

PEANUT SCIENCE

VOLUME 1

MARCH 1974

NUMBER 1

The Genealogy of APREA

Coyt T. Wilson¹

Most organizations come into existence to meet a recognized need or needs. APREA is no exception.

The need for a multidisciplinary research program on peanuts has been recognized for many years. It has also been recognized for many years that research and extension programs in agriculture must be closely linked and coordinated.

The problem has been, and is, to find an acceptable and workable administrative and organizational structure to meet these needs. Many approaches have been tried within universities, within the USDA and between universities and the USDA. No solution has been found that is completely satisfactory.

At a Peanut Research Conference organized by Mr. John T. Phillips, Jr. and held in Atlanta, February 21-22, 1957, the following resolution was passed: "That a well qualified and experienced person be engaged to serve as the coordinator of all research and research information relating to peanuts and peanut products in all its phases, from the breeding of the peanut to its consumption." This resolution was transmitted to the Resolutions Committee of the National Peanut Council. There was no recommendation regarding the source of the coordinator's salary or his relationship to the universities, the USDA or the National Peanut Council.

The reaction to this reaction was negative. Research and Extension administrators in the USDA and in the universities pointed out that they could not legally delegate responsibility for program coordination to anyone for whom they had no administrative responsibility. The Resolutions Committee recommended the establishment of a working arrangement under which representatives of State Agricultural Experiment Stations, State Agricultural Extension Services, the USDA and the peanut industry could jointly review research and extension programs and develop recommendations for consideration by appropriate administrators.

Within a few weeks the Peanut Improvement Working Group was organized and the *Memorandum* authorizing the organization was signed by the appropriate people representing State Agricultural Experiment Stations in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas and

Virginia, State Agricultural Extension Services in the same states, the Agricultural Research Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Federal Extension Service, the Farmer Cooperative Service, the National Peanut Council, the Southeastern Peanut Growers, the Virginia-Carolina Peanut Growers, the Southwestern Peanut Growers, the Southeastern Peanut Shellers, the Virginia-Carolina Peanut Shellers, the Southwestern Peanut Shellers, the Peanut Butter Manufacturers, and the Salted Peanut Products Manufacturers.

The Memorandum stated that the purpose of the PIWG was ". . . to provide a continuing means for the exchange of information, cooperative planning and periodic review of all phases of peanut research and extension being carried on by State Agricultural Experiment Stations, State Agricultural Extension Services, the United States Department of Agriculture and the peanut industry."

The PIWG functioned for 11 years primarily as a forum for discussion of peanut research programs in the seven states mentioned above and as medium of interaction among representatives from research, extension and industry. The annual meetings enabled research and extension personnel to come to a fuller understanding of the problems of peanut brokers, peanut shellers and manufacturers of peanut products. One fact that was reiterated over and over was that research and extension programs must be concerned with production of high quality peanuts and not just with increasing yields.

Although PIWG served a useful purpose, it had some limitations. It had no legal status. Members could not speak for PIWG; each one spoke for the organization or agency he represented. The significance of this fact became very clear in 1960 when representatives of PIWG appealed to Congress to establish a peanut laboratory facility to relate production and marketing practices to peanut quality. This direct appeal to Congress violated established channels of communication between the USDA and Congress. This action would have resulted in a dissolution of PIWG had not the Executive Committee met in October and issued a report stating that PIWG, as an organization, would not engage in further promotion of the National Peanut Research Laboratory. A second limitation was that PIWG had no funds. The proceedings of its annual meetings were published by the Agricultural Experiment Station of the state in which the meeting was held or they were

¹Executive Associate Dean, Research Division, and Director, Agricultural Experiment Station, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

not published at all. Perhaps the most severe limitation was that the official membership consisted of only one representative of each agency or organization that had signed the statement of Mutual Understanding and Agreement. This limitation was felt most keenly by the research scientists in the State Agricultural Experiment Stations and USDA agencies. Many found it difficult to secure travel authorization to a meeting of an organization of which they were not members. These research scientists wanted a voice in the formulation of recommendations concerning their work. Finally, under the terms of the Mutual Understanding and Agreement no further growth was possible.

It was the consideration of these limitations that led PIWG to decide at the Norfolk meeting in 1968 to disband and form the American Peanut Research and Education Association. It might be noted that this action was not "legal." The PIWG was formed by the organizations and agencies that signed the Mutual Understanding and Agreement. It could be argued that the appointed representatives of these organizations and agencies could not disband PIWG except as they were instructed to do so by their parent organization. No one questioned the action and PIWG ceased to exist.

The By-laws of APREA were adopted at the Norfolk meeting in 1968. Article II, Section 1, stated that "The purpose of the Association shall be to provide a continuing means for the exchange of information, cooperative planning, and periodic review of all phases of peanut research and extension being carried on by State Research Divisions, Cooperative State Extension Services, the United States Department of Agriculture, the commercial peanut industry and supporting service businesses . . ." The By-laws provided for four classes of membership which were defined as individual memberships, organizational memberships, sustaining memberships, and student memberships and established annual dues for each class. By October of 1969 there were 14 sustaining members, 51 organizational members, 145 individual memberships and 3 student memberships. Four years later there were 20 sustaining members, 39 organizational members, 289 individual members and 14 student members. Clearly, there was a need for an organization like APREA.

APREA is incorporated under the laws of Georgia as a non-profit organization and has been granted tax-exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service.

Under the By-laws of APREA there are five committees. These are: (1) Finance, (2) Nominating, (3) Publications and Editorial, (4) Peanut Quality, and (5) Public Relations. The Publications and Editorial Committee is responsible for publication of the proceedings of the Annual Meeting and other publications sponsored by the Association. This Committee is also responsible for formulating and enforcing editorial policies for all publications of the Association. The most significant accomplishment of this Committee to date has been the publication of *Peanuts — Culture and Uses* in 1973.

The Peanut Quality Committee has been a most productive committee in terms of establishing quality standards and development of equipment and procedures for measuring and expressing the factors related to quality of raw peanuts and peanut products. Each year the Committee selects a limited number of problem areas for study. These have included the development of standard methods for measuring maturity, milling quality, flavor and blanchability; improving and standardizing methods of sampling; developing equipment and methodology for measuring milling quality; improving the accuracy of the optical and refractive index methods for measuring maturity and iodine number; developing appropriate methods for measuring seed quality; studying the reasons for the wide variations obtained using the Water-insoluble Inorganic Residue (WIIR) procedure; and improving methods for determining moisture content of peanuts and peanut products. The Committee has utilized a variety of approaches to accomplish its objectives. In some instances individual committee members have conducted research in their own laboratories to develop or improve equipment and methodology. In many instances the Committee has brought to the attention of appropriate State and USDA research agencies the need for research on specific problems. The Committee has arranged for collaboration among State, Federal and industry laboratories in evaluation of new or improved procedures. In the late 1950's most people who were concerned with peanuts were talking about the necessity for producing and delivering to the consumer peanuts and peanut products having improved quality. However, there was no accepted definition of the term. The work of the Peanut Quality Committee has removed the air of mystery that surrounded the term, "high quality peanuts and peanut products."

The peanut industry in the United States is a complex industry. There are three major production areas. Production, harvesting and curing problems vary from area to area. There are three types of peanuts produced and marketed. The policies of the Government with respect to acreage allotments and price support are difficult to administer in such a way as to insure equitable treatment for all concerned. Regulations pertaining to certification and germination standards vary from state to state. The problems that confront growers are different from those that confront shellers and the problems of the end users are different from those of growers or shellers. This diversity makes it difficult, if not impossible, to coordinate in an effective and efficient manner all of the research and educational activities of State, Federal and industry agencies. The American Peanut Research and Education Association does not attempt to serve as a coordinating body. It does promote coordination by providing a continuing means for exchange of information and cooperative planning. It and its predecessor, the PIWG, has been remarkably successful in bringing about closer cooperation among all segments of the peanut industry.