATION FOR GARDEN SEEDS FOR  
APPLICANTS WHO ARE NOT RECEIVING AID FROM  
THE CITY

WELFARE DEPARTMENT  
TOLEDO, OHIO

DATE

NAME      ADDRESS

NUMBER IN FAMILY      AGES OF CHILDREN

IS APPLICANT EMPLOYED AT PRESENT      IF SO, WHERE

IF NOT EMPLOYED LAST PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT

MAN UNDER WHOM APPLICANT WORKED

TWO ADDITIONAL REFERENCE NAMES

DATE

NAME      ADDRESS

APPLICATION APPROVED BY

SEEDS RECEIVED BY APPLICANT

GENERAL SEEDS      PLANTS      POTATOES

DATE      DATE      DATE

SPECIAL APPLICATION FORM, TOLEDO, OHIO

69



(a) I agree to plant a garden according to the prescribed garden diagram and to keep it in good condition and free from weeds.

(c) I agree to consider the rights of others and to do all in my power to protect my neighbor's garden from harm, as well as my own, and further agree to avoid damage to sidewalks, trees, or any other improvements.

(e) I agree that I will not offer for sale on the general market, the products of my own garden.

(g) I agree to forfeit all rights and privileges in my garden if I fail to comply with the above rules and regulations and any other rules that the committee in charge may decide are for the best interest of all.

72

**Agreement**—I hereby pledge, in return for service and seed, to do everything in my power, to cultivate a garden suitable to the needs of my family. I agree to be subject to rules and instructions incorporated by the Committee and under no conditions will I sell either seeds or produce obtained hereof. I will keep a record of produce harvested and submit same at request of the Committee.

[illegible]

73

[illegible]