

FARM GOALS IN CONFLICT

Family Farm, Income, Freedom, Security



306

Iowa State University Center
for
Agricultural and Economic Development

FARM GOALS IN CONFLICT

Family Farm, Income, Freedom, Security

Iowa State University Press
Ames, Iowa, U.S.A.

Series list of the Center for Agricultural and Economic Development. (Work of the Center is supported in part by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation):

From the Iowa State University Press (hard-bound books)

Adjustments in Agriculture: A National Basebook, 1961

Dynamics of Land Use: Needed Adjustments, 1961.

Goals and Values in Agricultural Policy, 1961.

Labor Mobility and Population in Agriculture, 1961.

Food: One Tool in International Economic Development, 1962.

From the Center for Agricultural and Economic Development

Adjustment and Its Problems in Southern Iowa, 1959.

Consumer Preferences and Market Development for Farm Products, 1960.

How Agriculture Operates—In Production, In Marketing, 1961.

Price and Income Policies, 1961.

Bargaining Power in Agriculture, 1961.

New Areas of Land-Grant Extension Education, 1962.

Cold War, World Poverty and Land-Grant Colleges, 1962.

An Evaluation of Weather Factors in the Production of Corn, 1962.

Copyright © 1963 by
The Iowa State University Press.
All rights reserved.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 64-13368

HDI759
C76
1963

Preface

AN INITIAL CONFERENCE on Goals and Values in Agricultural Policy was sponsored by the Center for Agricultural and Economic Development in June, 1960.¹ Being the first national seminar on this subject, the conference necessarily dealt with certain broad aspects of goals and values, both in farm and national societies, as these reflect on proposed and accepted agricultural policies and programs.

The proceedings of the initial conference were well received. It was widely recognized that the goals and values complex was an important influence in stimulating debate over alternative policies and in restraining or promoting particular legislation. Thus numerous persons proposed that another seminar be held to permit a deeper analysis and an extended philosophical evaluation of goals and values as they relate to the potential policies and structures of American agriculture. Major church groups in the United States formed an informal committee which suggested that the Center for Agricultural and Economic Development hold the second seminar.

The seminar was planned over a period of a year and a half. The following persons from the staff at Iowa State University did the basic planning for the conference:

Ward Bauder²
Earl O. Heady
W. G. Stucky

Lee Burchinal
G. S. Shepherd
Ross Talbot

Don Hadwiger
Emerson Shideler

¹See Center for Agricultural and Economic Development, "Goals and Values in Agricultural Policy," Iowa State University Press, 1961.

²Resident collaborator, USDA, Iowa State Univ.

Lee Burchinal served as chairman of the planning committee before he joined the staff of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Don Hadwiger initiated his employment at Iowa State University by assuming chairmanship of the committee. Emerson Shideler, Don Hadwiger and Edwin O. Haroldsen undertook the mammoth task of summarizing the final day of open dialogue and debate. The planning committee was aided by several representatives of church groups, especially the Rev. Edward W. O'Rourke, executive director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

The conference was structured to include position papers by major groups with programs or activities which necessarily assume certain values and goals for agriculture. These included church groups, farm organizations and governmental action, educational and policy organizations. Following presentation of papers by these groups, four behavioral scientists outside of agriculture analyzed and evaluated the position papers in respect to their consistency or inconsistency and in relation to reality under economic growth, social change and national purposes. Finally, a day of unstructured debate and dialogue was included in order that issues might be discussed in depth and differences might be compared and resolved where possible. In the last chapter of this book the dialogue is summarized, though perhaps imperfectly, since no brief could capture the vitality of the discussion.

Goals and values of both farm and nonfarm groups have important bearing on current and future policies and organization of agriculture. Lack of permanent solutions to continuing problems of the industry undoubtedly rests more on value conflicts than on lack of means to attain certain ends. It is hoped that this further dialogue on goals and values has helped to clarify these conflicts, to identify goals more clearly and to specify more consistent means to attain them.

Ability of different groups to discuss and promote goals for agriculture or to explain the values underlying them is a characteristic of democracy and freedom. Freedom would not prevail if alternative or even conflicting goals could not be discussed publicly by different groups. It is only in totalitarian regimes where this process is impossible. Public debate and discussion is a means whereby hypotheses can be extended and examined, existing data can be used to evaluate propositions and more realistic solutions can be devised. Certainly this seminar did not resolve all differences among groups. It did, however, bring together the major groups which hold very specific values and goals for agriculture. No similar "get together had been held. Through open discussion progress certainly was made in

identifying inconsistencies among goals, values, policy proposals and the basic elements of economic and social change. Equally important, some differences considered to exist were found to have little foundation when referred to a common framework of assumptions, knowledge and reality of economic change. Finally, a broadened environment may have been created, allowing or encouraging a continued dialogue among the various groups which propose specific policies and programs for agriculture.

EARL O. HEADY

Iowa State University

Executive Director

Center for Agricultural

and Economic Development

Table of Contents

<i>Don F. Hadwiger</i> <i>Edwin O. Haroldsen</i>	1. Preview	1
<i>Lee Burchinal</i>	2. The Issues in Farm Goals and Values	8
<i>Shirley E. Greene</i>	3. Theology of Rural Life: A Protestant Perspective. . .	15
<i>George H. Speltz</i>	4. Theology of Rural Life: A Catholic Perspective	33
<i>Willard W. Cochrane</i>	5. Beliefs and Values Underlying Agricultural Policies and Programs	50
<i>W. E. Hamilton</i>	6. Goals and Values Underlying Farm Bureau Policies.	64
<i>Gilbert Rohde</i>	7. Goals and Values Underlying Programs of Farmers Union	77
<i>Herschel D. Newsom</i>	8. Goals and Values Underlying Programs of the Grange . . .	87
<i>Robert J. Lampman</i>	9. Goals for the American Economy.	94
<i>Oren Staley</i>	10. The National Farmers Organization	103
<i>Henry A. McCanna</i>	11. Goals and Values in American Agriculture: The Protestant Program.	112

<i>Edward W. O'Rourke</i>	12. Goals and Values Underlying Programs of the Catholic Church in Rural U.S.A.	129
<i>J. B. Claar</i>	13. Goals, Values and Cooperative Extension Programs	135
<i>Tyler Thompson</i>	14. Evaluation on an Ethical Basis	145
<i>Kenneth E. Boulding</i>	15. Agricultural Organizations and Policies: A Personal Evaluation.	156
<i>Robin M. Williams, Jr.</i>	16. How To Judge Institutional Programs	167
<i>Andrew Hacker</i>	17. An Evaluation by a Political Scientist.	184
<i>E. W. Hofstee</i>	18. European Perspectives of Agricultural Changes and Societal Adaptations	188
	19. Dialogue	207

1

Preview

A VIGOROUS INTERDISCIPLINARY MEETING takes the neatness from our particular world and sometimes makes us wonder whether it exists at all.

Such was the case at the Second Conference on Goals and Values in Agriculture, held in February 1963 at Iowa State University.

Conflicting goals and values were expressed as those participating in the conference sought to understand and judge the devastating tide of urban migration in which most people are or promise soon to be caught.

Top men in their fields asked such questions as these:

Is rural life inherently superior?

Is it, in any case, worth saving?

Or are family farms becoming family businesses and food production more an aspect of the laboratory than of the farm?

From the rural side, what can be done on behalf of those who will move to town?

Must we save the farm in order to save the family? During the conference, a political scientist asked, as eyebrows were raised, whether we might not even have to do without the family. His point: we cannot have the world as we want it until we come alive to its complex forces — and deal with them.

In this volume, spokesmen for churches, government agencies and farm organizations first candidly state their official aspirations. A theologian and three social scientists then comment. And finally, the comments, questions and special points of view of the many who participated in a general "dialogue" are included as the last chapter.

FARMING AS A WAY OF LIFE

In this volume the warmest controversy centers on the nature of farming as a way of life. Divergent points of view are noted. However, the conclusion prevails that while the rural community is capable of producing a good life, it would be a mistake to consider it as superior to other types of communities.

Catholic and Protestant points of view are expressed on this subject by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. George H. Speltz, St. Mary's College, and by Dr. Shirley E. Greene, secretary for the Church in Town and Country, United Church Board for Homeland Ministries, United Church of Christ.

Monsignor Speltz says the farmer's deep attachment to the soil is a source of stability and strength in nations.

"In speaking of the work of the farmer I wish to emphasize its therapeutic value. Much of the work of contemporary man, like repetitious factory or clerical work, lacks this value. Though we must accept this condition of things, we should not organize agriculture without giving thought to this social problem.

"Classical Socialism solves it by saying that when everything has been organized for production, then the worker will be able to find the good life in a Utopia of material plenty which he will have the leisure to enjoy. In this view, work is to be endured; a man enjoys life and perfects himself in his leisure hours, principally, and not through his work. Work is not regarded as having any significant cultural value.

"The Catholic perspective, for theological as well as philosophical reasons, is quite different. Man has need to work, not only for the acquisition of the necessities of life, the primary end of manual labor, but also because it is necessary for his spiritual and physical development."

The popes have expressed concern that an impersonal economic organization of society, based predominantly upon mathematical calculations, tends to reduce the laborers to mere objects without any significant identity. Because the living things with which the farmer works do not lend themselves readily to merely quantitative determinations but must be handled according to the far more complex laws of the organic realm, it is reasonable to hope that the agricultural worker can be spared the depersonalizing influences of modern technology and economic organization. As Pope Pius XII noted, labor on farms "still reflects the natural order willed by God, namely, that man, with his own labor, ought to rule material things not material things rule man."

"No more profound reason could be given for the inherent dignity of agriculture," Monsignor Speltz asserts.

Speaking as a Protestant, Dr. Greene notes the Christian thesis that man is a sinner who stands forever under God's judgment. He affirms that this thesis forces a re-examination of the "pleasant assumptions" some of us have lived with so long about the "superiority of the 'rural way of life,' the purity of 'rural values,' and the specially sacred nature of the 'farmer's calling.'"

"In my own attempts to appraise the rural way of life I have discovered that for every virtue attributable to country living and to the agricultural vocation there is to be found a counter-vailing vice. For example, to mention but a few: strong family structure—patriarchalism. Neighborliness—nosiness. Religious sensitivity conditioned by natural environment—deep seated pagan naturalism. Self-reliance—stubborn individualism. Absence of class stratification—family clannishness. Community loyalty—narrow provincialism. Respect for tradition—blind conservatism. And the list could be indefinitely prolonged.

"I can and will defend the thesis that there are those aspects in rural life, especially as we have known it in the economically well-adjusted sectors of the American scene, which are conducive to the development of strong character, wholesome family life, stable and fine communities and democratic qualities of life. No more than this. Rural life at its best provides a favorable environment for these values; it does not guarantee them. It has all too often produced their opposites."

However, Dr. Greene believes we should not lean so far away from nostalgic glorification of rural life as to fall into an equal but opposite fallacy.

"In recent years I have heard some speeches in glorification of the metropolis and the urban way of life which have been quite as oblivious of the Christian doctrine of judgment as anything in the romantic literature of rural life. The 'holy earth' boys have, if anything, been topped by the 'holy city' boys."

COMMUNITY CHANGE

Dr. Andrew Hacker, Department of Government, Cornell University, asserts that churches are passive and are forced to serve vested interests rather than bring about change. But both the Rev. Henry McCanna, executive director, Department of Church in Town and Country, National Council of Churches, and

the Rev. Edward O'Rourke, executive director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, see in churches the best instrument, perhaps the only instrument, capable of renewing and invigorating rural society.

Father O'Rourke notes that among the organizational tools recently made available one of the most promising is the Rural Areas Development program.

"In nearly 2,000 counties and larger areas of the United States RAD committees have been established. These committees coordinate the efforts of private organizations and agencies of the government. They seek to improve agricultural income, develop small industries and expand public facilities.

"The NCRLC heartily endorses the RAD program and promotes it at the national, state and local levels. We remind our people of their responsibilities toward their communities and urges them to assume positions of leadership in RAD committees."

The Rev. McCanna observes that lay and clerical church leaders need to be trained in "new and radical methods" to help low status groups develop their own leaders, identify their own concerns, develop varied mutual associations to help themselves and participate in the "larger" community.

The people who need help the most must find an articulate voice, he states. Local pastors, more than any other local group, can aid in the stimulating or initiative, and they can both seek out and help the dispossessed become articulate.

"To assume that the present county and town power structures will do this is an illusion — too much of vested interest is at stake. It is up to the pastor and his dedicated and sensitive laymen.

"Old rivalries between town and town must be absorbed into a comprehensive cooperative area approach. Again, it is up to the pastor as he works with other pastors of such an economic area to set an example of cooperation and to aid in the process of reconciliation. Economic salvation will never occur apart from such social reconciliation," the Rev. McCanna says.

FARM POLICY

Sharply varying viewpoints on the farm problem are expressed by farm organization and government agency spokesmen.

W. E. Hamilton, director of research for the American Farm Bureau Federation, says that farmers best may earn high per-family real incomes in a manner preserving freedom and

opportunity if the market price system is preserved as the principal influence in allocating the use of farm resources and in distributing farm production. Reliance on the market system does not automatically result in a Utopia in which there are no human problems.

"There is a place for private charity and for government programs to aid the less fortunate, but Farm Bureau believes that such efforts should be designed to supplement rather than replace the market system. It also believes that private charity benefits both the giver and receiver, whereas the increasing assumption of welfare responsibilities by a centralized government tends to reduce the individual's concern with other people's problems."

Hamilton adds that transitional programs are needed to liquidate accumulated surpluses and facilitate needed adjustments in resource use in order to keep the mistakes of past programs from placing an intolerable burden on the operation of the market system.

Dr. Willard W. Cochrane, principal economic advisor to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and director of agricultural economics for the U. S. Department of Agriculture, maintains that a fair return to agriculture cannot be achieved without some management of market supplies and hence some sacrifice of entrepreneurial freedom.

Even when pressed to the fullest extent possible, programs to expand demand for farm products, to open up new uses for farm resources and to create non-farm job opportunities "are likely to fall short of achieving a fair return to agriculture for considerable time to come."

Dr. Cochrane declares that studies indicate we have millions of acres under cultivation now that will not be needed to produce agricultural products we can use, even two decades ahead.

"Stated positively, there is little possibility of bringing total farm output in line with total demand at reasonable prices which does not involve supply management programs that, in some degree, limit the otherwise unrestrained power of farmers to produce as much as they choose.

"It is conceivable that farmers might prize entrepreneurial freedom so highly that they would prefer sacrificing whatever degree of a fair return necessary to prevent any loss whatsoever of entrepreneurial freedom. But, in general, we know of no evidence that farmers prize entrepreneurial freedom that highly."

Herschel D. Newsom, grand master of the National Grange, says a major cause of low incomes among farmers is protected prices and wages in industry which have become farmers' production and living costs.

Newsom points out the necessity for reducing trade barriers now is universally recognized by free nations, the American farm people and other Americans. But he asserts that others must be made to understand that the right of American farmers to protection from the full, free international market (comparable to that afforded nonagricultural labor, investment or industry) is not incompatible with the long-time objective of progressively reducing trade barriers.

"It is in this light that the propriety and reasonableness of the wheat certificate program, for example, as an instrument to achieve such levels of protection to the American wheat producer, in terms of a soundly balanced American economy, should be presented and evaluated."

Gilbert C. Rohde, president of the National Farmers Union in Wisconsin, observes that the NFU's proposal to establish family farm "maximums" in terms of production units and to make direct payments to farmers is receiving much attention at this time.

"Farmers Union is convinced that a direct payment program, incorporating supply management, has several advantages over our present price supports through government purchases."

He notes that payments would be made directly to the producer and not to the processor. Since the market would be allowed to clear the product, consumers would receive lower food prices and government would not have to meet high storage costs. With the ready-made government market removed, processor plants would operate in a more genuinely competitive market. Prices at which American products move in international trade will be reduced in keeping with our policy to liberalize world trade.

Oren Staley, president of the National Farmers Organization, declares that "it's time for the farmer to start putting the price tag on the product he sells instead of going to the market and asking 'what will you give me?'"

He says that to accomplish this farmers must organize, must affect the total supply, must use bargaining power and must secure contracts with processors to stabilize their price gains.

As a result of the NFO's holding action last year "we have been able to move forward in signing master contracts" and now have signed a larger number of them.

"No longer can farmers as individuals meet the problems of their industry. They must organize or relegate themselves to a lower and lower standard of living," Staley says.

Dr. Tyler Thompson, professor of the philosophy of religion, Garrett Theological Seminary, provides an ethical critique of the programs discussed by previous speakers.

He concludes that "God's love, man's sin and God's reconciling power, which never can be fulfilled short of our outgoing concern for every man," provide a framework which can bring all of the goals and values for agriculture to judgment — "whether propounded by individuals, or voluntary organizations or government agencies or churches."

FREEDOM VS. OTHER GOALS

Dr. Robin M. Williams, Jr., Cornell University, notes that entrepreneurial freedom is incompatible with several of the other important goals and values desired by farm people.

"Because we want several incompatible things, the agricultural programs of the future will continue to represent complex compromises among different values and goals.

"There is a limit to the subsidization of comparatively well-off commercial farms that will be politically tolerated in an urbanized democracy. There is no limit to the acceptability to the conscience of the public of the mass misery of migratory farm workers or of the rural slums of stranded populations."

The Cornell sociologist adds that "the only hope for an effective agriculture and an enduring rural life is in selective change and adaptation to new conditions. There is no simple panacea. Some answers will be found in research, teaching or extension services. Some will be devised by individuals, by cooperatives, by local communities, by private voluntary associations. A very substantial amount of governmental regulation and guidance will continue. New social inventions will be needed and will emerge — new forms of organization, new procedures."

DON F. HADWIGER

Associate Professor of History and Government
Iowa State University

EDWIN O. HAROLDSEN

Assistant Professor and Editor for
Center for Agricultural and Economic Development
Iowa State University

2

The Issues in Farm Goals and Values

LEE BURCHINAL¹

OUR WORLD is changing. America is changing. Changes are most obvious in our material world — in science, technology, engineering and in all the gadgets that make up the paraphernalia of modern living. But our social world also is changing. Ways of organizing family, religious, political and economic activities are no longer the same as before. The relationships between men and women, husbands and wives, and parents and children increasingly reflect equalitarian rights and responsibilities for all parties. Religious beliefs and practices are becoming closely related to ideas arising from the natural and behavioral sciences. Minority groups are demanding and achieving political and social rights long denied them. And the economic basis of our society, including agriculture, is undergoing revolutionary changes.

GOALS AND SOCIAL CHANGES

Changes, however, do not always occur smoothly. Some changes are accepted more readily than others, and some are encouraged while others are resisted. Generally, we accept and encourage changes in our material world — in the techniques for doing work more efficiently or for altering our surroundings — much more quickly than we accept changes in the ways of conducting our affairs in family, economic, religious or political activities. Modifications in our social relationships frequently bring anxiety and hostility, as the illusion of secure, stable ways

¹Assistant to the chief. Farm Population Branch, Economic Research Service, USDA.

of conducting these affairs crumbles before our eyes. Frequently we are suspicious or apprehensive about changes in social relationships.

Unlike most changes in our physical surroundings — even the man-made parts — changes in social relationships, including our work roles, require adjustments in our ideas about the “right” or “natural” way of doing things. Think of the last time you felt a flash of anger or a sense of righteous indignation because of a negative or critical remark directed against a group to which you belong. Why these reactions?

Simple. Almost all activities vitally related to our existence in this incredibly complex society result from our participation in groups. Order in these activities is maintained by striving for socially approved ends (goals) by means of socially approved means. For instance, we want many things: a good level of living for our families and ourselves, success, comfort, to name just a few things. And we attempt to attain these ends by means of work, perhaps supplemented by careful investment of part of the results of our labor.

The agreement upon goals sought and the means used to attain them shows remarkable persistence and wide acceptance in our society. The persistence and generality of goals are due in large part to their intimate association with values we have learned to accept. Values give rise to the ranking of the importance of goals. They define the approved and disapproved means of attaining goals. Values are ideas, and can be inferred from the choices we make among alternative courses of action. When people choose to remain in farming, despite lower incomes in many cases and less ready access to medical, religious, social and recreational facilities, it must be because they value certain satisfactions derived from farming over those that could be derived from a higher paying nonfarm job.

However, values seldom exist in isolation from one another: customarily sets of values hang together and form a set of interrelated values. For instance, nationalism versus internationalism, agricultural fundamentalism versus a broader social view and racism versus social, economic and political equalitarianism include numerous interrelated values with their associated goals and means for attaining these goals. However, we are seldom consciously aware of holding abstractly related sets of values about groups or activities. Instead, our personal feelings and degree of emotional involvement with these values and groups become focused upon certain symbols. As concrete objects that represent a cluster of values, symbols often become infused with great emotional attachment.

Our flag represents our country, its history, traditions, accomplishments and aspirations. The cross invokes still other feelings and responses. And in the particular segment of the economic system in which we are especially interested, references to the farm family may communicate little information, but will pack a large emotional wallop with a certain audience.

Thus, symbols, goals and values influence our objectivity; beliefs or opinions about matters become "facts" because we desperately want to believe things are as we want them to be, and not necessarily as they actually exist.

It is obvious, therefore, that inevitable difficulties, misunderstandings or failures in communication face us as we attempt to discuss goal and value issues in American agriculture and in rural community organization. Because we live in a vigorous multi-grouped society, value and goal issues always will abound. And because we have faith in reason and democratic processes, we expect to discover ways of resolving social and economic conflicts.

In this book we hope to make a modest contribution to the goal of identifying and possibly clarifying some of the value and goal issues associated with the dynamic agricultural sector of the economy and with changing rural community organization. We cannot hope to consider all such issues; our approach must be selective.

As the members of the program committee of this conference wrestled with the problems of organizing this conference, we agreed upon two conditions: (1) Our concern should be with issues which are directly and immediately related to agriculture and rural communities. (2) Furthermore, we should focus on broad issues of an ethical nature that underlie many of the current manifestations of policy differences regarding the economic and broader social bases of agriculture.

However, numerous issues could be discussed within this frame of reference. We offer one system for organizing sets of value and goal issues in American agriculture. Others will want to add or delete from our list of six sets of issues. Some may not accept our list at all. Any of these reactions would be understandable because conflicts exist over both the ranking of goals and values and over the means that should be used to attain goals and values in American agriculture and rural communities. But we must begin somewhere. In this introductory statement we begin with six clusters of goals and values. These are issues associated with freedom, justice, efficiency, security, the general welfare and with order and stability. For now, we attempt to specify some of the elements in each of the six clusters of goals and values and to suggest some of the conflicts among them.

The chapters which follow present alternative perspectives regarding the value and goal issues. They offer alternative solutions to current problems associated with American agriculture and American rural community organization.

Although we speak of value and goal issues in agriculture, these issues in American agriculture and rural community organization are reflections of similar issues of the total American society. However, several factors still differentiate rural farm society from the rest of society. These include the intimate association of farming as a way of life and farming as a business or production enterprise, the low population densities in most farming and rural nonfarm communities, and the high degree of specialization and the dependence of most farm-dominated communities on the economic health of a single industry. And some of the value and goal conflicts discussed in the following pages stem directly from the spatial, social and economic conditions that characterize rural areas.

THE ISSUES

For our purposes, we suggest the following six sets of value and goal issues:

I Issues associated with freedom

1. Issues associated with freedom related to agriculture production and distribution:
 - a. What should be the limits of freedom for farm operators or managers regarding production and distribution of agricultural products?
 - b. What systems of control, pricing mechanisms, farm organizations, trade associations or government action, if any, should be developed to maintain agricultural production at appropriate levels, to provide for adequate distribution of these products and yet to protect farm producers, distributors and the consumers in the many exchanges that are involved?
 - c. What should be the role of the federal government in developing or administering various farm production control systems in regard to various farm commodities?
2. Issues associated with freedom related to rural community organization:
 - a. What levels of government should assume responsibility for guaranteeing equal educational opportunities for all American youth, rural and urban alike?

- b. What degree of freedom should be preserved for local governments as contrasted with state governments and for the latter as contrasted to the federal government in relation to taxation and other forms of governmental power?
- II Issues associated with justice related to agricultural production and distribution:
 - a. What are the "rights" of farm operators to gain from their contribution to national economic growth in the same manner enjoyed by other industries?
 - b. In what ways should farm production be protected from economic losses associated with benefits that the farm producers have passed on to consumers because of innovations in uses of capital and development of greater efficiency in production?
 - c. What obligations do farm employers and government have in guaranteeing the rights to employment, decent wages and living conditions for the farm employees?
- III Issues associated with efficiency in agricultural production and distribution:
 - a. How much emphasis should be given to economic efficiency in agricultural production at the expense of the community population base, family ownership and operation of farms or ranches and other values associated with rural life?
 - b. What impetus or retardation should be given to trends toward larger and fewer farms and ranches and toward economic structures other than family-sized units?
- IV Issues associated with security
 - 1. Issues associated with security related to agricultural production and distribution:
 - a. What are the responsibilities of the local, state and federal governments in assuring financial security for the farm labor force over their productive years as well as during their retirement?
 - b. What are the obligations of society in protecting workers whose welfare is endangered by planned or unplanned developments in society?
 - c. What costs should be borne by individual workers and what costs should be borne by local, state or federal governments for assisting the transfer of redundant agriculture workers into productive nonfarm occupations?
 - 2. Issues associated with security related to farming as a way of life:

- a. What are the responsibilities of the state and federal governments in providing credits or other forms of financial or nonfinancial assistance to help persons maintain or improve their levels of living?

V Issues associated with the general welfare:

1. Issues associated with the general welfare related to agricultural production and distribution:
 - a. What should be the role of governmental bodies in attempting to maintain prosperity and preventing recessions in the agricultural or nonagricultural economy?
 - b. What protection should the federal government provide for American farm products threatened by competition from foreign-produced agricultural products?
2. Issues associated with rural community welfare:
 - a. What is the role of society (government) in providing abundant, relatively low-cost and widely-distributed farm products?
 - b. What obligations fall upon society for distributing agricultural surpluses to needy persons in the United States as well as to deprived persons in other countries?
 - c. What financial responsibilities does society have for assuring the quality of educational, health, protection or welfare programs for persons living in any part of the country?
 - d. What responsibilities, if any, should various governmental bodies assume for assisting population transfers among sections of the country and in helping adapt community services to these changes in population, both in the sending as well as in the receiving communities?
 - e. What should be the geographical basis for the organization of rural community services? Are localistic ties or loyal ties sufficient bases for organizing educational, religious, political, welfare, protective and economic functions?
 - f. At what administrative level should resources be allocated and controlled to insure adequate functioning of the community services specified in point "e"?

VI Issues associated with order and stability related to community organization:

- a. What should be the reciprocal obligations and limitations among groups of producers in relation to order and stability in producing, pricing and distributing agricultural products?

- b. What governmental bodies should be responsible for fair reapportionment and for adjusting governmental policies to the changing population makeup of the states and the nation?

Conflicts among these clusters of goals and values may be considered in terms of the order of their importance. Only a few suggested questions can be raised in this presentation. For instance:

1. To what extent should freedom in economic decision-making be emphasized if enhancing this condition imposes limitations on conditions associated with justice, security, welfare or order and stability?
2. How much sacrifice in efficiency should be made to enhance justice or security?
3. If justice is desired, what limitations must be imposed on freedom and efficiency?
4. If order and stability are desired, what limitations must be placed on freedom or efficiency?
5. What should be the relative order of importance for these clusters of goals and values?

The foregoing and related goal and value issues demand thorough consideration. We now turn to this task.

3

Theology of Rural Life: A Protestant Perspective

SHIRLEY E. GREENE¹

IT IS NO SMALL THING to be asked to represent the Protestant Christian theological community in an inter-disciplinary exploration of goals and values in American agriculture. Beyond the sense of responsibility lies an even more profound feeling of perplexity, for who can speak authoritatively in the field of Protestant Christian theology?

The situation is not quite as bad as it has been made to appear in the little anecdote of the three theologians confronted by a knotty ethical problem. According to the story, the Jewish theologian replied: "The Torah tells us —." The Roman Catholic began: "The Holy Father has stated —." The Protestant replied: "It seems to me —." Even if Protestant theology is not quite that individualized, it is probably true, to steal a trite formula from the economists, that if all Protestant theologians in the world were laid end to end, they would not reach a conclusion.

In such a situation I can do no more than seek to reflect the central tradition of Protestant theology with emphasis on the most recent tendencies within that tradition. In all honesty, I should begin by saying that my rendition of the tradition is inevitably colored by my own prejudices and predispositions in the area of theological interpretation.

RE-STATEMENT OF THEME

The topic assigned to me was *Theology of Rural Life: A Protestant Perspective*. I have witnessed several attempts over

¹Secretary for the Church in Town and Country, United Church Board for Homeland Ministries, St. Louis, Mo.

the years to formulate and state a "Rural Theology" or a "Theology of Rural Life." These attempts have always failed, just as I would fail if I allowed myself to engage in that effort. The simple fact is there is no "rural theology" or "urban theology" or "American theology" or "midwestern theology" or "theology for the middle class" or for the working class or for any other sociological, economic or geographical sector of society. The Christian Faith is unitary. While there are many schools of theological thought in Christendom and many variations of interpretation, Christian theology does not separate men into groups, classes or categories and offer a different gospel for different states of mankind.

Having demolished the topic assigned, I have obviously a responsibility to replace it with an acceptable substitute. My best offering in this regard is, I fear, much more pedantic and uninspiring than the original, but at least it is in my judgment more accurate and more discussable. The topic I have chosen is *Implications in Christian Theology for Human Goals and Values Affecting Rural Life*.

METHODOLOGY

The form of my presentation will be deductive. I shall first attempt to state briefly and all too simply the central thesis of the Protestant Christian faith. Against that theological background I shall undertake to identify some of the ethical implications of the Protestant thesis. In relation to each of these general areas of ethical concern, I will try to present some insights as to the bearing of the Protestant ethic on the goals and values most pertinent to agricultural and rural life.

THE PROTESTANT THESIS

The Christian religion may be aptly described as a religion of ethical monotheism. In common with its Hebrew antecedent and in contra-distinction to the numerous polytheistic faiths of mankind, Christianity affirms the existence of one God. Christianity ascribes to the will and the activity of that one God the origin, the meaning and the destiny of all reality. God is seen as the source and creator of the universe and of all things in it. Its continued existence is an expression of His will; its meaning is found in His purposes; its destiny is in His keeping.

The use of the adjective "ethical" to define Christian

monotheism points to the conviction of Christians that the fundamental relationship between God and man is a contractual one. Man is the crown of creation, a being of special endowments. With him God has established a "covenant" relationship. This contract or covenant defines both rights and obligations on the part of the contracting parties. God promises, for example, not to destroy mankind, but on condition that man shall observe and keep "his commandments and his ordinances and his statutes." (Deut. 8:11) In obedience to the "commandments" of God, Christian man finds the ethical dimension of his being.

Although regarded as a valid contract, the divine-human covenant, it must be pointed out, is not an agreement between equals. It is an agreement between Creator and creature; between Father and child; between Absolute Power and limited power; between Supreme Will and limited freedom; between Perfect Holiness and corruptible humanity. In this curious covenant relationship, man's powers and abilities to understand, accept and fulfill his part of the contract are wholly derived from God, who established the terms of the contract.

Man, having been created by God "in His image," finds himself a creature with limited but important areas of freedom, dwelling in a world of perpetual ethical tension. Symbolically that tension is reflected in the Creation myth, in which it is said: "the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being." (Gen. 2:7) In the "dust of the ground" and in the "breath of life" we see man as composed of a lower or worldly element and a higher or spiritual element. The resulting tension is not to be interpreted as a conflict between the "physical" and the "spiritual" as some classical Christian heresies have assumed. As the story of the temptation of Adam and Eve makes clear, the tension is between violation of the covenant through self-will and adherence to the covenant, which means obedience to God's will.

And what is God's will for man? In terms of the specifics of human conduct, this has been and continues to be the perennial search of conscientious adherents to the Judeo-Christian tradition. In general terms, the answer has been made crystal clear in and through the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, the central figure of the Christian faith. No more succinct summary of God's will for man can be found than in Christ's answer to the question: What is the first and greatest commandment?

His reply: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second is like it, You shall love your neighbor as yourself." (Matt. 22:37-39) Love,

in short, is the essence of God's will and purpose for man. Love toward God and love toward fellow man are man's primary obligations under the covenant. Love is the basic norm for ethical conduct in the Christian faith.

By this norm, however, man stands forever condemned. The heart of the human predicament, in the Christian view, is that man does not possess the power within himself to fulfill his part of the contract as established by God. His essential nature is forever a battleground. On the one hand, he is pulled by the secular lures of selfishness, greed, conflict, hatred and all the other forms which denial of love to God and to man may take; on the other hand, he is subject to the persistent demand of God for obedience to the Law of Love and its fruits in gracious, generous, self-denying conduct.

In this struggle, love is forever losing, the covenant is forever being violated, and man stands forever a condemned sinner. But this is not the final word, or Christianity would be a religion of ultimate hopelessness and pessimism.

In the complex covenant relationship between God and man, God himself provides the solution to the dilemma into which His demand for loving obedience has placed his creatures. As in all other things, God himself is the original source of love and in His great love for His creation, He has provided the means of redemption for sinful man. Although God judges the world by the standards of the covenant, His love is even more basic than His judgment. To put it in the classical simplicity of the New Testament: "God so loved the world, that He gave His only Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have eternal life." (John 3:16)

In Christ, then, we see not only the revelation of God's ultimate will for His children — that they shall live out the Law of Love — but also the means of grace by which faltering, sinful man may find forgiveness, cleansing and restoration to divine favor.

In Christ also, and in His abiding presence in human history in the form of the Holy Spirit, the Christian finds the source of continuing strength for the struggle against evil and for righteousness, both within himself and in the social order. Thus is undergirded the ethical dimension of the covenant. Man is not saved by his works, but by his faith. Because of his faith, he is motivated and empowered to do the works of righteousness, which means above all the works of love.

ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS

From the theological thesis just stated, the Christian derives many secondary insights: his interpretation of the meaning of history; his understanding of the nature of human destiny; his concept of the nature of the church; his evaluation of all sorts of social institutions, secular movements and human loyalties.

Sinful Nature of Man

I move now to a definition of some of the ethical implications of the Christian thesis which seem to have relevance for agriculture and rural life.

First, the Christian thesis asserts that man is a sinner who stands forever under God's judgment. This applies to all men at all times. This means that all of us, in all our activities, in all our attitudes, in all our relationships are guilty of some admixture of self-will and self-seeking. Because this is so, we may never absolutize our own insights, our own institutional arrangements, or our own patterns of life. This is one of the most humbling and devastating of all the insights derived from the Christian faith.

What would this do, for example, if taken seriously by the agrarian fundamentalists? It would certainly force a re-examination of all the pleasant assumptions some of us have lived with so long about the superiority of the "rural way of life," the purity of "rural values" and the specially sacred nature of the "farmer's calling."

I am not suggesting here that we lean so far away from the nostalgic glorification of rural life as to fall into the equal but opposite fallacy. In recent years I have heard some speeches in glorification of the metropolis and the urban way of life which have been quite as oblivious of the Christian doctrine of judgment as anything in the romantic literature of rural life. The "holy earth" boys have, if anything, been topped by the "holy city" boys.

In my attempts to appraise the rural way of life, I have discovered that for every virtue attributable to country living and to the agricultural vocation there is to be found a countervailing vice. For example, to mention but a few: strong family structure — patriarchalism; neighborliness — nosiness; religious sensitivity conditioned by natural environment — deep-seated pagan naturalism; self-reliance — stubborn individualism; absence of class stratification — family clannishness; community loyalty — narrow provincialism; respect for tradition — blind conservatism. And this list could be indefinitely prolonged.

I can and will defend the thesis that there are those aspects in rural life, especially as we have known it in the economically well-adjusted sectors of the American scene, which are conducive to the development of strong character, wholesome family life, stable and fine communities and democratic qualities of life. Rural life at its best provides a favorable environment for these values; it does not guarantee them. It has all too often produced their opposites.

In this connection, one is reminded of some words of Arthur E. Morgan in his book, "The Community of the Future" (1957). Conceding that in former times he had been among the voices of agrarian or at least "small community" fundamentalism, Dr. Morgan says in this later book:

During most of human existence such population groups, usually in the form of villages, have been the nearly universal settings of human life. Probably more than 99% of all men who have lived have been villagers. Men have been so deeply identified with this way of living that few societies have long survived its disintegration and disappearance. Man is a small community animal.

While these small population units have not been the sole possessors of community qualities, yet some living conditions and circumstances are more favorable than others for keeping alive that spirit. The many urban associations, while of great value, usually are poor substitutes for full community life, especially as to opportunity for children to learn the normal processes of living by sharing life and experience with their elders.

Such a modest evaluation is in line with the Christian appraisal which recognizes the admixture of good and evil in all communities and all societies.

Let's apply this doctrine of the sinful nature of man and his institutions in one other direction. What does it have to say to the ardent advocates of one or another particular form of economic organization for agriculture? I'm sure all of us know people who feel strongly that God's will for land tenure, at least in America if not throughout the world, is the family farm. All of us have heard allusions to the "divinely-inspired" law of supply and demand. A generation ago the great Japanese Christian, Kagawa, toured the United States and won a great deal of support among church groups for the cooperative movement by his proclamation that "Cooperatives are applied Christianity." I have not actually heard it, but I am sure a strong case could be made for God's support of the Communist collective pattern of agriculture, based on that verse in the second chapter of Acts which describes the early Christian community as one in which they "had all things in common."

Just as in war, so in economic ideological conflict we all tend to glorify our own side and deify our own favorite patterns of economic organization and our own kit of nostrums for all sorts of economic ills, including those of agriculture. The doctrine of man's sin and God's judgment cuts the ground from under all such absolutist positions.

This point can be summarized by a quotation from a 1954 statement of the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. entitled "Christian Principles and Assumptions for Economic Life":

God as we know him through Christ is the God of history, of nations and peoples, as well as of individual souls. It is His will that His Kingdom be realized among men and that His lordship be acknowledged over all principalities and powers, over every department of life including economic institutions and practices. The Church is under divine imperative to call all men — and especially its own members — to recognize the meaning of God's lordship over their economic activities, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth. . . ."

All men are created in the image of God; and, though they are in history sinful and rebellious as the slaves of their own self-will, God seeks to redeem them from their self-centeredness. Men experience freedom in the measure in which they are willing to become God's servants, and to allow God as revealed in Christ to become the center of their lives and the pattern of their living.

Redemption and Responsibility

The second implication to be drawn from the Christian thesis relates to the first as the obverse side of the coin. Man is by nature sinful; but he is also, by the grace of God, susceptible to rebirth and redemption. Regenerated by God's gracious act through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, man possesses a great capacity for good and responds in loving obedience to God's Law of Love. The role of the redeemed man was effectively stated in the section report of the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches (Evanston, Ill., 1954) dealing with "The Responsible Society in a World Perspective" as follows:

He (God) has established with men a living relationship of promise and commandment in which they are called to live in faithful obedience to His purpose. The promise is the gift of abundant life as children of God for those who hear and follow the divine call. The commandment is that men

should love God and their neighbors. In the call to responsible social action, the promise and the commandment of the righteous and loving God require us to recognize that in every human being Christ, Himself, comes to claim our service. Responding to God's love in Christ and being aware of His final judgment, Christians will act responsibly. The call to social righteousness is sustained by the sure hope that the victory is with God, who in Christ has vanquished the powers of evil and in His own day will make this victory fully manifest in Christ.

This statement clearly defines the role and the motivation of the obedient Christian in the realm of social policy and social action. He seeks to act responsibly and to overcome, with God's help, his own inherent tendencies toward selfish irresponsibility, not because he thereby earns the love of God and his own salvation; he acts in this manner rather because he has already experienced the redemptive love of God in Jesus Christ.

This experience, let it be quickly said, does not provide the Christian with any ultimate insights into the specific solutions to human problems. If Christian faith could provide such definite and specific answers, all Christians would inevitably belong to the same political party, the same farm organization and the same school of economic thought. That such is not the case is testimony to the wide margins of freedom and the vast areas of responsible decision making which God has left in the hands of His children.

What the Christian faith contributes to agricultural policy, to make this aspect of the discussion specific, is not a set of neat answers to the farm problem which has eluded the agricultural economists and the politicians. The Christian contributions are rather a plumb line, which is the Law of Love, and a motivation to seek the implications and the applications of the Law of Love issue by issue, case by case, election by election, proposal by proposal as they come along.

The Law of Love

This brings us squarely to the third ethical implication of the Christian thesis for goals and values in agriculture and rural life. It is this: Love is the highest value in human relations. All other goals and values in human experience are tested and judged by their contribution to this central value. The ramifications of this doctrine are extremely far-reaching — far beyond possible treatment in any single paper. One must choose among the infinite number of fascinating avenues which open before us. I have chosen four for exploration.

1. Stewardship. Stewardship is one derived Christian doctrine which has special significance for persons related to the agricultural economy. Generally speaking, Protestant town and country leadership has stressed stewardship as an extrapolation of the doctrine of creation. We have buttressed it with such Old Testament citations as "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein" (Ps. 24:1); and "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over. . .all the earth" (Gen. 1:26). In its application, we have related this doctrine most commonly to the obligations of resource conservation — the conservation of soil and water resources, forests and wildlife.

While all this is valid, I would like to suggest that both the source and the application of the principle of stewardship are too limited when seen only in these dimensions. Man's obligation as a steward of God's creation flows not solely from the special status accorded him in creation; it derives also from his response to the Law of Love. Treating other men as we ourselves would be treated (which is the instrumental statement of the Law of Love) includes dealing with the natural bases of human existence, the earth and its resources, in such a manner that earth will sustain an abundant life for contemporary and successor generations even as it has dealt bountifully with us. This is the ultimate Christian motivation for soil, water, forest, fish and wildlife conservation. It applies also to resource conservation in respect to minerals, energy and all other forms of natural phenomena which contribute to human existence and well-being.

I suggest further that our traditional applications of the stewardship principle to such matters as those just mentioned have been too limited. If stewardship is truly motivated by the Law of Love, must it not also concern itself with such matters as these:

Effective and equitable distribution, without regard to national frontiers or political ideologies, of both the fruits of the earth and the technological skills and economic developments which can expand the productivity of the planet?

Rational programs of population planning and control which will look toward limiting the earth's human population to a size its resources can carry in suitable nutrition, health, welfare and comfort?

Serious concern for revision of public policy and practice in respect to the wholesale and irresponsible use of chemical pesticides, insecticides, detergents and other earth, air and water pollutants which threaten both human and nonhuman life over wide areas?

Aggressive devotion to programs of international peace and order designed to avoid the dangers of nuclear or germ warfare which could well exterminate the earth's human population or render the world unfit for human habitation?

There are unquestionably many other applications of the principle of stewardship. Some of these run far beyond the range of agricultural policy and rural life. Yet all of them are of vital concern to rural people in search of normative goals and values for modern living.

2. Freedom. Freedom is one of the most highly regarded goals and values in both the American political tradition and in the Christian theological framework. Unfortunately, it has too often been defined and pursued as if it were somehow antithetical to the value of loving community. Especially in the American scene freedom as a value has been highly conditioned by the frontier psychology of individualism, which has been variously translated as "laissez faire," "caveat emptor," "the public be damned," and "mind your own business and I'll mind mine."

The Christian definition of freedom never sets this value over against the Law of Love but rather regards it as a function of the supreme value which is love. By what must seem an irreconcilable paradox to the mentality of the rugged individualist, Christian teaching always manages to relate freedom to obedience in a creative synthesis, the acme of which is the doctrine of "slavery to Christ." My only meaningful freedom as a Christian is that which comes when I have truly subordinated my will to the will of God. In this experience comes freedom from fear, from lostness, from meaninglessness, from death—freedom to self-giving, to love, to creativity, to immortality.

The subordination of freedom to the Law of Love is classically expressed in St. Paul's letter to the Galatians:

For you were called to freedom, brethren; only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love be servants of one another. For the whole law is fulfilled in one word "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." But if you bite and devour one another take heed that you are not consumed by one another. (Gal. 5:13-15.)

How does the doctrine of freedom thus construed bear upon goals and values in rural life? Let me venture a few hypotheses in this highly controversial field:

(a). Freedom, in its limited meaning of "absence of restraint," can never be a sole or major goal of public policy.

(b). The exercise of human freedom must always be conditioned by a sense of responsibility to the neighbor and to God.

(c). While governmental action may under certain conditions be an unwarranted invasion of human freedom, it may under other circumstances be the only effective means in a democratic society to preserve and promote the freedoms of certain groups or individuals.

(d). Traditional economic structures and practices, or newly emerging ones, may pose threats to human freedom as great or greater than any of the programs of government — and all should be scrutinized from this point of view.

The World Council of Churches, in its 1954 report previously cited, stated a definition of "responsible society" which is helpful in clarifying the status of freedom in the mosaic of human goals and values:

A responsible society is a society where freedom is the freedom of men who acknowledge responsibility to justice and public order and where those who hold political authority or economic power are responsible for its exercise to God and to the people whose welfare is affected by it.

Here is a guideline to the shapers of public policy generally and agricultural policy in particular which would move us far down the road toward reconciliation of the ideological warfare between the supporters of a "free marketplace" and the contenders for a "firm government program."

3. Justice. The preceding quotation from the World Council leads to justice as another important American and Christian value. Despite its popularity as a slogan, justice has long been a poor relation in the family of human values. It got off to a bad start in the Old Testament legalism of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." In this guise it has seemed with some justification to be almost the antithesis of the Law of Love, which certainly has strong overtones of mercy, forgiveness and reconciliation.

In more modern times justice has been the victim of popular distortions of the democratic credo that "all men are created equal." While it is profoundly true in the theological sense that all men are of equal value in the eyes of God, their creator, it is demonstrably false in terms of native physical, mental and emotional endowments. Thus this credo proved a poor vehicle for the value of justice in contemporary society.

What I should like to suggest is that before justice can become a useful goal of agricultural policy it must be seen in Christian perspective as a function of the Law of Love. The Old

Testament highlights two approaches to human relation: The Law, which was man's attempt to codify God's will in terms of specific legal prescriptions of universal applicability; and the prophetic tradition, which can be exemplified in the farmer-preacher Amos of Tekoa, who railed against the institutionalized legalism and ceremonialism of his day and proclaimed God's will that justice should "roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream."

In Christ's teaching both of these were superseded and placed in proper perspective. He said: "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them" (Matt. 5:17). And what was their fulfillment? "A new commandment I give unto you; that you love one another" (John 13:34).

This suggests that love is the fulfillment of justice. Looked at the other way around, it can be said that justice is one of the effective expressions of love. I hope the discussion up to this point has made clear that love in the Christian vocabulary has little or nothing in common with the various emotional and sentimental meanings given to that vastly overworked word in modern speech. Love in the Christian meaning is "agape"; it is a function primarily of the will, with support from the mind and the heart. Love means willing the good for the neighbor even as one desires the good for oneself.

Applied to the doctrine of justice, this means that I will desire and strive for justice, equity, equal opportunity, fair play — dare I say "parity" — for others in society with the same diligence that I seek these basic goals for myself. To put it a little differently, while justice by no means exhausts the demands of love upon Christian obedience, the toleration of injustice is a clear denial of the Law of Love.

One of the tragic facts of human history is that justice has rarely been freely given by man to man, by group to group, by nation to nation. Nearly always it has had to be won in hard-fought struggle, and almost without exception yesterday's victim of injustice turns out to be tomorrow's oppressor. This fact is sad and cogent evidence of the sinful character of man and of the remoteness of human society from the loving community of Christian faith.

Rural people have ever been involved in the struggle for justice. The world's first quarrel, according to Biblical tradition, was between Cain and Abel over the acceptability of their respective offerings of agricultural produce. Amos' complaint *as a shepherd and "dresser of sycamore trees"* (whatever that was) was of the inequities of income and level of living between

the farmers of Tekoa and the residents of the city of Bethel. From then (eight centuries before Christ) until now, history is studded with instances of peasant uprisings and farmer revolts against the disparities between levels of living on the farm and those enjoyed by at least the more conspicuously favored of the dwellers in cities.

This is precisely the focus of the great agricultural debate in our own generation, which has been symbolized by the term "parity." I realize that the word "parity" has lost its popularity among most agricultural economists and many in agricultural politics. Despite this fact, or perhaps I should say because it is being threatened with oblivion in its economic and political contexts, I should like to make the attempt, for purposes of this discussion at least, to rescue the word in what I believe to be its true and proper dimension — the ethical.

Parity is an ethical concept. It comes from the same root which appears in the phrase "on a par with." It speaks of equity, of justice. Stripped of its technical clothing, as in "parity ratio," "parity price," "parity index," etc., parity is an ethical principle. As used in the agricultural policy debate since 1930, the parity principle says: Diligent farm families operating efficient family farms are entitled, as a matter of right, to a level of living on a par with that enjoyed by other American families who invest comparable labor, skill and capital in other economic pursuits.

As an ethical principle this is a hard statement to controvert; nor have I heard it seriously challenged by the spokesmen of any political party or any farm organization. The only defensible opposition to it might be to criticize the parochial Americanism implied in it; but that issue runs throughout the whole sweep of our economic nationalism and can hardly be debated in terms of agricultural policy alone.

The great agricultural debate, as I hear it, deals not with the rightness or wrongness of the principle of parity; but with its implementation. Shall the farmer have his "full parity" in the marketplace, through loan-and-storage types of governmental action, or by direct compensatory payments? There are, of course, ethical issues involved in the choice between these alternative means, but to go into them in detail at this point would take us too far afield.

One aspect of the debate over means designed to achieve the goal of reasonable parity of income and living for farmers is worthy of brief comment. I refer to the endless controversy between those who defend strong programs of government in the name of justice and those who resist such programs in the name of freedom.

Although I think there has been a vast amount of phony argument advanced on this issue, the issue itself is quite real and important. This clash between the values of freedom and justice in the agricultural debate illustrates as well as any the important fact that human goals and values are forever in conflict with one another. Conceivably if the ultimate Christian goal of a perfect loving community could be achieved, the conflict among the lesser and supporting values might be finally resolved. Then, for example, we might as human beings so perfectly define our own goal of freedom that it would in no way threaten injustice to any other person. The fact that such a suggestion sounds fantastic may simply illustrate how far we are both in fact and in imagination, from the fulfillment of the Law of Love in human relations.

It is this kind of situation that I had in mind earlier in this chapter when I made reference to the "mosaic of human values." One role of the Law of Love is to reduce the element of conflict among various subordinate values and tend toward their arrangement in a mosaic pattern of beauty, harmony and peace.

Before leaving the subject of justice, I must put one more element into focus. Earlier I referred to the ease with which erstwhile victims of injustice become its perpetrators whenever and wherever they acquire the power to do so. Consider, for example, the ethical inconsistency of industrialized agricultural operators who seek the public's sympathy because of the high risk and uncertain incomes which characterize their industry but at the same time reject even with violence the efforts of their employees to organize and enter into collective bargaining relations with them. Even worse, some of them, or at least their spokesmen in Congressional hearings, have piously declared, "We would rather starve than accept price supports." But when it actually gets down to the practice of the thing, it turns out that they really meant: we would rather starve our help than take the steps necessary to stabilize our industry.

Justice is an important value in the Christian mosaic. It is worthy to struggle for justice for one's self and one's own group provided the means used are worthy. It is much more laudable to grant justice before it is wrested from us because this is a more genuine expression of the Law of Love. As with all other significant human goals and values, the theologian and the ethicist should work in partnership with the social scientists — economists, sociologists, political scientists. The latter can make an enormous contribution by clarifying the means and methods most suitable and efficient for implementation of the goal of justice. Creatively bringing together the insights of Christian faith and

the technical knowledge of the scientist gives great significance to the dialogue sought in this and similar conferences.

4. Community. The final value I would hold up briefly for our scrutiny is the value of community. I realize that sociologists may feel that it is an invasion of their domain to refer to community as a value. However, they have had so much trouble defining it satisfactorily in sociological terms, that perhaps the fog will not be greatly intensified if I make a theological assertion or two about community as a human value. The two highest avenues for the expression of the Law of Love in the common life are the family and the community. Although communities as the sociologist finds and describes them are a far cry from the perfectly loving community of Christian faith, community is nevertheless the proper context for the practice of the Law of Love.

It seems quite evident that God intended his children to dwell in communities. He so arranged his creation that there is virtually nothing a man can do in complete isolation, except die. You can't be born by yourself, you can't get married by yourself. You can't think, or speak without the use of culturally created and conditioned tools. Personality itself is a culturally conditioned product; so are economic activity, scientific pursuit and religious worship. The self-made man who worships his creator is as deluded as every other sort of idolater. There is even the strong implication in the Christian doctrine of the Trinity that God Himself is a community.

It may well be that the most important of all assertions to be made about "rural values" is that rural life is, by classical definition, composed of small communities of intimately and sensitively interacting human beings and families. As we have repeatedly said, this does not guarantee the practice of love in human relations in the rural community. It does provide the opportunity, as possibly no other structure of society does, for the expression of the Law of Love over a maximum range of the varieties of human need, experience and interaction. If and when the tide of urbanization has finally engulfed us all and achieved the totally homogenized culture which it seems to threaten, we may find that the most grievous of the casualties of that assault on the human spirit has been the death of the opportunity and the incentive to human community.

On the other hand, one is sustained by the Christian hope that "love will find a way" and that new vehicles for the expression of the Law of Love, possibly superior ones, may emerge to bless and redeem the barren wastes of depersonalization which seem all too typical of urbanized society. At least, if I may turn

homiletical for a moment, I believe the major challenge before the supporters of rural values is to seek ways of preserving the essential experience of loving community and to find structures to express it in the society of tomorrow.

Of the numerous implications of the doctrine of community, I will develop only one which has specific relationship to agricultural policy. I refer to the much mooted roles of competition and cooperation in agricultural purchasing and marketing. My comment is a very simple one: As a principle, cooperation has more to contribute to the achievement of loving community than competition.

Having made that statement, I should probably protect it by a few further observations. This observation is not intended as a blanket endorsement of farmers cooperatives and their practices. We have already pointed out the sinful nature of all human institutions, and this includes farmer cooperatives. Nor is the principle intended to deny a useful and practical role for competition. That is a matter for the economists to discuss.

Among the positive implications I would derive from the principle as stated are these: Farmers are in line with the Christian goal of community when they undertake and pursue in good faith cooperative methods of organizing their economic life. In this pursuit, however, they are subject to the same kinds of temptation to violation of the Law of Love as they and all men are in other forms of business. The technique is a good one; it should be used in ways and with motives which are amenable to the expression of the Law of Love.

On the other hand, in a world where competition plays so prominent a role in economic motivation and organization, the community principle can have a modifying role. It calls upon the competitor to recognize the human dignity of the person on the other side of the bargaining counter, to be responsible in all his dealings in a competitive economy, to accept the goal of true and loving community as a superior value exercising discipline over his pursuit of competitive advantage.

MODEL FOR SOCIAL ACTION

I have tried to expose some of the ethical implications of the central Christian thesis. It has become obvious how quickly, as one moves down the ladder of abstraction, the issues become controversial. I have tried to stay principally in the areas of general consensus.

Aside from the validity of any of my own personal conclusions

as to agricultural policy, I have tried to illustrate an intellectual process which I believe to be incumbent upon all men who would conscientiously address themselves to issues of public policy. The process, in general, is this:

1. Identify the ultimate loyalty of your life. For the Protestant Christian it is the God revealed and made real in human experience by the life and teachings of Jesus Christ.
2. Define the supreme value which flows from this loyalty — the Law of Love.
3. Explore the ethical ramifications of that supreme value. Those mentioned here were the doctrines of stewardship, freedom, justice and community.
4. Apply these ethical doctrines to the issues of policy as they arise in the life of society. At this critical point, the Christian will seek and weigh the best insights of the social scientists as to methodologies, but he must make his own decisions as a free citizen of Christian concern. He can claim no absolute wisdom for his judgments at this level; indeed he must retain a flexibility of judgment which will admit former error, new light, changing circumstances and other factors which keep the arena of public policy ever fluid and ever controversial.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES' STATEMENT

As a final contribution to this discussion and a further illustration of this methodology in the area of goals and values, I call attention to an official statement of the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., adopted in 1958 on the subject of "Ethical Goals for Agricultural Policy." This statement covers some of the ground dealt with in this chapter but includes other topics. It cites a total of seven "Goals" which it "affirms" and "commends to the churches and to the consciences of Christian men and women."

This statement touches on the three levels of abstraction which have characterized this chapter. It makes a general theological affirmation. It cites seven ethical goals. Under each of the seven stated goals is a paragraph of commentary which includes both a tie-back to a Biblical basis and some specific implications for agricultural policy and program. As a conclusion I quote the introduction and the seven goals from the official statement:

A Christian ethical approach to agriculture begins with the acknowledgment that "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. . . ."

God, the Creator, has given man a special position in the world, with a specific responsibility for the fruits of the earth and towards all living things. This is the stewardship of the earth's resources for the nourishment and the enrichment of human life. Thus the production of food and fibre — the primary task of farmers — becomes a service to God and man.

The goals:

Opportunity for the full and wholesome development of persons.

Preservation of the integrity of the farm family and the enrichment of rural family life.

The encouragement of voluntary association, cooperation, and mutual aid among farm people.

Conservation of nature's resources and their development for the legitimate uses of mankind.

Adequate and healthful diets for the world's growing populations.

Fair and reasonably stable levels of income for farm producers.

Recognition of human interdependence on a national and world scale.

Theology of Rural Life: A Catholic Perspective

GEORGE H. SPELTZ¹

THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL THOUGHT which I shall present draws its principles from theology and philosophy. However, it recognizes that these must be tested and refined in the reality of the concrete, existing social order. For this reason the theological approach should be integrated with the social sciences, as the popes have tried to do. The Catholic perspective, as I shall outline it, will be based almost entirely on papal social encyclicals and addresses. Here we find a consistent tradition of social thought, but one which at the same time clearly indicates development. I shall begin with Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum*² of 1891, followed by Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno*³ of 1931, by Pius XII's social addresses including the address, *La Solemnita della Pentecoste* of 1941,⁴ commemorative of *Rerum Novarum*, and most recently, by John XXIII's *Mater et Magistra*⁵ of 1961, the 70th anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*. Many sections and passages can be found in these documents and in many other papal addresses making explicit reference to agriculture. The popes draw principally from two sources: the natural moral law and the social teaching of the Gospel. This, then,

¹The Most Reverend George H. Speltz is Auxiliary Bishop of Winona, Minnesota.

²Leo XIII, Pope, encyclical letter, *Rerum Novarum: On the Condition of the Working Man*, May 15, 1891, trans. in "Principles for Peace," ed. H. C. Koenig, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Wash., D. C., 1943, pp. 52-81.

³Pius XI, Pope, encyclical letter, *Quadragesimo Anno: On Reconstructing the Social Order*, May 15, 1931, trans. in "Principles for Peace," ed. H. C. Koenig, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Wash., D. C., 1943, pp. 397-446.

⁴Pius XII, Pope, address, *La Solemnita della Pentecoste*, June 1, 1941, trans. in "Principles for Peace," ed. H. C. Koenig, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Wash., D. C., 1943, pp. 719-29.

⁵John XXIII, Pope, encyclical letter, *Mater et Magistra: Christianity and Social Progress*, May 15, 1961. National Catholic Welfare Conference, Wash., D. C., 1961.

will be the Catholic perspective on goals and values in agriculture. Because of the importance of the natural law approach in the Catholic perspective, I wish at the outset to clarify this much misunderstood concept.

NOTES ON THE NATURAL MORAL LAW

The natural law rests on the assumption of purposefulness in creation. All things are directed to their goal by Divine Reason; creatures below man, through the implanted tendencies and instincts of their nature; man through the light of reason through which the Divine plan becomes intelligible to him. The natural law is, therefore, nothing more than man's reason acting as interpreter of the Divine Reason. Belief in the natural law is belief in the power of natural reason to arrive at moral truth for the individual and for society. St. Paul testified to its existence when he spoke of the law written in the hearts of the gentiles for their guidance.⁶ In this age of diverse religious, intellectual and cultural ideas, the natural moral law—human reason—provides the one possible basis for agreement in social thought and in agricultural policy. Pius XII traced the social and political evils of the day to the rejection of the natural law. This is a judgment which underscores its importance in Catholic social thought.

Scholars have criticized the natural law as being too inflexible. This objection rests on a misunderstanding. The natural law is not a series of propositions rationally and rigidly deduced from some first principle and rigidly applied to every person and age without distinction. Rather the natural law doctrine affirms that there is a certain basic pattern of order and value in human affairs, a reflection of human nature. It provides certain guide lines within which change must be confined if it is to benefit man. At the same time it recognizes that social principles must be tested in the real world and must always reflect the social, political and technological characteristics of the day, otherwise they are without truth or relevancy.

As guides to action these social principles must be workable. This is not to suggest, however, that social practice takes precedence over the principles, as if changing conditions could invalidate them and give rise to new ones. For example, the natural law outlook would not admit the possibility that man may evolve to a point where political society becomes unnecessary, or that in the complex society of the future the individual person

⁶Saint Paul, Epistle to the Romans, Chap. 2.

may become totally subordinate to the state, as a totalitarian philosophy implies. Human nature sets certain limits upon social change. It is the burden of social principles to define these limits and to guide social change within them.

You will note that this is precisely the approach to the social question used by John XXIII in his encyclical, *Mater et Magistra*,⁷ which is a very important document for Catholic social thought. In the introductory portion of this work he observes that a principal characteristic of our day is the multiplication of social relationships. He notes that these developments are at once both a symptom and a cause of the growing intervention of public authorities in matters pertaining to the more intimate aspects of personal life. He puts this situation to the test of the natural law principle affirming the primacy of the person over the system and asks: "Will men perhaps, then become automatons, and cease to be personally responsible, as these social relationships multiply more and more?"⁸

His answer is that this need not occur if public authorities act according to a correct understanding of the common good. They must, for example, allow intermediary bodies within the expanded social structure to be ruled by their own laws. These intermediary bodies, such as a labor union, must, in turn, be true communities in which the individual members are treated as persons and are encouraged to participate in the affairs of the group.⁹ Thus we see that social organization is morally neutral. It furthers the true common good when it respects the dignity and individuality of the person; it becomes a social evil when it organizes persons in such a manner that they are merely objects rather than responsible subjects. Persons organized without regard to their individual differences and personal prerogatives (i.e., as objects merely) do not form a true, organic, moral unity. They do not form true communities within the social body.

The natural law approach avoids the error of those who, like the Marxists, regard social changes as the result of "a blind drive of natural forces."¹⁰ It believes that principles of justice, particularly of social justice, can be interjected into social change to guide it constructively. At the same time it avoids the error of those who decry social organization, as such, as an infringement of individual freedom. The natural law principle of the primacy of the person is a surer guide for social policy than the nebulous value of individual freedom. The good of the person is

⁷John XXIII, Pope, *op. cit.*

⁸John XXIII, *op. cit.*, n. 62.

⁹John XXIII, *op. cit.*, n. 65.

¹⁰John XXIII, *op. cit.*, n. 63.

a true end, a goal, whereas freedom is but a means. Freedom requires further specification before it can qualify as a value.

Firstly, this chapter gives a philosophical and theological analysis of certain selected goals and values inherent in the occupation of agriculture.

Secondly, it deals with the structure of rural life. Under this heading it shows the decisive role two institutions have always played in forming the person: the rural family and private property in land. Also it shows the need for achieving an organic structure in society, and in agriculture as an integral part of society, through the rural family, through professional associations and mutual-aid societies among farmers and through the rural community.

Thirdly, it indicates the critical need for a strong social consciousness and religious outlook among farmers.

RURAL LIFE: A SPECIAL WAY OF LIFE

In presenting the Catholic evaluation of the occupation of agriculture I shall avoid, if possible, any romanticism. I shall refrain, for example, from quoting the classic texts of Virgil's *Georgics*. Moreover, after reading Professor Jaffa's chapter, *Agrarian Virtue and Republican Freedom*,¹¹ I shall be hesitant to quote Thomas Jefferson or defend his unrealistic dream of a pure rural economy. I am intrigued by the statement attributed to Paul A. Miller that "The modern value orientation of rural people in the United States is a condition of ambiguity."¹² And, finally, I note with some reservations the opinion expressed at the 1960 conference on goals and values that "too many people are working at producing food and fibre."¹³

These considerations make one pause and ask whether we should continue to regard agriculture as a special way of life, and, accordingly, whether the preservation of this way of life should be made a goal in our American society. Wisdom is needed to answer such a question; and I feel that the words of the popes on this subject, particularly of Pius XII, are worthy of careful pondering. Pius XII was strongly convinced that the inherent moral qualities and values of rural life are such as to

¹¹Jaffa, Harry V., *Agrarian Virtue and Republican Freedom*, in "Goals and Values in Agricultural Policy." Iowa State University Press, Ames, 1961, p. 143.

¹²Miller, Paul A., *Social, Economic, and Political Values of Farm People*. Iowa State University Press, Ames, 1960, pp. 80-96. Quoted by Olaf F. Larson.

¹³Larson, Olaf F., *Goals and Values of Farm People*, in "Goals and Values in Agricultural Policy." Iowa State University Press, Ames, 1961, p. 143.

give it a specific character. He recognized that rural life is under influences that conspire to divest it of this character, assimilating it to the life of urban and industrial centers, "making the country a simple extension of the city."¹⁴ He regards this as a problem of great moment:

Today it can be said that the destiny of all mankind is at stake. Will men be successful or not in balancing this influence (of industrial capitalism) in such a way as to preserve for the spiritual, social and economic life of the rural world its specific character? Will they succeed in assuring it, if not a preponderant, at least an equal impact on the life of the human family as a whole?¹⁵

REVERENCE FOR THE SOIL A FOUNDATION FOR PIETY

The farmer's love of his land has been pointed out on many occasions. He cannot be unconscious of its inexhaustible fecundity and productivity; and, if he is a just man, he deeply reveres the soil as the source of life and sustenance afforded him by the good God. This trait is an expression of the virtue of piety. Piety moves us to recognize our debt to those who are the source of what we are: to God who is our first principle, to our parents and our country that have given us birth and nourishment. In the mind of the good farmer these things are closely related; his reverence for mother earth is one with his reverence for God and his parents. Moreover, this feeling quite naturally embraces a reverence for his native country — the fatherland. Love of land, love of God and love of country spring from a common inspiration, namely, reverence for a father or nourishing mother. Emerson confirms this in his observation that any relation to the land generates patriotism.¹⁶ We notice, too, how one of our patriotic songs, "America the Beautiful," associates love of country with love of the land. For such reasons as this it has always been felt that the farmer's deep attachment to the soil is a source of stability and strength in nations. I think it doubtful whether any other agency can be substituted for agriculture in laying this natural foundation for true piety.

The farmer's relation to the soil, and likewise his relation to the elements, plants and animals, take a deeper significance

¹⁴ Pius XII, Pope, address, *Problems of Rural Life*, Rome, July 2, 1951, in "Christianity and the Land," National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Ia.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Emerson, Ralph Waldo, address, *The Young American*, Feb. 7, 1844, in "Nature, Addresses and Lectures," Brainard Publ. Co., Boston, p. 342.

when seen in the light of Christ's redemption. St. Paul tells us that Christ has delivered all creatures "from the servitude of corruption, into the liberty of the glory of the children of God."¹⁷ Therefore, it becomes the Christian's duty and privilege to bring all creation to the praise and service of God. Even as the Christian farmer himself, so also his fields, flocks and crops are now susceptible of being offered to God. It is with this in mind that the Catholic Church, through its many sacramental blessings, extends to natural things the cleansing, uplifting power of the redemption. Through the Christian farmer she brings all these things to the service of God. She invites him to bring these, at least in spirit, to the sacrifice of the altar.

LABOR THAT FORMS THE MAN

In speaking of the work of the farmer I wish to emphasize its therapeutic value. Much of the work of contemporary man, such as repetitious factory or clerical work, lacks this value. Though we must accept this condition of things, we should not organize agriculture without giving thought to this social problem. Classical Socialism solves it by saying that when everything has been organized for production, then the worker will be able to find the good life in a utopia of material plenty which he will have the leisure to enjoy. In this view, work is to be endured; a man enjoys life and perfects himself in his leisure hours, principally, and not through his work. Work is not regarded as having any significant cultural value.

The Catholic perspective, for theological as well as philosophical reasons, is quite different. Man has need to work not only for the acquisition of the necessities of life, the primary end of manual labor, but also because it is necessary for his spiritual and physical development. It is a matter of common experience that the harmony and balance between man's reason and bodily appetites is defective. Catholic faith finds the explanation for this in Original Sin. Arduous labor that fully engages a man helps him to overcome this condition. It helps him to control himself and to maintain a sense of his own worth and a balanced outlook upon life; but in order to achieve this wholesome effect work must be carried out on a level of rationality and creativeness calling for judgment and decision.

The popes have felt that agricultural labor qualifies in these respects. With this in mind, they have expressed concern that an

¹⁷ Saint Paul, Epistle to the Romans, Chap. 8.

impersonal economic organization of society based predominantly upon mathematical calculations tends to reduce the laborers to mere objects without any significant identity.¹⁸ Professional work "becomes so dependent on and subordinate to the 'efficiency' of the machine and of the tools of labor that the worker is rapidly exhausted."¹⁹ Because the living things with which the farmer works do not lend themselves readily to merely quantitative determinations but must be handled according to the far more complex laws of the organic realm, it is reasonable to hope that the agricultural worker can be spared the de-personalizing influences of modern technology and economic organization. This would seem to be the import of Pius XII's words that labor on farms "still reflects the natural order willed by God, namely, that man, with his own labor, ought to rule material things, not material things rule man."²⁰ No more profound reason could be given for the inherent dignity of agriculture.

In concluding this evaluation of agricultural labor, I want to make it clear that Catholic thought does not reject technology whose benefits are obvious. It heartily endorses whatever will eliminate drudgery and develop resources; but in doing so it cautions against the outlook that regards work as something to be avoided, lest men, seeking inordinately to escape the condition of work, fall into the evils that attend idleness and the excessive mechanization of life.

For these reasons, as well as for others generally recognized by the friends of rural life, papal thought places a high value on agriculture. The popes believe that a rural people in virtue of their distinct character exercise a profound influence on the biological and intellectual, spiritual and religious development of humanity. They believe that this influence is of paramount importance in keeping society in right balance. They regard agriculture as a special way of life and would urge the preservation of this way of life as a goal of high priority for our American society.

STRUCTURE IN RURAL SOCIETY

I turn now to the structure of rural society, two important elements of which are the rural family and the institution of

¹⁸ Pius XII, Pope, Christmas Eve Address, 1952, in "The Catholic Mind," America Press, New York. Vol. 51, No. 1082, Feb., 1953, pp. 111-22.

¹⁹ Pius XII, Pope, Christmas Eve Address, 1953, in "The Catholic Mind," America Press, New York. Vol. 52, No. 1095, Mar., 1954, p. 179.

²⁰ Pius XII, Pope, address, Life of the Farmer, Nov. 15, 1946. National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Ia., p. 9.

private property. Of the family I need speak only briefly. The practical aspects of the question are treated later by the Reverend Father Edward O'Rourke, Executive Director of the National Catholic Life Conference.

The Family on the Land

The popes urge us to provide a social and economical environment where the rural family can flourish. They point out the decisive influence it exerts upon the person and its proven worth in the formation of good citizens. According to Pope XII the family reaches its full stature as a cell of society when it is on the land: "Only that stability which is rooted in one's holding makes of the family the vital and most perfect and fecund cell of society, joining up in a brilliant manner in progressive cohesion the present and future generations."²¹ The National Catholic Rural Life Conference has as a principal objective the preservation of the family farm.

Property in Land

The Catholic Church has long been advocating a widespread distribution of property, particularly land, because of its primary importance for sound social structure. Private ownership of productive property fixes responsibility, gives security to the family and gives stability to communities. During these last few decades, when human dignity has suffered much, private property has taken on a new importance as a bulwark of human freedom. For these reasons the popes have urged that the benefits of ownership should be made available to the many.

Filled with anguish over the violation of human dignity during and after World War II, Pius XII bases his appeal for ownership on the dignity of man. Property aids not only economic freedom, but political, cultural and religious freedom as well. It "provides man with a secure material basis of the highest import, on which to rise to the fulfillment, with reasonable liberty, of his moral duties. . . ."²² Man might achieve security under Socialism or some other form of statism, but he would have no protec-

²¹ Pius XII, Pope, address, *La Solennita della Pentecoste*, June 1, 1941, trans. in "Principles for Peace," ed. H. C. Koenig, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Wash., D. C., 1943, n. 1692.

²² Pius XII, Pope, *op. cit.*, n. 1684.

tion for his personal freedom, no economic basis for his human dignity. Systems of social insurance or protection by public law are inadequate substitutes. Ownership should be widespread: "Small and medium holdings in agriculture, in the arts and trades . . . should be guaranteed and promoted; cooperative unions should insure for them the advantages of big business."²³ As a noted authority on Catholic social thought observed, "Pius XII wants the structure of economic society to be an inherent bulwark of freedom. This means diffusion of power through diffusion of ownership."²⁴

John XXIII makes explicit the recommendations of his predecessor. He wants the body politic "to modify economic and social life so that the way is made easier for widespread private possession of such things as durable goods, homes, gardens, tools requisite for artisan enterprises and family-type farms, investments in enterprises of medium and large size."²⁵ Man needs a piece of land, or a set of tools, or stocks as the external expression of his interior freedom.

The need for land is seen also in the consequences of its denial. When land ownership becomes the privilege of the few and is used in a socially irresponsible way, then we see a decay of the social order, as in areas of South America. And when land is held by the state, then we see a de-personalization of the masses.

I have spoken of the rural family and land ownership as the two pillars of a sound social structure. It is generally recognized that these institutions have been very successful in forming man as a person. In societies less advanced than our own, their existence was not seriously threatened. But this is no longer true. Technological and economic developments have created a new world — that of the gigantic enterprises of modern industry, a marvelous manifestation of the inventive and constructive genius of the human spirit. These enterprises carry with them a characteristic spirit that pervades our entire culture as well as a technique that modifies our entire economy. (A more complete analysis of this spirit and its effects is given at the conclusion of this chapter.) Already this has affected farming techniques and the system of land ownership. The enlarging of farms and concentration of ownership that have already begun will likely continue. This trend represents a danger to a system of distributed land ownership, and, consequently, to the rural family rooted in

²³ Pius XII, Pope, address, Sept. 1, 1944.

²⁴ Cronin, John F., S.S., *Social Economics of Pope Pius XII*, in "The Catholic Mind," America Press, New York. Vol. 49, No. 1066, Oct., 1951, p. 686.

²⁵ John XXIII, Pope, encyclical letter, *Mater et Magistra*, n. 115.

such ownership. Pius XII was deeply aware of this trend. His proposals in regard to it are at the same time conservative and progressive. Technology is a blessing, at least potentially. However, its development must be under moral control. An earnest and persevering effort must be made to assimilate it in such manner as not to destroy the rural family and distributed land ownership. True progress must conserve proven benefits of the past. His judgment of the situation is expressed in measured words as follows:

History teaches that other forms of economic organization (other than the gigantic forms) have always had a constructive influence upon all society, an influence which benefited both the basic institutions of family, state and private property and those freely formed by men. We may point out by way of example the undeniable advantages which have followed where an economy based chiefly on agriculture or the crafts has predominated.

Modern industry has unquestionably had beneficial results but the problem which arises today is this: will a world in which the only economic form to find acceptance is a vast productive system be equally fitted to exert a happy influence upon society in general and upon the three fundamental institutions of society in particular?

We must answer that the impersonal character of such a world is contrary to the fundamentally personal nature of those institutions which the Creator has given to human society.²⁶

It is in terms of this problem that we must understand the papal plan for an organically structured society which is to be the means of bringing technology and the gigantic enterprises of industry to the service of the family and the person. This plan has come to be known as the vocational organization of society, sometimes called the industry-council plan. It was first proposed by Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno*.²⁷ One purpose was to lessen the tension between labor and capital. Another was to provide the large modern state with agencies that could speak and act authoritatively within the various sectors of the economy and also serve as mediators between the state and the individual. Its third purpose was to enable the individual to assume a responsible role in the segment of the economy where he works. The individual farmer, for example, can do little by himself to establish a just price for his products, but in cooperation with farmers of the region this is possible. Alone he faces a similar difficulty in paying a just wage to his employees. This wage is subject to factors which are beyond his power as an individual to

²⁶ Pius XII, Pope, *Christmas Eve Address, 1952*, p. 114.

²⁷ Pius XI, Pope, encyclical letter, *Quadragesimo Anno*, n. 994 ff.

control. Hence social justice requires that a farmer cooperate with his neighbors in the establishment of farm organizations and likewise that in his business transactions he adhere to the policy of the groups to which he belongs. The right institutional framework is necessary to facilitate the practice of social justice.

The need for vocational groups is seen also in the difficulty the national government faces in determining agricultural policy and legislation. Under present conditions it cannot turn to any one organization of farmers, or, for that matter, to any one organization of wheat growers for authoritative recommendations in what concerns all farmers or all wheat growers. The vocation plan calls for one organization representing agriculture, one representing steel and in like manner organizations representing the other industries. In steel, for example, capital, management and labor would be in one group, although they would continue to meet separately, as in the labor union. This plan rests on the principle of subsidiary function, which states that it is a disturbance of right order to assign to a greater and higher association what lesser and subordinate organizations can do.²⁸

Implementation of this revolutionary plan will be gradual, involving much experimentation. Existing elements of economic organization will have to be incorporated into it. On August 3, 1948, the Parliament of Belgium took a cautious first step and provided in its legislation for a central economic council, industry-wide councils and local councils in each business unit of a certain size. The scheme includes other groups and integrates existing groups, like chambers of commerce and chambers of crafts and guilds.

The latest papal social encyclical, *Mater et Magistra*,²⁹ refers to this plan of Pius XI and notes that it calls for the establishment of a juridical order, with appropriate public and private institutions, inspired by social justice. In a section devoted to agriculture it makes a number of practical suggestions tailored precisely to the farm enterprise of the family type. The proposed organizations would have as their purpose strengthening the family-type farm financially and updating its methods of agriculture through a knowledge of the latest techniques of farming.

²⁸ Pius XI, Pope, *op. cit.*, n. 991. Pius XI states this principle as follows: "Just as it is gravely wrong to take from individuals what they can accomplish by their own initiative and industry and give it to the community, so also it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and disturbance of right order to assign to a greater and higher association what lesser and subordinate organizations can do."

²⁹ John XXIII, Pope, *op. cit.*, n. 37-40.

Cooperatives³⁰ should be organized to complement and perfect artisan and farm enterprises of the family type.³¹

As a means of helping the family secure sufficient money income for decent and humane family living he recommends that farmers form mutual-aid societies and professional associations.³² "All these are very necessary," the encyclical states, "either to keep rural dwellers abreast of scientific and technical progress or to protect the prices of goods produced by their labor. Besides acting in this manner, farmers are put on the same footing as other classes of workers who, for the most part, join in such fellowships. Finally, by acting thus farmers will achieve an importance and influence in public affairs proportionate to their own role."³³ This statement of purposes gives some indication of what type of farm organization is envisioned and offers a basis for evaluating our own existing ones. The encyclical stresses that the farmers themselves are to be the principal agents and protagonists of economic improvement, of cultural betterment or of social advance.

The rural community is also to be regarded as an important part of the social structure. Rural industry greatly strengthens this social and economic unit. The NCRLC devoted its 1960 policy statement to this subject. In this recommendation and in many others the NCRLC anticipated the recommendations of *Mater et Magistra* issued in May of 1961. The encyclical urges the development in rural areas of industries and services that are useful in preserving, processing and transporting farm products so that opportunity may be given farm families to supplement their incomes without leaving the milieu wherein they live and work. Local work has obvious economic, social and moral advantages over the system that requires commuting long distances.

In these practical recommendations of *Mater et Magistra* there is embodied an important principle of social philosophy — the principle of self-sufficiency. Thomas Aquinas observed that self-sufficiency is a mark of perfection. Applying this criterion to the 13th-century towns of his day he wrote "that city is more self-sufficient which the surrounding country supplies with all its vital needs than is another which must obtain these supplies by trade."³⁴ The self-sufficient city is more dignified; and in

³⁰ The Latin text reads: "*incepta oeconomica consociata.*"

³¹ John XXIII, Pope, *op. cit.*, n. 85.

³² The Latin text reads: "*adiutrices societates et consociationes ad artes pertinentes.*"

³³ John XXIII, Pope, *op. cit.*, n. 141, 146, 144.

³⁴ Aquinas, Thomas, "The Governance of Rulers," Sheed and Ward, New York, 1938, pp. 116-17.

time of war it is safer,³⁵ a reason that has not lost its cogency today when men are talking about decentralization.

From the viewpoint of this principle of self-sufficiency, a town-country unit, strengthened by rural industry, offers many advantages. It brings the rural industrial worker close to the food supply; it augments the farmer's income needed to secure a standard of living comparable to that in the city; and it gives to the rural community a certain measure of economic independence which, in turn, gives a measure of autonomy in education and culture. What is envisioned here is a blend of industrial efficiency and rural tranquility, an economically and culturally integrated town-country unit giving organic structure to the social body. The rural areas development project has demonstrated the possibility of achieving this.

In regard to the role of the state I wish merely to emphasize its obligations in distributive justice and equity to agriculture. It must bring about an improvement in the principal services needed in rural areas: roads, medical service, schools, housing. It must make capital available at a reasonable rate of interest. In other words, it must redress obvious imbalances between agriculture and the other sectors of the economy.

The Social Virtues

The organic structuring of rural society will require a re-activating of the social virtues in the farmer and a rooting out of that exaggerated individualism that has given a false orientation to modern social philosophy. He must relearn the law of human solidarity and charity which is dictated and imposed by our common origin, by the equality of rational nature in all men and by the redeeming sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ on behalf of mankind. The farmer must also be conscious of the solidarity that should exist among those sharing a common occupation and a common fatherland. He must come to understand the deeper meaning of the common good, which the ancients said is more lovable to the individual than his private good. The farmer must cooperate with his neighbor in true Christian friendship. He must do this even to the point of sacrificing personal advantage for the wider good of the group, as he may be called upon to do, for example, in behalf of the community creamery or of a marketing agency seeking a just price for his produce. Professional associations, mutual-aid-societies and cooperatives cannot

³⁵ Ibid.

function effectively unless the members have an enlightened social consciousness. The farmer must practice social justice, i.e., common-good justice, which demands from each individual all that is necessary for the common good. This demands that he use his land in a socially responsible way, that he join with his neighbor in mutual-aid societies, that in buying and selling he be faithful to the social commitments he has made to his fellow farmers.

The rural values such as reverence for the soil, love of God, love of the fatherland, willing acceptance of honest toil and love of the commonweal are fundamentally spiritual and cannot be maintained for long on any other basis. These qualities should be esteemed above the technological and the economic. They are essential for maintaining an organic social structure based upon freedom and personal responsibility. They are part of an authentic rural spirit. As such, they are of great importance, even from the purely economic point of view. In this country, where agriculture quotas are constantly being exceeded, we simply assume that the nation will always be blessed with a class of people who are willing and proud to do a farmer's work. It is possible that materialism and the love of ease which it engenders could over a long period invalidate this assumption. It is in this way that great nations, because of their wealth, deteriorate from within.³⁶

Can rural life, in the face of the aggressive influence of materialistic industrial capitalism maintain its specific identity? We are talking of a new kind of materialism, namely, technology with a materialistic outlook. It judges in terms of the quantitative; its criterion of success is, in the last analysis, financial return. Desire for gain rather than human need determines how technology will deploy its forces, how human and natural resources, how labor and capital will be expended.³⁷ Naturally given to large-scale calculations, technology has for its own

³⁶ Even if this nation could dispense with most of its farmers, there would remain the question of whether it could remain strong without the type of man agriculture produces. Even now there are indications of a problem. *Today's Health* reports that some 17 million persons of our country have serious emotional problems. Mental illness has been called our number one disability. The cost for the professional care of mentally ill patients is some 3 billion dollars per year. (*Today's Health*, Oct., 1961.) President Kennedy, in his July 19, 1961, message on physical fitness observed that "the softening process of our civilization continues to carry on its persistent erosion." It is my opinion that this process could be retarded by instilling a more rational and Christian attitude toward work.

³⁷ Pius XII, Pope, Catholic International Congresses address, Social Study, Fri-bourg Union, and Social Action, Rome, June 3, 1950. Cf. also, Pius XII, address, Life of the Farmer, Nov. 15, 1946.

purposes developed a type of machine suited to large-scale agricultural enterprises. The result is an approach to agriculture that is quantitative, impersonal, utilitarian, mechanically efficient, interested in large tracts of land which lend themselves to methods of uniform cultivation.

It appears, then, that the goals and values in agricultural policy are under tension. If my analysis is correct, the spiritual outlook that characterizes a vital and distinctive rural way of life will find itself to be in opposition to the technological, utilitarian outlook that is dominant in the American economy. In this tension there is something of the opposition which Christ spoke of when he told His disciples that it is impossible to serve God and mammon. The question here, however, is not one of individual morality, not one of personal greed or materialism in the individual farmer's life. Rather it is one of social morality, of deciding which is the ultimate norm for determining goals and values in agriculture: will it be the ethical-religious norm or the technological-economic? Fortunately these are not opposed and cannot be. At times the two norms are seen to be in evident accord. Consider, for example, the important matter of land ownership. In the natural law perspective a wide distribution of land is urged as in keeping with human dignity. In this spirit the early settlers and later immigrants staked out claims, homesteaded and built their lives upon modest holdings in land and industry. The result has been an abundant food production such as the Collectivist experiment has not been able to achieve. Indeed, Soviet Russia has found it necessary, in order to increase food production, to grant to the peasants an acre-and-a-cow-type of farming. The resulting production is phenomenally large.³⁸ What our nation has done in the name of human dignity, the pragmatic Soviets have been forced to do by hard economic realities.

At other times, the two norms are in apparent conflict. Consider the matter of capital investment. The natural law viewpoint urges economic support of the family-size farm as conducive to the formation of the human person. On the other hand,

³⁸According to Lazar Volin this type of farming in 1959 accounted for close to one-half of the total Soviet meat and milk production, more than 80 percent of eggs, 46 percent of green vegetables, and nearly two-thirds of potato production. He noted that this produce came from but a "dwarf private sector" of Soviet agriculture. He attributes this to the peasants' strong attachment to their little private holdings and animals. He writes that it can hardly be disputed "that giantism militates against efficient farm management." Volin, Lazar, Soviet Agriculture: A Continuing Problem, in "Current History," November 1961, pp. 286-91. The 1961 National Peoples' Congress of Red China proposed the restoration of private incentive through permission for private plots as one means for solving their food crisis. Yuan-Li Wu, Farm Crisis in Red China, in "Current History," September 1962, p. 166.

so-called prudent business practice favors capital loans to the large operator, for whom capital is made readily available and at a lower rate of interest. Obviously, here there is tension calling for a difficult decision, which more often than not is made on the side of expediency. While merely paying lip service to the ethical-religious norm, the practical man determines his goal on the basis of hard economic realities. As a consequence, our social policy drifts as we move from one short-term goal to the next. Marx was more consistent and decisive in his professedly and thoroughly materialistic philosophy. The economic factor was the decisive one. He branded the ethical-religious consideration as an opium for the people. Though we emphatically reject his philosophy that denies God and the human spirit, we must recognize a consistency in his pattern of goals and values that makes for a strong and effective public policy.

On our part, I think it can be said that we have neither accepted nor rejected the implications of an ethical-religious norm. This ambiguity in regard to norms, goals and values weakens our Christian position, takes the edge off the effectiveness of our social thought and prevents us from presenting to the world the image of a social order that clearly excels in justice, charity and humanity. This ambiguity also will have its effect upon rural life and cause it to become something other than what it is envisioned to be in the Catholic perspective; and in the process of this change I think that important spiritual values will be lost to our nation.

In outlining the Catholic perspective on rural life, I have stressed the following propositions:

1. The natural law outlook is essentially a recognition that human affairs are under Divine ordering. Human reason is competent to discover this ordering through a reading of human nature in its essential parts and relations, a reading which must take into account social change. Finally, this faith in human reason, as illuminated by Divine revelation, provides our pluralistic society with a basis for agreement in working out a solution for the social and agricultural question.
2. Rural life properly retains a specific character in relation to the urban outlook; the influence of the rural character upon the national character is of great importance.
3. Work is an important and essential factor in perfecting the human person. Agricultural work is eminently in keeping with man's nature as a creative and responsible being.
4. Technology, not as such, but as influenced by a materialistic spirit orientated almost exclusively to quantitative considerations, works harm to the human spirit and is a threat to the specific values of the rural way of life.

5. Social structure is the important factor in the rural question. The elements of structure are the family, the institution of a well distributed private property and the state. These are of critical importance in forming the person.

6. The structure of agricultural society must be kept organic, i.e., it must have a stability and vitality based upon smaller functioning units like the family farm and the town-country unit, which, in turn, are strengthened by such organizations as mutual-aid societies, professional organizations and cooperatives.

7. There is need to think through and apply the implications of our ethical-religious norms to the market place and countryside. This is a work for educators, statesmen, farmers and farm organizations.

5

Beliefs and Values Underlying Agricultural Policies and Programs

WILLARD W. COCHRANE¹

PUBLIC POLICIES and programs are collective ways in which people determine how they live and make a living. Policies and programs stand or fall depending on whether or not they are in line with basic beliefs and values. This fact provides the standpoint from which I wish to assess the underlying basis of agricultural policies and programs now underway and in process of formulation.

To carry out this assignment we need to do four things: First, we need to lay out those basic beliefs and values long indigenous to our society. Second, we need to see how these have guided the evolution of farm policy with considerable success until very recent years. Third, we need to see how rapid rates of change have thrown historic beliefs and values into conflict at numerous points, thus generating serious policy problems. Finally, we shall evaluate current agricultural policies and programs as means of minimizing these conflicts by bringing actual conditions more in line with long-held basic beliefs and values.

Before entering upon these four lines of enquiry, I wish to state the meaning I attach to the terms beliefs and values. Beliefs are concepts of ways of living and making a living which people feel obliged to follow. Values are the degree to which people feel a need to follow given ways.

It should be clear, however, that all concepts are not beliefs. I might, for example, have a concept of proficiency in head-hunting as a way of living and making a living. In my case, this concept is not a belief, because I feel no need to engage in such practices in order to prove myself a worth-while person. For many primitive tribes, however, this concept is a profoundly

¹ Director, Agricultural Economics, USDA.

motivating belief. Similarly, millions of people in master-servant societies have the concept of free elections, speech and assembly. But for them this concept is not a belief because, unlike ourselves, they do not need to follow these practices in order to prove themselves worth-while persons. On the other hand, in our society men have valued these practices more than life itself because of their profound need to prove themselves self-masters, subject to the arbitrary power of no one.

I consider values to be the degree to which people feel a need for following the practices that are interpreted (or conceived) as evidence of worth-while life. A concept of a given way of life is a belief only to the extent that a person values this way of life as evidence of the kind of person and society he prizes and feels obliged to achieve.

With these definitions in mind we now turn to our first problem: that of identifying basic beliefs and values that have long guided the evolution of farm policy.

HISTORIC BELIEFS AND VALUES²

Our society has long placed a high premium on technological advance. So high is this premium that American people find extremely distasteful any proposal to remedy the trouble such technological advance is causing by slowing down the rate of expenditure and effort going into research, development and the farm adoption of new techniques.

The high premium that our society places upon economic and technical progress reflects the strong sense of commitment in western society to the ethical significance of proficient work. Our capitalistic-democratic society in great measure was born in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. This was the period in which the religious reformers turned against the pre-capitalistic, feudalistic belief that dependence on economic work was a badge of inferior personal qualities. And they substituted the revolutionary belief that proficiency in any employment is the badge of superior character.

² For ideas in this section, the author is indebted to the writings of John M. Brewster, especially, "Beliefs and Values as a Factor in the Farm Problem," prepared for Agricultural Editors' Association Winter Meeting, Chicago, Ill., Nov. 29, 1961; "The Impact of Technical Advance and Migration on Agricultural Society and Policy," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, Dec. 1950; "Agriculture's Evolution as Related to Political Thought and Action," prepared for the World Food Forum, May 1962, Washington, D. C.; "The Relevance of the Jeffersonian Dream Today: A Current Look at Griswold's Farming and Democracy," prepared for Homestead Centennial Symposium, Lincoln, Nebr., June, 1962.

The economic impact of this new attitude is tremendous. It means that excellent performance in all employments, whether tilling the soil or composing sermons, is unquestioned proof of a praiseworthy life. What counts is not what particular task one does, but how well he does it. Furthermore, no matter how highly an individual may be regarded, he can earn still greater recognition by performing his work with a still higher degree of excellence. No amount of wealth can exempt a person from the sense of obligation to do his work still better. If he succeeds in making two blades of grass grow where only one had grown before, thirst for a still finer image of himself then obliges him to find a way of making three blades grow where only two had grown before. Energized by this directive, people seldom find any rest and would be bored if they did.

This commitment of American people to excel in all employments has always included certain concepts of equity. The belief that the key responsibility of the individual to himself and society is to earn high standing through increased productivity includes the further belief that society owes three reciprocal debts to individuals. These debts are the obligations (a) to provide each person with the opportunity or access to the means necessary for developing his potential to the fullest extent possible (e.g. public schools), (b) to offer opportunities for productive roles in keeping with his abilities and (c) to give each a fair return for his contributions.

These three concepts of equity are all caught up in what is commonly called "the justice of equal opportunity." The first two debts are called distributive justice, and the third is called "commutative justice." That is, distributive justice includes the belief that society owes to each (a) access to the means necessary for developing his potential as fully as possible and also (b) opportunity for a productive role in keeping with his abilities.

Commutative justice includes the belief that society is obliged to return each a fair reward for his contributions. Thus the directive to each in society to work proficiently and diligently places society under obligations to the individual which are no less binding than those which it places on the individual to himself and society. And, it is impossible for the individual not to resent the unfairness of a society which fails to discharge all of these debts to the individual and at the same time expect him to earn good repute through excellent work. In the same way, it is impossible for society not to resent the unfairness of the individual who seeks a living and a favorable valuation of himself but is unwilling to earn these goods through superior industry.

In addition to these unique concepts of equity, American people have long placed a high premium on each of two opposite meanings of freedom. One is entrepreneurial freedom; the other is democratic freedom. Entrepreneurial freedom is the negation or absence of collective restraints on individual action. This premium is rooted in strongly held enterprise beliefs that to the individual belongs complete power and right to run his life and business as he chooses. In contrast, the democratic meaning of the term freedom is not the mere negation or absence of restraints, but the right and power of each to a voice in making the rules which all must observe for the sake of their mutual well-being. This meaning of freedom is rooted in strongly held democratic beliefs that all men are of equal dignity and worth, and that none is good or wise enough to have arbitrary power over any other. In terms of these commitments, the hallmark of free men is not exemption from restraints, but the right and power to participate in saying what rules all must observe for the sake of liberating themselves from ills which they inflict upon each other by their otherwise unrestrained individual action.

For a people with our historic beliefs and values, the good society would be one which automatically harmonized our concepts of distributive and commutative justice without requiring us to forego to any degree our entrepreneurial freedom through democratically imposed restraints on individual action. In other words, the ideal society is one which gives to each the equivalent of his contributions and also the means necessary to develop his productive potential without imposing any common rules on anyone. However, individual capabilities are themselves largely the function of goods and services that are within society's power to extend or withhold. Thus, we do not make an absolute value of entrepreneurial freedom, refusing to forego any measure of it for the sake of a larger measure of equity. The whole history of our social legislation is abundant evidence to the contrary. It does mean that we strive for policies and programs that bring conditions of life into line with our sense of distributive and commutative justice at as little sacrifice of entrepreneurial freedom as possible.

This fact becomes abundantly clear from a brief view of the evolution of farm policies and programs from early times.

CONCEPTS OF EQUITY AS DIRECTIVES TO AGRICULTURAL POLICY

In line with our concepts of equity, farm people have struggled for national policies and programs that would extend to them

an equality of opportunities to make themselves increasingly productive, on the one hand, and the opportunity to receive a fair return for their work on the other.

The long struggle for equality of productive opportunities is marked by three great achievements. The first was in land policy, the second was in agricultural research and education and the third was in agricultural credit.

Until about 1860 the great struggle was for land policies that would give the working farmer with little or no cash an equal chance with the rich to acquire as much public land as he and his family could convert into a productive farm with their own labor and management. Early land policies were distinguished by extreme inequality of opportunities for acquisition of public land. They gave moneyed men a virtual monopoly on opportunities for first acquisitions of public lands, which they commonly turned into speculative gains through resale in small tracts to farm families. The struggle to correct the miscarriage of distributive justice reached a climax in the Homestead Act of 1862.

Even before the issue of public land was resolved, farmers began to realize that equal opportunity to acquire public land was not enough to enable them to fulfill their aspirations for a better life through superior industry. They found that they also needed technical knowledge of ways to make their work more productive. To this end, over the next half century (roughly from 1860 to 1914), they sought to establish and strengthen agricultural research and educational institutions. The government responded through the Morrill Act of 1862, which established the Department of Agriculture and the present system of land-grant colleges; the Hatch Act of 1887, which established the modern system of agricultural experiment stations; and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which established the agricultural extension service.

In addition to research and education, farmers also found themselves in need of capital on longer terms, a need that private lending institutions were not meeting adequately. In due course, this need was met by the establishment of the Federal Land Bank, and later the organization of the Farm Credit Administration, which provided real estate credit, production credit and credit for farm cooperatives. The Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration were added in the 1930's.

Underlying all these farmer struggles for equality of productive opportunities was the unquestioned assumption that there was room enough in agriculture for all farm families to have an efficient sized farm if they wanted one. No one was disturbed with the thought that changing conditions would eventually throw into

sharp conflict the desire for programs and policies to achieve an agriculture of efficient sized family farms and the desire for policies and programs to enable all farm families to have productive, remunerative employment.

Achievement of a procedure to acquire public land, agricultural research and education, and credit institutions helped farmers achieve equality of opportunities to produce. But the opportunity to produce and the opportunity to enjoy a fair return for what is produced are quite different. Generally speaking, since the Civil War, except for war periods, farmers have felt themselves to be more the victims of institutions that withheld opportunities for a fair return than of institutions that failed to give equality of production opportunities.

The struggle of farm people for commutative justice — the opportunity for a fair return — has taken four main forms. In the late nineteenth century it expressed itself as a striving to achieve protection from exploitation by business monopolies. To this end, farmers sought policies and programs that would counteract the economic power of railroads, grain exchanges, elevators, warehouses and other types of business that exercised monopoly powers.

In the 1920's the struggle for a fair return reflected itself in a preoccupation with cooperatives and in an effort to apply a two-price system for agriculture. Many thought that through cooperative action farmers could solve their own economic problems by bringing big business practices to bear on agricultural purchasing and selling. Through the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 farmers did achieve for cooperatives exemption from some of the restrictions of the anti-trust laws. Many cooperatives organized during this period were successful. But, by and large, the chief economic problems of the major commodities did not yield to the cooperative approach.

As this fact became apparent farmers sought more direct ways of achieving equality of income opportunities. Throughout the 1920's many farmers and farm leaders believed this could be done through implementing a two-price system for some agricultural products. It was thought that this could be accomplished by segregating total farm output into two portions — the first representing domestic needs, the second representing exports. For the first portion, farmers were to receive the world price plus the difference between the world price and the parity price. For the second portion, they were to receive only the world price. However, this means of achieving equality of income opportunities was never put into effect.

In the 1930's the struggle for a fair return shifted to policies

and programs that would help farmers to manage their total output in line with what consumers were willing to take at stable prices. To be emphasized here is the fact that throughout the 1930's, the 1940's and the early 1950's such programs were perched on the assumption that they were needed because of the lack of a full employment economy. They assumed that the absence of such an economy was a temporary ill which would soon pass away, whereupon supply control programs could be laid on the shelf. It turned out, however, that the kingdom of heaven was not this close at hand.

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE AS THE GENERATOR OF CONFLICTS AMONG BASIC BELIEFS AND VALUES

It has become unmistakably clear that the greatly accelerated rates of farm and nonfarm technological advance since the close of World War II have generated more serious conflict than ever before between the high premium of people on doing their work with increasing excellence, and their equally cherished beliefs in society's responsibility to provide families in farming with the opportunity of receiving a fair return, having efficient sized farms and having no democratically imposed restraints on entrepreneurial freedom. The following chain of reasoning bears out this fact.

1. A phenomenal acceleration of the technological advance of agriculture has expanded farm output at an appreciably faster rate than the growth in domestic and foreign demand. This imbalance has brought about a downward pressure on farm prices and income in general. Therefore, in their attempt to become increasingly more productive, farmers generate an increasingly severe conflict between their high premiums on technological advance and the equally cherished belief that society owes the individual a fair return for his contributions.

2. In similar fashion, present-day rates of technological advance generate a sharper conflict than ever before between our historic commitments to commutative justice and to distributive justice in the form of an opportunity for all families in agriculture to have efficient sized farms. In 1959 there were 2.4 million commercial farms. Depending on what assumptions are used, one may reach somewhat different estimates of the number of efficient sized family farms that would be needed to provide society with all the food and fiber it needs at reasonable prices. But, all "educated guesses" indicate that somewhere around one million efficient farms would be enough to do this job. Conceivably,

we might provide these 2.4 million farms with productive employment opportunities in agriculture by expanding their resources and productivity to the point required for proficient operations. But, if this were done, the level of total farm production would be so great as to completely defeat the objective of a fair return to farmers as a whole.

3. The only conceivable way of resolving this conflict between our historic commitments to both commutative and distributive justice for farm people is to limit total farm output to a level that will bring to agriculture as a whole a fair return and allow farm operators of inadequate farms to achieve efficient sized farm units. This means the price level would have to be high enough to enable operators of inadequate farms to expand their present limited resources and productivity at least to the point that will yield sufficient earnings to do three things: (a) meet family living expenses; (b) meet operating expenses, depreciation, repairs, interest and principal payments on borrowed funds; and (c) accumulate sufficient reserves to make additional capital investments necessary to keep in step with technological advance.

But this method of resolving the conflict between commutative and distributive justice throws our historic premiums on technological advance and entrepreneurial freedom into opposition and conflict at another conceptual level. This is true because limiting the total output of farm units prevents operators from using new and available technologies in whatever ways they may desire.

As previously explained, farmers have been willing to forego some degree of entrepreneurial freedom for the sake of achieving a fair return through supply management programs. But this method of achieving commutative justice at the expense of entrepreneurial freedom is distasteful. In great measure, farmers have been willing to suffer this discomfort through the faith that supply management programs were mere temporary arrangements and would vanish once we succeeded in achieving a full employment economy.

The fact is, however, that the experience of the 1950's upended the validity of this faith. For that decade made clear that, for a long time to come, even high levels of employment and rapid growth of the national economy may be accompanied by a large excess capacity in agriculture and price depressing surpluses. In short, the 1950's showed that agriculture is caught in a long-run squeeze involving a persistent pressure of supplies on demand with the consequent strong downward pressure on farm prices. In keeping with this fact, realism behooves us to cease deluding ourselves with the faith that the long run is bound to

bring to pass that happy state of affairs in which these belief and value conflicts will have completely disappeared. Abandonment of the long-run myth of ultimate deliverance from all conflicts among our deeply cherished beliefs and values will enable us to divert otherwise wasted energies into lines of action that will minimize the discomforts of our conflicting beliefs and values.

POLICY AND PROGRAMS

The four main lines of action are as follows:

1. Expand the demand for farm products and, hence, the demand for farm resources.
2. Find new uses for farm resources, such as land, which are not needed in the production of food and fiber.
3. Increase nonfarm employment opportunities in rural and urban areas.
4. Limit the supplies of agricultural products to amounts that will clear the market at fair and stable prices.

These approaches differ in their degree of acceptability and effectiveness in resolving the belief and value conflicts. It has been the aim of policy makers to pursue the most acceptable of these approaches as far as possible before resorting to less acceptable ones. These approaches are now considered in their decreasing order of acceptability.

Demand Expansion

There are two characteristics of this approach to the farm problem which make it the most acceptable means of minimizing our belief and value conflicts. First, it enables farmers to use their resources in the traditional ways of producing food and fiber. Second, it puts the products of their work in uses that are highly prized by society, and especially by farmers themselves. For, as we all know, farmers take great pride in producing for human needs. Whatever the economics of the matter may be, they feel something is basically wrong about a world which calls upon them to cut back their production as long as there are empty stomachs in the world.

In line with this fact, the Department of Agriculture has pursued policies and programs designed to feed and clothe the underprivileged people at home and abroad. In the past, this approach has included the National School Lunch, the Special Milk,

Direct Distribution of Food to Needy Families and Institutions, and Foreign Food Aid Programs. The present administration has expanded activities along these lines. These expansions include:

1. Initiation of a Pilot Food Stamp Program that will be operating in 47 areas.
2. Expansion of the National School Lunch Program to cover more of the nation's children with priority given to schools and children in economically depressed areas.
3. Extension of the Special Milk Program through the 1967 fiscal year.
4. Expansion of the Direct Distribution Program to additional areas of economic need and an increase in the number and variety of foods distributed.
5. Expansion of our Foreign Food Aid Program designed to further economic development.

While this approach increases demand for farm products in general, and hence expands effective uses of farm resource, it is not capable, by itself, of bringing about a fair and stable return to farmers. Given the work ethic and the premium on technological advance discussed earlier, output in modern agriculture has a way of quickly catching up with expansions in demand.

New Uses for Farm Resources

Since demand expansion cannot provide a complete answer, policies and programs turn to the second most acceptable way of resolving belief and value conflicts in agriculture. This approach consists of putting land and other farm resources not needed in farming to the service of public needs.

It is estimated that by 1980 we will need 51 million fewer acres of cropland than we used in food and fiber production in 1959. Shifting this unneeded cropland to grass, forestry, recreation, wilderness areas and open space — all important in meeting the needs of an urban people — strongly appeals to the general public.

The nation's private lands hold a major potential for wildlife conservation and production for hunting and fishing, and for many other forms of recreation. Already, more than 85 percent of our hunting land is privately owned, and most of our game is produced on farms and ranches. This affords farmers a beneficial use of some of their resources not needed in the production of food and fiber.

The present administration has proposed a set of pilot

programs to convert farm cropland to grazing land, forestry, recreational and wildlife uses. The conversion of cropland to grazing land does not directly meet the outdoor needs of urban people, but it does represent a more extensive utilization of that land. And to the extent that recreational uses of otherwise surplus farm resources can be found, they serve the requirements of both commutative justice and distributive justice. They contribute to commutative justice because they tend to bring farm income into line with the requirements of a fair return. They serve distributive justice because they provide farmers a greater opportunity to make themselves more productive and useful citizens.

But while this true, this approach is somewhat less acceptable than the first. For, it requires the use of farm resources in more extensive ways and in the production of nonfarm services, thus calling upon farmers to make some departures from their customary modes of living and making a living.

Nonfarm Employment Opportunities

By greatly expanding the minimum size of efficient farm businesses, modern day technological advance not only causes a rapid decline in the farm population but also causes a rapid shift of services from small villages to central towns. While this does not mean that the total rural population is declining, total income — producing opportunities are declining in the smaller villages. Further, there are many living on the land who have not and will not be able to achieve efficient sized farm units. This means that many farmers can share equitably in the nation's employment opportunities only if nonfarm employment opportunities are made available to them.

It has been an objective of our over-all economic policy to maintain a high level of employment and economic growth. By doing so, nonfarm employment opportunities are made available to many farmers who are unable to achieve proficient farm units. But this is not enough. For many of these farmers, the cost of moving out of their community is great. And this cost is more than monetary. It involves the cutting of long standing social ties. To assist those who find it difficult to move to urban areas, the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with other agencies, is currently engaged in a determined effort to generate expanding economic opportunities in rural areas. Probably the most promising potential source of new economic opportunities in many rural areas is to be found in providing commercial

enterprises. Each additional factory, commercial enterprise and public installation that locates in an area and builds a payroll generates the purchasing power base and need for additional commercial enterprises, trade and service, and professional services. Their payrolls, in turn, add still additional jobs and purchasing power in the area.

Modern transportation and technology is such that the size of a commercial enterprise may provide employment opportunities for a rather large geographic area. Thus, rural area development does not mean a factory at every crossroads. The concentration of employment in the larger towns is consistent with widely dispersed residences in rural areas.

This rural development approach provides rural people with a way of sharing more equitably in the nation's employment opportunities without having to move to urban centers. It is, however, a less acceptable way of minimizing belief and value conflicts than either of the above approaches, for it requires a transfer from farm to nonfarm employments. But it has the distinct advantage of providing proficient employment to these people without requiring them to leave the rural community; it tends to avoid the abandonment of rural institutions that their migration to distant metropolitan centers would involve.

Supply Management

The fact remains that even when pressed to the fullest extent possible, policies and programs of demand expansion, opening up new uses for farm resources and creating nonfarm employment opportunities are likely to fall short of achieving a fair return to agriculture for considerable time to come. "...studies show that we have millions of acres under cultivation now that will not be needed to produce agricultural products we can use, even two decades ahead."³ This means that our high premium on a technological advance in agriculture is in such fundamental conflict with our historic commitment to commutative justice that a fair return to agriculture cannot be achieved without some management of market supplies, hence some sacrifice of entrepreneurial freedom. Stated positively, there is little possibility of bringing total farm output in line with total demand at reasonable prices which does not involve supply management programs which, in some degree, limit the otherwise unrestrained power of farmers

³Food and Agriculture: A Program for the 1960's, USDA, Washington, D.C., March, 1962, p. 1.

to produce as much as they choose. It is conceivable that farmers might prize entrepreneurial freedom so highly that they would prefer sacrificing whatever degree of a fair return necessary to prevent any loss of entrepreneurial freedom. But, in general, we know of no evidence that farmers prize entrepreneurial freedom that highly.

This means that the real problem is not a question of supply management or no supply management; the actual issue is over what form of supply management policies and programs shall prevail. There are two general types to choose between: voluntary and mandatory.

By voluntary programs we mean programs that have the sanction of the majority of farmers, but this sanction is not binding on each and every individual. If the individual chooses to enter the program, he must forego some measure of his entrepreneurial freedom. But he need not enter the program if he doesn't want to. Mandatory programs are ones which are not only endorsed by the majority consensus of farmers, but which oblige all farmers to abide by the limitations on entrepreneurial freedom which are agreed to by the majority. Such programs are an example of the way free society has commonly liberated itself from the ills of unrestrained individual action through the exercise of its democratic power and freedom to determine what rules all must observe for the sake of their mutual well-being.

Neither this administration nor any other has ever advocated forcing supply management programs, whether voluntary or mandatory, down the throats of American farmers. Time and again I have stated that no supply management program will work which does not have the support of at least two-thirds to three-fourths of the farmers involved.

The point is, however, that the public's consent to either form of supply management turns on their relative costs to the U.S. Treasury. I know of no evidence that the public is unwilling, through government programs, to provide the organizational machinery enabling farmers to limit their collective output to levels that will clear the market at a fair price. This administration is, however, of the presumption that there is a limit to what the public is willing to incur in treasury costs on surplus farm resources, whether these resources take the form of land which the farmer is paid a price to remove from production or whether they take the form of farm products stored in warehouses.

If the magnitude of the surplus problem is small, a production-consumption balance can be obtained at low treasury cost through voluntary programs not requiring participation of all

farmers. In this situation, little entrepreneurial freedom is sacrificed for the sake of a fair return.

But the magnitude of the surplus problem has been so large in recent years that budget expenditures for maintaining a fair return to farmers primarily through price and income support programs reached the very large figure of approximately \$3.5 billion for the 1960 crop year. In the face of this fact there was great danger that the public would revolt against farmers and refuse to support its historic commitment of a fair return to agriculture.

Fortunately, this administration has made progress in proposing and receiving farmer acceptance of a new set of voluntary supply management programs which have significantly reduced farm output. These programs have also raised net farm income by about \$1.2 billion. These income gains were achieved through higher price supports and compliance payments, as long-run savings to the treasury were effected through the reduction of surplus stocks and the carrying charges related thereto.

We must not forget, however, that even these voluntary programs may not provide the long-run answer to the problem. Rates of farm technology advance are so rapid that the costs of maintaining a production-consumption balance through present programs could mount rapidly in the years ahead. Thus, the only alternative that will yield farmers a fair return and minimize treasury costs could turn out to be one that requires farmers democratically to manage their output in line with the needs of consumers for an abundance of food and fiber.

The policy choice presently confronting farmers is whether they want to achieve fair returns at the expense of some entrepreneurial freedom and some degrees of proficiency (i.e. allowing some of their resources to remain idle), or whether they prefer the fullest degree of entrepreneurial freedom and proficiency at the expense of a fair return. The hard fact is that the middle ground between these alternatives is rapidly passing away. This is not a popular statement but I would be less than frank if I refrained from saying it.

CONCLUSIONS

The job of agricultural statesmanship today is to design policies and programs that will minimize the serious conflicts which rapid rates of technological advance now generate among basic belief and value presuppositions concerning economic progress, distributive and commutative justice, and democratic and entrepreneurial freedom. These belief and value presuppositions are powerful; they will wreck any policy or program which fails to take full account of them.

6

Goals and Values Underlying Farm Bureau Policies

W. E. HAMILTON¹

DIFFERENCES IN GOALS and values have contributed to the controversy that has long characterized discussions of agricultural policy. In the interest of resolving this controversy we need from time to time to re-examine all of its probable causes. On the other hand, we should recognize that the views of individuals and organizations reflect many complex and interrelated factors. While the reason for a difference of opinion may be a simple difference in goals or values in some cases, we should not expect this always to be true. Differences with respect to the merits of existing or proposed agricultural policies may also reflect differences in information, judgments as to probable results and emphasis on the relative importance of short-term and long-range effects. The list could be extended.

I shall refrain from entering into a philosophical effort to distinguish between goals and values. However, I would note that the term "goals and values" seems to include at least some of the things farm people more often refer to as "beliefs" or "principles." This brings to mind this observation of a former state farm bureau president:

If you know a man's principles you can usually figure out about what he will do in any particular circumstance; but if he doesn't have any principles, you can't tell what he will do.

Much the same thing can be said of organizations. It must, however, be recognized that policies of a democratic organization reflect a melding of the views of many people. Individual members may have different goals and values. There may be

¹ Director of Research, American Farm Bureau Federation.

minority viewpoints on some issues. Moreover the voting combinations that determine the majority view may shift somewhat from time to time and from issue to issue. Accordingly, it should not be too surprising if apparent inconsistencies are occasionally encountered in the analysis of an organization's policies. Inconsistencies will also be found in an examination of individual viewpoints.

In examining the principles or goals and values of an organization, it seems appropriate to consider first the purpose of the organization and the process by which guiding principles and policies are determined.

The "Purpose of Farm Bureau" has been officially defined as follows:

Farm Bureau is a free, independent, non-governmental, voluntary organization of farm and ranch families united for the purpose of analyzing their problems and formulating action to achieve educational improvement, economic opportunity and social advancement, thereby promoting the national welfare. Farm Bureau is local, statewide, national and international in its scope and influence and is non-partisan, non-sectarian and non-secret in character.²

From this definition it will be seen that Farm Bureau places a high value on the voluntary organization of farm people to solve their own problems and that its goals include "educational improvement, economic opportunity and social advancement."

Farm Bureau owes its very existence to the desire of farm people for educational improvement. It originated as a part of the educational movement which led to the establishment of Co-operative Agricultural Extension work. Its policies have always reflected a high regard for the contribution research and education can make to the solution of farm problems.

The reference to "economic opportunity" is significant because it suggests that Farm Bureau members are seeking conditions that will permit the individual farmer "to earn" a claim on society for services rendered by the productive use of his abilities and resources.

The phrase "social advancement" indicates Farm Bureau's awareness of the importance of spiritual and cultural values. This awareness is spelled out in more detail in the following resolution on "Religious Life":

Our national life is founded on spiritual faith and belief in God. While Christianity has been the dominant force in the religious life of our country, we recognize the contributions of other religions.

² Farm Bur. Policies for 1963.

We pledge our organization to continued application of Christian principles in the solution of rural economic and social problems. The solution of problems arising from social and economic change involves recognition of spiritual and moral values.

We urge each Farm Bureau member to make every effort (1) to keep belief in God the dominant force in America, (2) to participate in the activities of the church of his choice, (3) to make certain that actions taken by his church are within the basic concepts of our American system, (4) to encourage growth of churches and extend their spiritual influence by active support, regular attendance and spiritual instruction in the home and (5) to encourage prayer and reading of the Bible in our schools.³

HOW FARM BUREAU POLICIES ARE MADE

Farm Bureau members not only are permitted to determine the policies of the organization, but a widespread effort is made to encourage all members to participate actively in the policy development process. This process involves study, discussion and decision by majority vote at community, county, state and national meetings.

To be certain that policies determined by the members, and their elected representatives, are carried out in a way consistent with the will of the membership, free elections are held — county, state and national. Through this process, official voting delegates are elected, officers are chosen and members of the boards of directors of the respective units of the organization are selected. The boards of directors, in turn, are responsible for guiding the activities of the administrative officers and staff.

While some states accept limited numbers of associate members, only farmers are entitled to vote. In addition, state and county farm bureaus quite generally have a rule that no member may hold office unless he receives more than one-half of his income from farming. These rules are all designed to keep policy making in the hands of bona fide farm family members.

The recommendations of state farm bureaus on national issues are considered by a national resolutions committee. In turn, this committee reports to an elected delegate body.

The national resolutions committee consists of the elected presidents of member state organizations from 49 states and Puerto Rico, the chairman of the national Farm Bureau Young People's Committee, the vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation and representatives of the Farm Bureau Women's Committee.

³Ibid.

The delegate body to which the resolutions committee reports consists of the presidents of member state units, additional delegates apportioned on the basis of membership and four representatives of the Farm Bureau Women's Committee. The president of the American Farm Bureau Federation is also a delegate. Thus the national organization, as such, has one vote in a delegate body of approximately 170 people. No delegate may be a salaried employee of the AFBF, a member organization or affiliate. However, a person otherwise qualified is not disqualified by substantial full-time duties as an elected Farm Bureau official.

A further check on Farm Bureau policies results from the fact that Farm Bureau is a voluntary organization supported by membership dues. There are no checkoffs in Farm Bureau. No one is compelled to join to farm. Member families pay dues because they want to — not because they have to.

Thus, Farm Bureau members have a three-way check on the policies of their organization. The members make Farm Bureau policies. They elect the people responsible for carrying out these policies. Finally, they decide each year whether to continue their membership.⁴

There is no substance to the charge that Farm Bureau's membership record has been built by the desire of farmers to obtain cheap insurance. Insurance programs have been developed to meet a need expressed by Farm Bureau members. It is strong state farm bureaus that have created successful insurance companies rather than the reverse. It should not be surprising to find that some farm people are more interested in services than public policy, but it is downright insulting to farm people to suggest that those who are interested in policy would continue, year after year, to support an organization with which they disagree just to save a few dollars.

BASIC FARM BUREAU PHILOSOPHY

The goals and values underlying organization policy are not always made explicit in policy statements. Deeply held goals and values may be taken for granted until they are challenged. This is well illustrated by Mrs. Campbell's discussion of Farm Bureau's reaction when the Farm Security Administration undertook to reform the land tenure system in the late 1930's.

⁴ Portions of the above discussion are based on the 1962 Annual Report of Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer, Amer. Farm Bur. Fed. See also the Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws of the Amer. Farm Bur. Fed. (in force January 1, 1961, as amended).

A basic assumption of Farm Bureau people, which was challenged by the FSA, was that the best possible system of land tenure was that of private, individual ownership. This principle was taken so much for granted that it was not even mentioned in the AFBF resolutions of 1934, which summarized the land utilization policies of the Farm Bureau. In fact it was not until President Roosevelt's Committee on Farm Tenancy made its report in 1937 that the AFBF felt called upon to defend this principle. . . . The report recommended that the federal government purchase land and sell it under long-term contracts to operating farmers, who would not, however, be allowed to repay all the principal and obtain title to the land until after 20 years. . . .

The Farm Bureau's insistence upon the fee simple ownership of farm land followed the tradition of those who fought for the homestead policy and other measures by which the public domain had passed into private ownership.⁵

Since then, Farm Bureau has made a rather considerable effort to enunciate its underlying philosophy in policy resolutions. The following extracts from a policy resolution entitled "Farm Bureau Philosophy" are particularly pertinent to our discussion:

America's unparalleled progress is based on freedom and dignity of the individual, sustained by basic moral and religious concepts.

Freedom of the individual versus concentration of power which would destroy freedom is the central issue in all societies.

Economic progress, cultural advancement and ethical and religious principles flourish best where men are free, responsible individuals.

We reaffirm our belief that freedom may best be secured through the following concepts and actions:

Basic Principles

We believe in self-government, in limitations upon government power, in maintenance of equal opportunity, in the right of each individual to worship as he chooses, in separation of church and state and in freedom of speech, press and peaceful assembly.

Property rights are among the human rights essential to the preservation of individual freedom.

Individuals have a moral responsibility to help preserve freedom for future generations by active participation in public affairs.

The Constitution

Stable and honest government with prescribed and limited powers is essential to freedom and progress.

The Constitution of the United States has been well designed to secure

⁵ Campbell, Christiana McFadyen, *The Farm Bureau and the New Deal*, Univ. of Ill. Press, Urbana, 1962.

individual liberty by a division of authority among the legislative, executive and judicial branches; the diffusion of government powers; and the retention by the states and the people of those powers not specifically delegated to the federal government.

The trend toward centralization of power and responsibility in the federal government violates constitutional purpose, has reached a point dangerous to state sovereignty and individual freedom and should be reversed.

The constitutional prerogatives of each branch of the federal government should be preserved from encroachment by the other branches.

State and Local Government

We believe that the maintenance of strong, independent and responsible state and local government is imperative to the preservation of self-government and individual freedoms.

Public functions should be performed by the unit of government closest to the people which can effectively perform them. State governments should not perform functions which can be efficiently performed by local units of government.

We favor the assumption of responsibility by state and local units of government for the exercise of their appropriate functions.

Capitalism — Free Enterprise

We believe in the American capitalistic, free enterprise system in which property is privately owned, privately managed and operated for profit and individual satisfaction. We believe in a competitive business environment in which supply and demand are the primary determinants of market prices, the use of productive resources and the distribution of output.

We believe in the right of every man to choose his own occupation, to be rewarded according to his contribution to society, and to save, invest, spend or convey to his heirs his earnings as he chooses.

Efficiency of production and per capita output are the primary elements in determining standards of living.

These principles are consistent with our religious values and the highest goals of mankind. They contribute to the diffusion of power essential to the preservation of liberty. They have produced an unparalleled volume of goods and services and supported widespread educational and religious opportunity.⁶

Farm Bureau quite obviously believes that freedom and individual responsibility are basic to economic, cultural and spiritual advancement. Further, its views toward government appear to have much in common with Woodrow Wilson's famous statement:

⁶ Farm Bur. Policies for 1963.

....The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it....⁷

As a consequence of these underlying views, Farm Bureau places a high value on the preservation of constitutional checks and balances, continued retention by the states and the people of the powers and responsibilities not specifically delegated to the federal government, and measures to strengthen the competitive, private-ownership and market-price aspects of our economic system.

THE APPLICATION OF FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES TO FARM POLICY

The basic rationale of Farm Bureau's recommendations with respect to government farm programs is set forth in the following extracts from the currently effective Farm Bureau resolution on "Support and Adjustment Programs":

A major objective of Farm Bureau policy is to create conditions whereby farmers may earn and get a high per-family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and opportunity. We firmly believe that this objective can best be accomplished by preserving the market price system as the principal influence in allocating the use of farm resources and in distributing farm production.

As a yardstick for measuring policies for agriculture, we propose the following guidelines:

Policies affecting agriculture should—

- Increase economic opportunity for farm people.
- Promote efficiency in the farm business.
- Protect the competitive principle.
- Be consistent with the law of supply and demand.
- Strengthen the market system.
- Stimulate market expansion.
- Encourage soil and water conservation.

Policies affecting agriculture should not—

- Open the way to price fixing.
- Stimulate excessive production.
- Permit development of monopolies.
- Erode individual freedom.
- Freeze historical production patterns.

⁷From address at the New York Press Club, New York City, September 9, 1912. Published in: *A Crossroads of Freedom — The 1912 Campaign Speeches of Woodrow Wilson*, ed. John Wells Davidson, Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, Conn., 1956.

Encourage use of synthetics or other substitutes.
Shift adjustment burdens from one producer group to another.
Increase farm production costs.
Make farmers dependent on government payments.

If farm people are to enjoy freedom, we must accept the discipline of competition. We therefore recommend that a start be made immediately toward restoring the market price system as the principal guide to needed adjustment in all areas of agriculture.⁸

The key to Farm Bureau's position on farm programs is a desire to create "conditions whereby farmers may earn and get a high per-family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and opportunity."

Farm Bureau members want to earn their income rather than to depend on government hand-outs. They emphasize "per-family farm income" because they recognize that farmers don't spend national income statistics. They speak of "real" income because they realize that the value of dollar income can be eroded by inflation. Finally, they want to preserve freedom and opportunity.

Freedom and opportunity are interrelated; however, there are some who argue that freedom is not a relevant issue in farm policy. For example, in his presidential address to the 1961 annual meeting of the American Farm Economic Association, Bushrod Allin opened a discussion of "freedom" with these words:

Few terms are so loaded with confusion as the word freedom. It can have the negative meaning of absence of government restraints on individual action, or it can have the positive democratic meaning of the right of each to an equal voice in determining the restraints all must observe for the common good....⁹

Again, Dr. T. W. Schultz has argued that freedom is not an issue in the controversy over farm programs because "it is hard to see that our farm programs have endangered the civil rights of people" and there has been compensation — perhaps excessive compensation — for the economic restraints imposed by such programs.¹⁰

Farm Bureau insists that freedom is a relevant issue. Allin's contention that freedom means "the right of each to an

⁸ Farm Bur. Policies for 1963.

⁹ Allin, Bushrod W., "Relevant Farm Economics," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, Vol. XLIII, No. 5, December, 1961.

¹⁰ Schultz, T. W., paper presented to the Third Annual Farm Policy Review Conference, Center for Agricultural and Economic Development, Ames, Ia., Dec., 1962.

equal voice in determining the restraints all must observe for the common good" makes sense only if the role of government in relation to individuals is properly defined and restricted.

Almost any law or regulation will restrain individual actions to some degree. But there is a vast difference between the type of restraint that establishes "rules of the game" for equal application to all citizens and the type that gives some citizens an economic advantage over others on the basis of past history or other arbitrarily defined criteria.

Thus, it is one thing for government to require that meat must be inspected, that drugs must be proved safe before they can be placed on the market, that scales must give correct weights and that products offered for sale must be properly labeled; it is quite a different thing to fix prices or to allocate production rights.

It can be argued that there is no difference between a governmentally enforced rule requiring automobile drivers to stay on the right side of the road and observe certain speed limits and the regulations promulgated under marketing quota programs. But there actually is a vast difference. Traffic regulations supposedly are applied on a uniform basis; they do not operate to change the economic standing of individuals. The public would be outraged by traffic regulations which restricted the right of individual drivers to use the highways or the speed at which they may travel on the basis of what each did in some past period. But that is the type of thing done under marketing quota programs.

The contention that freedom means "the right of each to an equal voice in determining the restraints all must observe for the common good" seems to imply the majority is always right and the minority has no rights. It ignores the possibility of proposed restraints being more harmful to some than to others. It seems to mean that it is perfectly all right for sections of the country going out of cotton production to vote into effect programs which could destroy the cotton business for everybody.

If a policy is wrong in terms of fundamental principles, it does not become any sounder merely because it attracts a majority, whether in Congress or a producer referendum.

Dr. Schultz is correct in a narrow sense when he says that farm programs have not impaired civil rights, although the rules on eligibility to vote in referenda have necessarily been somewhat arbitrary to say the least. In a wider sense, programs which make people dependent upon the federal government certainly impair their freedom to decide how they will use their right to vote. Economic freedom and political freedom are

interrelated. Neither can be impaired without impairing the other. The man whose economic position depends on a particular program is under great pressure to vote for candidates who promise to continue the program, even though he may differ with them on numerous other issues.

Schultz is on weak ground when he contends there has been adequate, or even excessive, compensation for the economic restraints imposed under mandatory programs. The freedoms infringed by mandatory commodity programs are the freedom of the farmer to make his own decisions, freedom to change his operations when conditions change and freedom to compete for the right to supply a market. Most types of compensation are on a year-to-year basis, but the bad effects of restraints tend to accumulate over time. Further, the people who get the compensation are not necessarily the ones most adversely affected by program restrictions.

Support prices may be more than adequate compensation for acreage restrictions in areas going out of cotton, such as some sections of the Southeast. But what about the low-cost areas where economic conditions indicate a need for producers to expand rather than contract acreage? How do we determine the adequacy of compensation for programs that threaten to reduce economic opportunity by permanently destroying the market for a commodity?

California has three counties each of which produces more cotton than the state of North Carolina. Any one of these counties apparently has a greater stake than the state of North Carolina in the future of the raw cotton business. In the last cotton referendum, however, producers in these three California counties voted against marketing quotas by a margin of 11 to 6, while North Carolina producers approved quotas by a margin of 276 to 5. The number of producers, of course, is much larger in North Carolina.

It is a well-known fact that the "benefits" of restrictive programs tend to be capitalized into the cost of acquiring production rights. A 1960 study found that "the approximate market values of an acre of flue-cured tobacco allotment (without any associated land or buildings)" was \$2,500 in three North Carolina counties in 1957.¹¹ This type of "compensation" for production restrictions creates a windfall for landowners who receive production rights on the basis of past history. But it becomes a cost of doing business for anyone who subsequently buys or leases land to which allotments have been attached.

¹¹ "The Sale Value of Flue-Cured Tobacco Allotments," Publ. No. 35 of the Southeast Land Tenure Research Committee, April, 1960.

As Don Paarlberg has pointed out, the capital assets created by quotas "fall disproportionately into the hands of those farm people who already are in the upper ranges of net worth and income."¹²

Futhermore, a considerable amount of farm land is owned by nonfarm landlords. It is hard to see how "social justice" is served by creating a substantial capital gains windfall for those who own farm land at a particular moment at the expense of renters and future owners.

Farm policy should not be evaluated solely on the basis of its effects on a particular group of farmers. Equity would appear to require some attention given to the interests of other citizens as consumers and taxpayers. It would also appear to be good politics to take account of these other interests in a country where nonfarm people form an ever-increasing proportion of the electorate.

It is hard to see how the interest of the general public is served by policies that price farm products out of normal markets and force consumers to turn to substitutes. It is impossible to calculate the damage done to the national welfare when nationalistic farm policies force us to restrict imports, dump surpluses and join international cartel arrangements, such as the Geneva Agreement for limiting textile imports including those from the less developed countries we have so often professed a desire to aid.

It is, of course, argued by some that a system of deficiency payments would avoid pricing supported commodities out of normal markets, but the payment approach also has serious defects. A price supplemented by a government payment is not a competitive market price. Where demand is inelastic, a payment program would tend to depress prices below free market levels. This would have adverse effects on underdeveloped countries heavily dependent on exports of raw materials. Payment programs carry an open invitation to limitations on individual participation. Such limitations would level farm incomes downward and promote inefficiency, which ultimately would increase the real cost of farm products. In addition, the value of the right to receive payments would be subject to capitalization.

A market economy in which competitive prices are allowed to guide production and consumption must, of necessity, be responsive to human needs. It encourages the production of the things people want and the efficient use of the limited resources available to supply human wants.

¹² Paarlberg, Don, "Discussion: Contributions of the New Frontier to Agricultural Reform in the United States," Jour. Farm Econ., Vol. XLIV, No. 5, Dec., 1962.

The judgment of the market is impersonal. It reflects current needs, not the pattern of a by-gone base period. Finally, a competitive market has built-in checks and balances that automatically set corrective forces in action when errors are made. In contrast with the judgment of a market system, the judgment of men is subject to prejudice, oversight, political maneuvering and red tape.

It must, of course, be recognized that reliance on the market system does not automatically result in a Utopia in which there are no human problems. There is a place for private charity and for government programs to aid the less fortunate. But Farm Bureau believes that such efforts should be designed to supplement rather than to replace the market system. It also believes that private charity benefits both the giver and receiver, whereas the increasing assumption of welfare responsibilities by a centralized government tends to reduce the individual's concern with other people's problems.

Farm Bureau believes that a market system can and does contribute to individual freedom and well-being by providing a mechanism for the exercise of individual choice. If this assumption is correct, it follows that the effect on individual freedom of government intervention in the market will depend on whether the intervention improves or impairs the ability of the market to provide for the exercise of individual choice.

The functioning of the market is improved by improving public information and by assuring the public that the information available in the market is dependable. But the function of the market is impaired or destroyed when the government fixes prices or allocates production rights.

Farm Bureau's emphasis on the desirability of returning to the market system does not rule out all agricultural adjustment programs. It does, however, mean that the functions of the market system should be recognized in the development of such programs. With this in mind Farm Bureau members have developed the following "guides" for price support programs:

Where price support and production adjustment programs are used they should be designed to facilitate orderly marketing.

Price support levels should take account of competitive conditions, supply and demand, and market trends. They should not be based on arbitrary formulas nor left, to any greater extent than necessary, to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Where special export pricing is necessary to regain or maintain foreign markets we should return to a one-price system as rapidly as possible.

When supplies of crops under allotment have been reduced, increases in acreage should have priority over increases in support prices.¹³

Farm Bureau has also recognized the need for transitional programs to liquidate accumulated surpluses and facilitate needed adjustments in resource use in order to keep the mistakes of past programs from placing an intolerable burden on the operation of the market system.

As one such transitional device, Farm Bureau has advocated a voluntary program under which cropland may be retired voluntarily for periods of not less than three years on a competitive bid basis with premiums for the retirement of whole farms. In contrast with programs that would force every farmer to retire a part of his acreage, Farm Bureau's cropland retirement program is designed to avoid impairing efficiency and to let individual farmers decide where adjustments should take place.

In conclusion, it should be stressed that Farm Bureau's policies reflect a carefully considered conviction with respect to the best way to advance the long-run interests of farm people as well as deeply held philosophical values. In the words of a distinguished economist, Dr. O. B. Jesness:

If farms are held below their optimum size, earnings will be lowered. Limiting opportunities in farming by reducing the scale of the business would be a sure way of driving the more enterprising and efficient elsewhere, leaving incompetents on the farm....¹⁴

In Farm Bureau's view, the economic freedom necessary for preserving the opportunity of each individual to make the most of his abilities will contribute to rather than impede the advancement of higher religious and ethical values.

¹³ Farm Bur. Policies for 1963.

¹⁴ Jesness, O. B., "Trends in Farm Population and Size of Farms," Natural Resources of Minnesota: 1962, Minn. Nat. Res. Coun., Minneapolis.

7

Goals and Values Underlying Programs of Farmers Union

GILBERT ROHDE¹

A CONSIDERATION of the goals and values underlying the programs of Farmers Union is necessarily a task that cannot be completed in one chapter. The subject matter has so many ramifications that my analysis must fall somewhere short of the mark.

This assignment in some respects raises the question of conflict of interest. As farm organization leaders we are primarily concerned about the economics of farming and administrative problems. In our price and income objectives we are dealing almost exclusively with economic man. Though we recognize the philosophical and social implications of our programs, we are hesitant to tread the same ground as the rural sociologist. This dual role of both psychologist and patient is an unfamiliar one. What follows must necessarily be a highly personal interpretation of our organization's goals and values.

CHANGE AND THE FAMILY FARM

In considering goals and values we must recognize change. Farming, when Farmers Union came into being in 1902, had little in common with agriculture as we know it today.

Dr. Henry Ahlgren, associate director of Agricultural Extension in Wisconsin, recently recalled those strenuous and rugged days:

Horsepower was provided by "oats and timothy" rather than by "gasoline and electricity." There was a minimum of farm machinery. Farming

¹ President, Wisconsin Farmers Union.

was an art rather than a science. Livestock and crop varieties were – for the most part – nondescript. Habit and custom and trial and error were the basis for most farm operations.

There was no electricity, nor were there telephones. There was no running water in the home. Whoever got up first in the morning built a fire in the kitchen stove. We took a kettle of hot water out to the pump on cold winter mornings to thaw it out so we could get at our water supply. We heated bricks – or stove lids – to warm the family sleigh – or our beds – on cold winter nights. We read around the kitchen table with a smoky lamp providing the sources of our light.

The farm furnished the milk, meat, eggs, fruit and vegetable supply. Mother made the butter and clothing for the family, baked the bread, fed the chickens, worked in the large garden and often helped with work in the fields.²

This is our rugged rural heritage which still is the basis for much of our value system as applied to agriculture. The family farm image still stirs poets and provokes nostalgia in the city dweller who dreams of returning to the land. However, the process of change has produced inevitable conflicts between the old and new orders.

Individual and group goals and values have changed with the changing farm environment. The introduction of good roads, enlarged marketing areas, expanded educational opportunities, off-farm employment and improved communications and transportation have all had their impact on the aspirations and lives of rural people. The farm community is undergoing changes in social institutions and values as the industrialization, mechanization and urbanization of our society continues.

But in changing America there are certain goals and values which we consider to be fundamental – to be preserved as part of the American dream or democratic ideal. We cherish our belief in the dignity of the individual, in the basic freedoms in our Bill of Rights, in the importance of every man having the opportunity to think for himself. Dr. Henry Wriston has given eloquent expression to the American spirit:

The ideology of the Declaration and the Bill of Rights shaped our history. It set in train forces that moved inexorably toward democracy. It made this a land of opportunity for the oppressed of the world and precipitated the greatest movement of peoples history had ever seen. Mere availability of land would not have produced this result. Other sparsely settled regions of the earth with greater unused natural resources saw no

² Henry L. Ahlgren, At the Forefront of Progress, A Tribute to the Past – A Pledge to the Future, address, Golden Anniv. Celeb. Coop. Exten. Serv. in Wis., Madison, Feb. 12, 1962, pp. 2-3.

such tidal influx. The spirit of liberty acted as a powerful magnet; the commitment to freedom made us hospitable to others. The ideal of equality of man set our course as a revolutionary force, a foe of colonialism, hostile to tyranny anywhere.³

The family farm ideal was an intrinsic part of the American Revolution and the democratic ideal. Placing ownership, management and labor in the farm family was the democratic answer to Europe's system of a landless peasantry.

The family farm since colonial times has maintained its cultural role. Economist John Brewster has called it "a unique belief-forming role." According to this view, the family farm places great value on the "work-imperative," avoiding the easy way for workmanlike excellence.

With over 90 percent of its population farmers, this fledgling nation developed an agricultural fundamentalism that persists to this day. It involves much more than a belief in the economic importance of farming. It involves a judgment that the family farm, as it performs the social function of feeding and clothing the nation, is a superior institution. Says Historian Gilbert Fite:

Agricultural fundamentalists have insisted that there is something special and unique about the rural way of life. It has been said that farmers are more dependable and stable politically than city-dwellers and that they have high moral character exemplified by honesty, integrity, and reliability. A man on the land is independent and self reliant. Some have even argued that farming is a divine calling where God and man work hand in hand to supply the physical needs of mankind.⁴

Many social scientists are out of sympathy with these fundamentalist views, which they see as expressions of rural sentimentalism. But they do concede that these attitudes have influenced past and present farm policy.

It can be argued that the general farm organizations all have roots that are anchored deep in this fundamentalist tradition. Many of the values ascribed to the family farm by the agricultural or agrarian fundamentalists are stated in the official programs that these organizations have adopted.

With the advent of the Industrial Revolution and the Machine Age certain value judgments fostered by the agrarian fundamentalists have come into conflict with ideas and values associated with our growing industrial complex. According to Brewster

³ Dr. Henry Wriston, *Goals for Americans*, Chap. 1. The Amer. Assem., Columbia Univ., New York, 1960, p. 37.

⁴ Gilbert C. Fite, "The Historical Development of Agricultural Fundamentalism in the Nineteenth Century," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, Proc. Issue, Dec. 1962, p. 1203.

three value judgments, in particular, retarded desirable social change under corporate industry:

(1) Proprietors, or their legal agents, deserve the exclusive right (power) to prescribe the rules and procedures for operating their production units. (2) The individual (or family) alone is and ought to be wholly responsible for his own economic security throughout life. Therefore, (3) the primary function of governments is to prevent (a) encroachment of the "natural" right of proprietors to run their production units as they see fit, and (b) the imprudent from pressing either government or business into assuming the burden of their economic security. In no small measure, our modern industries were founded by lads from the field, such as the McCormicks, the Deerings and the Armours. It is not wide of the mark to say that the typical "captain of industry" was simply a farm boy a long way from home.⁵

These three value judgments belong to the economic fundamentalism that evolved in conjunction with agrarian fundamentalism. Economist John Schnittker has this to say about economic fundamentalists:

In short, they argue that the agricultural economy ought to be left to function the way it used to function, and implicitly the way it was meant to function.

The central dogma of this school of thought is that government programs to limit agricultural production ought to be terminated, and that any price supports which were left in effect should be reduced to levels much lower than now in operation, that is, to a stop-loss rather than at an income-stabilizing level.⁶

Farmers Union policy, as it has evolved since 1900, has retained what we consider to be certain ethical considerations from the old agrarian fundamentalism, i.e., the character-building value of proficient work, the importance to democracy to have a considerable number of people on the land, the spiritual and cultural values we associate with the farm family and the interdependent rural community.

Apart from these ethical considerations, Farmers Union has championed the family farm as the best suited economic organization for American agriculture. A Farmers Union policy statement summarized this belief in this fashion:

⁵ John M. Brewster, "Technological Advance and the Future of the Family Farm," paper presented at joint meeting of the Amer. Farm Econ. Assoc. and Canad. Agr. Soc., Winnipeg, August 20-22, 1958, pp. 9-10.

⁶ John A. Schnittker, "Economic Fundamentalism - Its Relation to Agriculture," Jour. Farm Econ., Proc. Issue, Dec. 1962, p. 1213.

The Farmers Union believes that, (1) family farming (a) is the most efficient method of food and fiber production; (b) provides greatest protection for the consumer since family farmers ask only to be allowed to earn parity of income with other groups; (c) is essential to a truly democratic way of life. (2) The small business nature of farming is a strong bulwark against Communism or Fascism, but it leaves the family farmer without protection in the market place.⁷

Farmers Union fundamentalism, if we can call it such, has been greatly tempered with the growing social consciousness of our industrial society. It is here that we part company with the economic fundamentalists and their "laissez-faire" attitudes. Emphasis on "for good of the group" is inherent in Farmers Union goals.

BASIC GOALS OF FARMERS UNION

1. Farmers Union believes efficient family farmers should have full parity of income returns on labor, management and capital invested in comparison with returns to comparable resources invested in nonfarm enterprises. We believe that the principle of economic justice involved here is indisputable.

2. Farmers Union believes that preservation of the family farm is in the national interest. Farmers Union is an organization of family farmers who believe that the keystone of a democratic society, as well as of a strong rural America, is the efficient, economically adequate and prosperous owner-operated family farm.

3. Farmers Union believes farmers must acquire more bargaining power in the market place. There is a widespread belief that farmers are the only economic group in the country who are out of step with our free enterprise system. That's why we hear so much about returning farmers to the free market. Actually, the farm market more closely approaches the free market concept in our free enterprise economy than the markets in which other industries operate. Most industries wield great economic power over the supply and prices of their products. Farmers have little of such control and are essentially "price-takers" in the market place.

4. Farmers Union believes in expanding food consumption at home and abroad. Getting our agricultural abundance to the needy is a sound objective both in its humanitarian and economic aspects.

⁷ "The Modern Family Farm," Farm. Union Pol. Leaf. No. 10, p. 3.

5. Farmers Union believes in the preservation of rural values closely associated with the family farm pattern. Tied into this bundle of values are soil conservation and stewardship, citizenship and participation in church and community affairs.

There are numerous subsidiary objectives that will be considered when we take up the matter of the means Farmers Union employs to obtain its ends.

One of the fundamental differences between farm organizations revolves around the role of government in agriculture. The basic aims of our organization are closely related to the policies of government at federal, state and local levels that contribute to the economic betterment of farm families on the land.

Beginning in the early 1920's the government's involvement in the economic affairs of the nation's farmers has steadily grown in importance and scope. This involvement was based on the principle that maintaining a sound and healthy agriculture was in the national interest. Intrinsic in this belief was the realization that millions of relatively small farm operators were at a disadvantage in a market place characterized by a growing concentration of economic power. This lack of farm bargaining power gave rise to the parity concept upon which federal farm price support programs have been based.

A preponderance of evidence is available showing that farm income was raised substantially by farm price support programs since the 1930's. During the period government programs have been in force, our farms have become the most efficient in the world and have provided consumers an overflowing abundance at the lowest relative cost in history. Yet many who have reaped the benefits of these programs still view them with suspicion.

The economic fundamentalists still believe in letting such problems as low and unstable prices and overproduction work themselves out in the market without any government interference. Such a course, Farmers Union contends, would result in intolerable hardships imposed upon a large part of our farm population.

Most of the farming in this country is still done on family farms. These farms have been growing in size, becoming more mechanized and increasing their capital requirements, and thus far at least, ownership, decision making and the labor supply have been concentrated in the farm family. With the growth of contract farming and integration we have seen changes made in this traditional pattern. We see feed companies, chain stores, packers and other integrators taking over some of the management functions and in a sense making a hired man out of the farmer.

The large capital requirements are also affecting the family farm pattern as we have known it. A young farmer's entry into agriculture is becoming more and more restricted. There is a serious question of whether or not a family will ever be able to accumulate enough capital in a lifetime to own the farm and all the machinery and equipment necessary to operate it efficiently. These are developments which are of great concern to Farmers Union.

The shrinking farm population, the restrictions on entry and the encroachments by agribusiness interests have caused Farmers Union and others to concentrate on greater efforts to strengthen and perpetuate the family farm ideal. Economist Marshall Harris places much of the blame for lack of a family farm policy on society in general:

Another factor of concern is society's lethargy concerning family farm policy. Like the weather, everybody talks (writes) about family farming but no one does anything about it. Family farming is held in high respect; outspoken critics are hard to find. Professional groups pay intellectual homage to family farms; farm organizations and political parties draft resolutions in their behalf; and Congressional Committees hold hearings on the subject. Yet a national family farm policy has not emerged from these deliberations.⁸

According to Harris, under such an established family farm policy, action programs would be designed to maintain its integrity. Although larger-than-family and smaller-than-family farms would be permitted, constant effort would be made to establish family farms.⁹

Farmers Union policy goals have consistently been attuned to the proposition that the family farm should be strengthened and perpetuated. This objective is implicit in all our legislative proposals.

Farmers Union legislative programs seek the establishment of a food and land policy in America that will put the use of our natural and human resources on a more rational basis. Lack of such a policy has encouraged chronic overproduction with accompanying low farm prices, depressed farm income and wasted resources. The main features of such a food and land policy are as follows:

1. An annual determination of the nation's food and fiber requirements would be made. This determination would include

⁸ Marshall Harris, "The Family Farm in Domestic and Foreign Land Tenure Policy," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, May 1962, p. 543.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 539.

commercial demand at home and overseas, domestic welfare programs, Food for Peace commitments and adequate reserves to meet defense and other emergency needs.

2. Development of supply management programs at the farm level to adjust agricultural supply to anticipated demand.

3. Farm income would be maintained at support levels by adjusting supply to demand and through direct payments to farmers.

4. Family farm "maximums," representing production units, would be established to bring the primary benefits of farm programs to family farm operators.

The direct payment approach and the establishment of family farm "maximums" are receiving much attention although previous Farmers Union programs have contained both features.

Farmers Union is convinced that a direct payment program incorporating supply management has several advantages over our present price supports through government purchases:

1. Payments are made directly to the producer and not to the processor. This eliminates the risk that the support price will not be passed on to the farmers.

2. Since the market is allowed to clear the product, consumers will receive the benefit of lower food prices and the government will not have to meet high storage costs.

3. With the ready-made government market removed, processor plants will operate in a more genuinely competitive market.

4. Prices at which American products move in international trade will be reduced in keeping with our policy to liberalize world trade.

Total government expenditures for direct payments are not a satisfactory measurement of the program's costs. Lower food prices must be subtracted along with sums formerly expended on government storage. Direct cash payments will also have an accelerator effect as this money is fed into the economy.

Historically, policy positions to limit government payments to family-sized farms have followed two approaches: (1) A dollar-and-cents ceiling on government payments and loans; and (2) payments would be limited to production units falling within a production maximum determined for the family farm. Presently, Farmers Union favors the latter approach. Though setting production ceilings for family farms may appear arbitrary and tend to freeze production patterns, the resultant rigidities, we believe, will not hinder economic progress. We must balance the social gains of maintaining the family farm against the social costs of an economy that is bleeding agriculture's resources.

Apart from the broad policy goals, Farmers Union activities

are directed at many corollary objectives for strengthening the family farm. In the public policy field, Farmers Union is working for expanded farm credit sources, prosecution of illegal price fixing by buyers of farm commodities, new opportunities for families on inadequate farms and full employment policies for the entire economy. Farmers Union's primary concern is with the well-being of the farm families that make up its membership. But as a socially conscious minority it has traditionally expanded its interest beyond the confines of agriculture. It has taken stands against greed and exploitation, poverty and hunger, ignorance and disease wherever they have arisen.

Much of Farmers Union's efforts have been dedicated to co-operatives. Farmers Union members have built some of the most substantial cooperative institutions in America. Having helped build these cooperatives, Farmers Union is dedicated to protecting them from unjust attacks. Farmers Union believes that cooperatives are a very democratic form of free enterprise where ownership is widespread and management is responsive to the wishes of the patron-members. The farmer's cooperative is actually an extension of the farm business beyond his own fence lines. Combined with his neighbors, he is able to have more buying power through his supply cooperative and more selling power through his marketing cooperative.

Farmers Union also performs significant educational functions. The organization provides a "voice" for family farmers so that their needs and interests are crystallized and made known. Action programs initiated at the local level are closely identified with the hopes and aspirations of the people most vitally concerned.

Farmers Union conducts an extensive youth program for helping young people be better citizens and community leaders. Primarily, the program is designed to educate the youth in co-operation — to develop a sense of social responsibility toward one another and the rest of society — to create a better understanding of their rural culture so that they can make the most of the opportunities provided.

Changing rural America has produced difficult personal problems for many family farmers who have been forced by economic and other environmental circumstances to change their way of life. Many are faced with the critical decision of whether to remain on the land or give up farming. Others have found compromises. A fourth of our 3.7 million farms are operated by persons who depend almost entirely on off-farm work or other income for their living. We seriously question whether this is good for agriculture.

Farmers' contribution to the economic growth of our nation, through the years, is second to none. Family farming has provided a philosophy of life, manpower and an overwhelming abundance of cheap food and fiber. Is the nation going to show its gratitude by foreclosing the future on the land for family farmers? Farmers Union believes economic justice for family farmers is more than a dollar-and-cents problem. It is a moral issue that confronts all America.

8

Goals and Values Underlying Programs of the Grange

HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM¹

HISTORY makes it abundantly clear that a major goal of those who founded our American republic was to provide equitable opportunities for all American citizens. Throughout the history of this republic, powers of government have been used in efforts to provide such opportunities.

The first use of this power came with the Tariff Act of 1789, the first piece of legislation passed by the First United States Congress. While this was primarily a revenue measure, protection to industry then and there became basic national policy.

Since that time — through wage and hour laws, tax concessions and other protective devices including direct taxpayer subsidies — government income protection has been extended to every major sector of the U.S. economy. This protective structure has become the very foundation for our entire economic system. No one has even suggested the elimination of this total protective structure; to do so would invite economic disaster.

However, as Americans we have failed to recognize sufficiently the established and unavoidable economic fact that wages of labor and prices of industry established under this system automatically become the farmer's production cost and that therein lies the primary cause of our farm income problem.

GOAL OF GRANGE FARM PROGRAM

Thus, the primary goal of Grange farm program policy is the re-alignment of these established and fully accepted government-provided protective devices so as to supply equitable income

¹ Master, the National Grange.

opportunities to farmers. This re-alignment must include programs necessary to give agricultural producers an opportunity to earn and receive for their labor, management, risk and investment a return reasonably comparable to that provided for those same factors in their best nonfarm employments. Anything short of such opportunity is not in keeping with the principles upon which this republic was founded. It was never intended that Americans should be satisfied with national policy which denies to agricultural producers an opportunity to enjoy first-class citizenship — economically, socially and spiritually.

Thus, since the middle 1920's, in a decade when American agriculture was losing \$34 billion in equity, the Grange has been pleading with Americans in and out of agriculture to realize that the farm income problem would never be solved until the cause of the problem was recognized and taken into full account. From that time until now, it has become increasingly clear that the problem of just and equitable relationships and balance within our American economy (between agriculture and the remainder of the American economy) could best be solved by developing specific commodity programs taking full account of and indeed predicated on the total patterns of production, marketing and distribution and final end use of the various commodities.

ORIGIN OF GRANGE PHILOSOPHY

This philosophy was born out of two fundamental facts which unfortunately have not been understood by many of the people who have attempted to prescribe remedies for the farm income problem. As is the case in the relationship between the physician and his patient, an inaccurate diagnosis and comprehension of the real case which confronts the "doctor" has certainly lessened the prospect of a correct and effective prescription to treat the problem.

In post-World War I the agricultural problem of the United States originated in our major export crops. It was the destruction of patterns of production, utilization and marketing developed during the war on a world-wide basis that brought about the problem. This is why the original problem was manifested in wheat, cotton, pork and oil-bearing products — our major exports.

Belatedly, attempts to solve these original agricultural problems in a monopolistic manner were accepted by some as necessary adjustment programs. A continued reliance upon such adjustment programs down through the years — through World War II, through the Korean War and into the present — was certainly

not based on an accurate appraisal of the problem which has existed continuously since the close of World War I.

There has been failure also to understand that American agriculture is not completely independent — that on the contrary, American farmers and other Americans are increasingly interdependent, that one American's price or wage becomes another American's cost, both in and out of agriculture. Failure to understand this has been the reason for failure to make an accurate diagnosis of the American farm problem of nearly forty years standing.

It was tremendously important that Alexander Hamilton should win his debate with Thomas Jefferson in the very First Continental Congress of our great republic. The victory of Mr. Hamilton resulted in a protective system that generated a great industrial structure in the United States. But failure to understand that historical fact invites failure in diagnosing the farm problem with which we have been struggling for these same four decades.

NEW FACTS TO BE CONSIDERED

Now, however, in the 1960's we must take account of two additional major facts. First, governmental policy in the early 30's was based on the necessity of creating equitable purchasing power — equitable in terms of productive output and efficiency of American nonagricultural labor — so that American workers could become consumers of the products of their own labor.

Second, a fact of increasing importance to American farmers and the nation in recent years is the increasing need for free world nations to supplement and complement each other — the economic necessity for increasing the flow of goods between the nations of the Free World, the existence of an economic war between the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

Economically, morally and politically we are compelled to recognize the necessity of permitting our highly efficient American agricultural industry to have even greater impact in the world-wide civil war in which we, of necessity, are clearly engaged.

In the First Continental Congress of our infant republic, Alexander Hamilton referred to the forces of "destructive competition" faced by our young manufacturing industry. Mr. Hamilton sought to stimulate this industry in order that we might develop an industrial and manufacturing potential in the United States. He pointed out that such a manufacturing industry must

be developed in a country dedicated to enhancement of opportunity for great masses of individuals, a country in which, therefore, living standards would be substantially higher than those in many countries where established industries could inflict destructive competition on American manufacturing. In the decade of the 1960's we must strike a much more intelligent balance than we have in the past three of four decades between giving equitable protection to American agricultural investment and American agricultural labor on the one hand and having the products of our highly efficient agriculture flow into the markets of the world on a reasonable and equitable basis.

"BASE-SURPLUS" PRICING

These necessities and these facts have given rise to the development of the so-called "Base-Surplus" pricing philosophy long supported by the Grange. It is out of these circumstances and this philosophy that the Grange, over the past several years, has developed a sound "parity of income" concept as contrasted to the long prevalent parity of price concept. To be sure, income and price are interrelated. But it does not necessarily follow that price alone determines income.

The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall regulate commerce. Regulation of marketing, therefore, becomes a device available to American farmers only by authority of, or with the consent, of Congress. It is out of this fact that the features of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 were developed. It is under this philosophy that marketing orders and agreements have been put into operation. It was likewise under this philosophy that the wheat certificate program was developed.

The Grange long has supported the principle of using wheat certificates as a means of regulating marketings according to end-use and of improving the prospect of realizing a parity of income for American wheat growers.

The soundness of the parity-of-income objective cannot be questioned. Our wheat farmers and other farmers are entitled to receive a return for their labor, management, risk and investment in reasonable relation to the returns claimed by those factors in other segments of our economy. Nor can the appropriateness of the wheat certificate concept as a useful tool in achieving parity of income be denied. It is based upon the sound premise that at least in the primary domestic market the American wheat producer has every moral as well as economic right

to receive an American price for that portion of the U.S. wheat crop which goes into domestic consumption for human food.

There are, to be sure, some complications in the wheat certificate program. These complications would not have arisen had we been able to put such a program in operation a few years ago, as indeed the Grange tried to do. These complications are made necessary now because of the increased surplus, not alone of wheat but of all feed grains. This surplus has resulted from prolonged adherence to a program which did not recognize the basic factors that generated the problem.

It is not my purpose to discuss the details nor the merits of the Grange wheat program. Nor should the necessity of its having to be modified from its basic form by reason of the fact that we are approximately ten years late in getting it submitted to wheat growers for referendum determination be the subject of our detailed discussion. It is of tremendous importance, however, that American farmers and citizens of this entire nation clearly understand the real factors — economic, political, nutritional and international relations-wise — that confront all of us in the decade of the 1960's, at home as well as in the remainder of the Free World.

POLICY ERRORS OF PAST

It has seemingly been all too easy during the past three or four decades for some people to fall into the error of attempting to shape agricultural legislation by pledging blind allegiance to some seemingly sound single principle which would be clearly perceived to be invalid were all pertinent factors clearly apparent and weighed carefully.

Differences in legislative approaches to the low-income problem and the imbalance between agricultural income and agricultural costs and, indeed, the high governmental cost of many programs which have been operative in the past several years have stemmed in large part from differences in appreciation of the various factors which should have been considered before attempting to prescribe the remedy.

For example, we must recognize that there are differentials in values according to end-use of many agricultural commodities, differences in the value of fluid milk in the bottle and of milk which goes into manufactured dairy products, differences in the value of choice citrus fruit and of surplus citrus products which can go into frozen concentrate or even into feed pulp, differences between the value of high quality wheat for human food and wheat

which goes into feed grain use or international commerce. Unless we recognize such differentials there are bound to be fundamental differences with respect to the acceptability of legislation proposing that there be "quotas" of any sort, even quotas for determination of the quality of milk, citrus products, wheat or any other agricultural product which would be eligible for a base price.

In my judgment these factors have retarded America by contributing to an imbalance between agricultural return and return on nonagricultural labor and nonagricultural investment. Inequitable income and inequitable purchasing power in the hands of American farmers and other producers of new wealth have contributed to an underemployment situation which has plagued America for many years. Thus the economic growth of our nation as a whole has been retarded to the point that the United States is the only major industrial complex in all the world that has had continuing and chronic unemployment, even though unemployment has been at a relatively low level.

PROTECTION OF NONFARM ECONOMY

We must not lose sight of the fact that the low-income problem of American agriculture will not be solved by the simple elimination of unsound farm programs. Neither will it be solved by the simple elimination of increasing numbers of American farmers. This is true because such programs as we have had are not the sole cause or even the primary cause of our low-income farm problem. Instead, the problem is, to a very great extent, a result of a comprehensive and extensive structure of governmental programs designed to protect the income of those in nonagricultural segments of the American economy.

Somehow we simply must find a way to get our fellow Americans to understand that wages and prices established under this protective system — protective for our industrial pricing structure and protective for American wage levels — automatically become farmers' production costs as well as living costs. Herein lies the primary source of our farm income problem, affecting wheat farmers, dairy farmers, feed-grain and livestock producers alike.

World Wars I and II generated imbalances between nutritional needs and supplies of wheat and other bread grains — also imbalances with respect to other raw materials and new wealth in the world. These imbalances also generated protective devices including restraints upon trade which influenced U.S. farm

income very substantially. But most important, to fail to understand this is to invite further difficulties for ourselves, for lack of understanding of these fundamental facts has given rise to many of the differences of opinion within American agriculture that have retarded our progress toward objectives and goals completely compatible with our own national well-being and in the best interest of the cause of our American type of freedom.

NEED TO REDUCE TRADE BARRIERS

The necessity for reducing barriers to trade is now universally recognized by the free nations of the world, as witness the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the European Economic Community (Common Market) and our own long-standing Reciprocal Trade Agreements program, which has just received new impetus from the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Farm people, along with other Americans, recognize the necessity for reducing barriers to trade and have given their support to the instruments which have been developed to this end.

At the same time, however, we must do everything in our power to see that Americans in other walks of life understand that the right of farmers to have levels of protection from the influence of the full, free international market — levels that are comparable to the levels of protection afforded to nonagricultural labor and nonagricultural investment — is not incompatible with the long-time objective to which we are dedicated. That objective is to progressively reduce barriers to the flow of goods and services among the free nations of the world. For example, it is in this light that the propriety and reasonableness of the wheat certificate program as an instrument to achieve such levels of protection to the American wheat producer in terms of a soundly balanced American economy should be presented and evaluated.

We must modify agricultural legislation as necessary to permit farm people effectively to regulate their own marketings so as to continue to give Americans the greatest bargain in history in the necessities of life, in the products of agriculture. At the same time, we must recognize even more than heretofore the necessity of making our highly efficient agriculture an even greater asset in the world-wide civil war. Willingly or unwillingly, we are in it — and it will determine the sort of economic, political, social and cultural structure under which we and citizens of the world, including our children, will live and operate in the years to come.

9

Goals for the American Economy

ROBERT J. LAMPMAN¹

I SHALL approach the topic of goals and values for agriculture by way of a review of goals for the economy.

The CEA is not centrally involved in agricultural policy. It does undertake to interpret developments in all broad sectors, including agriculture, and to relate them to the over-all performance of the American economy. The CEA was called into being for that purpose by the Employment Act of 1946.

It assists the President in reviewing the state of the economy and in recommending policies which will promote the goals expressed in the Employment Act. In advising the President the CEA reports and evaluates facts, makes forecasts and appraises policy choices. These choices are necessarily appraised in the light of a vision of what is both desirable and possible. The validity of policy choices often hinges as much upon an understanding of how the economy works as it does upon resolve to accomplish a set of goals.

Our emphasis here is upon goals, and the following is a summary statement concerning them. Goals for a complex economy which operates in a democratic setting can never be stated with finality. In this country, government does not, of course, set forth a detailed plan of output or a catalog of specifically directed performances. Rather, under our free institutions, individuals and groups make their own choices as to producing and consuming, spending and saving. In our society the powers of government are limited and success or failure in reaching economic objectives turns on the energies and initiative of our citizens in their capacities as businessmen, workers and farmers. Government provides a basic framework within which such

¹ Staff member, President's Council of Economic Advisors.

choices are to be made, sometimes limiting the range of the permissible, sometimes enlarging the range of the feasible. Maximizing the free choices effectively open to all individuals is the basic aim of economic policy in a democracy where ultimate value is the integrity and dignity of the individual human being.

A SET OF INTERRELATED GOALS

National economic policy seeks a reasonable accommodation among a variety of related but sometimes partially conflicting goals. These goals are concerned not only with the quantity of goods and services produced, but also with the quality and composition of the output, the equity of its distribution, the nature of its final uses, and the character of the economic system and institutions themselves.

The authors of the Employment Act of 1946 referred to a complex of goals. They declared the government's interest in "creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power."

By these words the act indicates concern for both goals and methods, for both means and ends, for both quantitative and qualitative measures of achievement. "Useful employment opportunities" are ends. They are also the means to higher production; and production, in turn, is a means to the final use and enjoyment of goods and services. Similarly, the act refers to the context within which the more immediate goals are to be sought. Thus, maximum employment is to be sought "in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare."

The major goals which Americans set for their economy and among which they seek a workable balance are as follows:

- full employment and full utilization of the nation's productive capacity
- satisfactory growth of capacity to produce
- efficient use and allocation of that capacity
- fair sharing of output and of opportunity
- reasonable stability in the general level of prices
- meeting the economic responsibilities of world leadership.

Full Employment and Utilization

The goal of full utilization centers attention upon employment of labor and use of existing capital and available resources. Failure to achieve this goal means that the creative energies of some workers go unused and that the full productive potential of the economy is not called into action. The waste of such underutilization is irretrievable; the unused productive power of past years is forever lost. Such underutilization excludes some individuals from participation in the economy. It involves severe hardship to many unemployed persons and to their families. Full utilization is the key to successful economic performance; failure to achieve it may frustrate the pursuit of many other goals. A persistent gap between actual and potential production is indefensible economic waste.

Growth of Capacity

The rate of economic growth will determine the extent to which increasing millions will be able to enjoy a better, more rewarding and more secure life tomorrow.

However, without full use of existing capacity it is difficult to achieve a high rate of growth of the capacity to produce. With a labor force that is growing by 1.6 percent a year there is some "built-in" growth of capacity, but if there is to be growth in output and income per worker, there must be improvement in the quality of the labor force, net additions to plant and equipment and introduction of improved technology.

Efficient Use and Allocation

Resources should be not only fully employed but employed where and in such a way that their productive contributions are greatest. Sometimes goods produced are of less value to consumers than others not produced — this may happen because of arbitrary tax advantages or ill-considered subsidies. Sometimes monopolistic power is exploited to restrict production in order to keep prices or wages up, even though new business firms and new workers are willing to produce and take jobs. Practices of this kind distort the distribution of income and lower the standard of living for society as a whole.

A free market economy, relying on private incentives and

reflecting private choices, allocates and uses resources efficiently in most situations. But there are also cases in which efficiency demands that private productive activities be supplemented by public undertakings. The clearest example of such an activity is national defense. We all have a stake in a strong defense in today's world, and there is no way to provide it except through the federal government.

The features of a "public good" which stand out so clearly in the case of national defense are present in some degree in almost all major programs of government at all levels. We travel the same highways, waterways and airways; we enjoy the same national parks and forests; we are protected by the same police and fire departments; our health depends on the same measures and facilities for public sanitation.

And we all reap the benefits of living in an educated society. Our whole society depends, in ways we take for granted, on our ability to communicate with each other. Widespread education and training are essential to technical progress. A better educated citizen also makes a greater contribution to the political process, to organizations to which he devotes a part of his leisure time and to the lives of those around him. Further, education, like defense, yields nationwide benefits in addition to the benefits to individuals and to local governments. The economy is nationwide, the political processes of our democracy are national in scope and the population is increasingly mobile within the nation. Hence, there is a specifically national interest in and responsibility for supporting education.

Fair Sharing of Output and Opportunity

Equality of opportunity for all persons without regard to color or creed or inherited circumstances is a central part of the American dream. A high level of employment is an important step toward this goal. Unemployment hits first and hardest the least fortunate, the least skilled, the least trained members of our society.

The American goal is equality of opportunity, not equality of condition. We recognize the social interest in rewarding achievement and effort. But equality of opportunity places limits upon the tolerable degree of inequality of condition. It is particularly our obligation as a democratic society to prevent the misfortunes of one generation from limiting the economic destinies of the next. Without good health and decent education and individual does not have a fair opportunity. Social insurance, public assistance

and social service programs assure a minimum level of living below which individuals are not expected to fall. By these means governments can assist families in building defenses against the economic losses associated with unemployment, disability and old-age. Equity in the distribution of income is an important goal of our tax structure and of our policies to prevent or regulate private monopoly power.

Price Stability

Reasonable stability of the general price level is necessary for achieving the goals of efficiency, equity and international equilibrium. Instability in the general price level can lead both to inequities and to inefficiencies. A sharp general rise in prices disrupts business relationships and undermines the purchasing power of incomes and assets of fixed recovery values. Inflation amounts to an arbitrary system of taxes and subsidies, numbering among its taxpaying victims groups, including retired persons, with the least defenses against hardship. Of special importance, a rapid rate of inflation can disarrange our trade relationships with other countries, thereby requiring painful adjustments among industries that sell abroad or which rely upon imported materials. Inflation is of concern at this time particularly because of its impact upon our balance of payments.

Fulfilling the Economic Responsibilities of World Leadership

The United States has undertaken large commitments around the world to defend freedom and to aid the rapid economic development of the free nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America. One goal of economic policy is therefore a large enough surplus in our trade and private capital transactions with foreign countries to pay for defense and foreign aid. Confidence in the dollar must be maintained because it is the key reserve currency in the system of international monetary payments.

Striking a Balance

These several economic goals are interrelated, and in many respects complementary. Full utilization of existing capacity will facilitate the further growth of productive potential and the elimination of inefficient practices. Higher employment, greater

production and faster growth will in turn improve opportunities for many individuals whom a weak and sluggish economy passes by. At the same time, investment in educating and training these individuals will help to accelerate national economic progress.

But on some occasions, conflicts may arise among the goals. More specifically, the means proposed to achieve one goal may be inconsistent with the achievement of other goals. Some measures to improve efficiency and incentives are bound to increase inequality in income and wealth. Like other industrial countries, the U.S. has sometimes faced a conflict between high utilization on the one hand and price stability on the other. In some respects, particularly those of monetary policy, the needs of domestic expansion may be at odds with those of external equilibrium. But measures can usually be found which contribute simultaneously to several goals and interfere only minimally, if at all, with others.

BROAD TYPES OF ECONOMIC POLICY

The preceding is an overly simplified statement of goals. It does not reflect all the concerns of particular groups or sections of the country. Nor does it give sufficient attention to the prices that must be paid to achieve goals. These "prices" are indicated by policies advocated in pursuit of goals.

Chairman Walter W. Heller, in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, recently summarized the main lines of economic policy of the Kennedy administration under three headings. First, policies to increase the productive capacity of the economy. Second, policies to increase demand for both consumer goods and investment goods. And third, policies to accommodate, adapt and re-adapt the nation's economic resources, especially manpower, to the demands of a dynamic and growing economy.

With regard to increasing the productive capacity of the country, he referred to the possibility of raising the annual rate of growth in our gross national product from its recent level of 2.7 percent to over 4 percent. To do this will require allocation of a larger share of our capacity output to investment in research, education and physical capital.

One important measure toward achieving this higher rate of growth is bringing about higher utilization of the existing capacity to produce, and one way to do this is to induce a higher level of demand by expansive fiscal policy of the type proposed by the administration. This is a policy to absorb the manpower released by increases in the capacity to produce.

The third type of policy reviewed by Chairman Heller is integral with the first two. Along with growth and high levels of demand, a successful economy will have problems of change — change in the final products we will consume, change in the methods and location of production, change in the nature of jobs that are to be done. These changes arise because of shifts in consumer preferences, because of the continuing flow of discoveries and inventions and because of new developments in world trade.

All of these changes require that individuals adapt and re-adapt in their role as producers. Further, they call for governmental programs such as the Area Redevelopment Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the re-training and relocation provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

AGRICULTURE IN THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The relationship between growth of capacity to produce and the need for change is dramatically illustrated by the case of agriculture.

In 1962 agriculture was using slightly less land (10 percent less) and considerably less labor (38 percent less) than in 1950. Yet total farm production was 25 percent higher. Prices of all farm products were 7 percent lower in 1962 than in 1950. Total farm income in this period fell about \$1 billion (from \$15.7 billion to \$14.8 billion) in current prices, but net income per farm, in 1962 prices, rose from \$2,951 to \$3,525.

In 1963 there are almost a third fewer farms than there were in 1950. The farm population is 9 million smaller than it was at that time and has fallen from 15 to less than 8 percent of the total population. Fewer people live on farms than in what is called the "standard consolidated area" of New York City. And people living on farms receive a third of their income from non-farm sources. The total personal income received by the farm population is 4 percent of the national total. The income from farm sources (\$15 billion) is only a little more than the amount (\$11 billion) the federal government pays in the form of wages and salaries to its military personnel.

The production of more with less labor time, by means of more capital and superior technology, is what is meant by economic growth. Agriculture has certainly done its share toward the achievement of that national objective, with product per man-hour rising at an average rate of about 8 percent per year, well above the national average. This statistical disparity is due in

some part to the departure from agriculture of many of the less productive workers who have accommodated a rise of the national average by moving to what were for them higher productivity employments.

It is a truism that national product would be maximized by a continuing transfer of labor out of agriculture until the value of the additional product of one more worker in nonagricultural employment is equal to the value of the loss occasioned by his departure from agriculture. From the point of view of the national economy, and abstracting from a number of value-judgment issues, agricultural policy may be evaluated by the contribution which it can make to increasing national income and product. Does it facilitate increases in agricultural productivity and at the same time facilitate movement out of agriculture to higher value employments? In 1963 one-third of the farms produced over three-fourths of the value of farm output, and this means that there are many very-low-value producers in agriculture.

Here we see a clear connection between the so-called farm problem and the problems of continuing slack in the total economy. Clearly, one of the greatest contributions government can make to the farm population is to maintain a growing over-all demand for the expanding quantity of goods and services which our increasing population is capable of producing. This will continue to open new opportunities for those on farms as well as in cities.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We have asserted that there is a set of goals which Americans set for their economy. These include high-level employment, economic growth, efficiency, equity, reasonable price stability and world economic leadership. Making policy often requires that we strike a balance or make some "trade-off" among these several goals.

Federal economic policy is pursuing three main lines. These are increasing the productive capacity of the economy, increasing demand for both consumer and investment goods and adapting resources to changing demands.

American agriculture gives us a dramatic example of the possibilities of rapid economic growth. It also demonstrates the need for continuing increases in the level of total demand and for assistance to individuals in adapting to the changing needs of the economy.

Americans are living in an environment of great promise for

fulfillment of economic goals. As President Kennedy said in his economic report, "The decade ahead presents a most favorable gathering of forces for economic progress. Arrayed before us are a growing and increasingly skilled labor force, accelerating scientific and technological advances and a wealth of new opportunities for innovation at home and for commerce in the world."

It is most appropriate, therefore, that there should be conferences on goals and values to give direction to this "most favorable gathering of forces," which can give us economic progress and an improved quality of life.

10

The National Farmers Organization

OREN LEE STALEY¹

THE AMERICAN FARMER has really been the conservative balance wheel of America. From rural America have come many of the great leaders of our nation. These great leaders have been made, in my opinion, due to the fact that they lived in a rural community, grew up where they met the problems of everyday living and started early to make decisions of their own, unlike children who grew up in a city.

Today these people are forced to leave the farm. But they face a completely different setting, which we are trying to overcome by building playgrounds, by building many other modern facilities considered important in our society.

What we have here is, I think, dreadful. Not that I am trying to say that once they leave the farms they do not have good moral characters. But the farm is the ideal setting — the family in a rural community. We see this family actually disappearing, due largely to economic forces.

We should take a look at the rest of the world to see that as countries have developed they have gone in many instances toward totalitarian governments of some type. In these you always see the disappearance of family farms. When the cycle is completed, the result is government dictatorship of some kind and government ownership eventually. As family farms disappear they are replaced by a corporate agriculture with a few large landowners. And then those nations that have returned to a true democracy have divided up the land again. This is one of the first things that happens in many of these foreign nations as the change develops from some type of totalitarian government back to a democracy.

¹ President, National Farmers Organization.

TRENDS IN AGRICULTURE

There is a trend toward a corporate agriculture — a vertically-integrated agriculture. It gets the blessing of people that are supposed to be intelligent. People supposed to be the best observers of what is happening in agriculture actually are saying that this is the type of agriculture we should have. This, to me, shows a lack of understanding of the problems of rural America, the problems of our nation and, in the end, lack of understanding of what has happened in other nations. We had better take a leaf from history and note what has happened and what is happening in America. Now if this sounds alarming, it is just that we are about to have a complete development of a corporate, vertically integrated agriculture. This is more of a reality than many people realize.

I once saw a publication giving some government statistics. This report pointed out that in about 1958 there were predictions that one million farmers would leave the farm in the ten-year period from 1960 to 1970. This report showed that it is not going to take that ten-year period but is going to be accomplished in five years. It indicated that 150,000 left in 1960, 150,000 in 1961 and more than 200,000 in 1962, and it predicted that far more than 200,000 will leave again this year. This is going to happen in a period of five years. But this is not going to stop at the end of five years because the same factors which cause this to happen will continue to operate unless we do something about it.

What is really happening in rural America? I think my community is typical of any community. Not long ago, I visited friends living ten miles from my home. They brought to me the stark realization that this is far more serious than I had realized during my travels to many areas. They talked about a fertile area of northwest Missouri, a good productive agricultural area. This family told about a situation that is common throughout rural America. Of the farmers living on a ten-mile stretch of road in a fertile agricultural area they could only think of three that they considered to be young farmers. And when they named them, I didn't consider two of them as young as my friends did. One of them was 42 and the other one was 39. The other farmer was 33 years old.

My friends had worked hard all their lives. They had reared three boys. They had hoped that one of these boys would stay on the farm. Consequently they had made sacrifices beyond just doing without luxuries; in some cases they have gone without necessities. They had accumulated quite a lot of land and now they were in their late sixties, with not a boy there. One son had

started out farming and had decided that he could get a better livelihood by going to town. Who was going to take this large farming operation over? Were they going to rent it out or hire a hired man? This was impossible. This is the situation all over America.

When they sell that farm or when it changes hands, what happens? In all likelihood it won't be a young farmer who will buy this operation. It will be someone with 10, 15 or 20 years of labor, experience and investment behind him. He will not have a \$100,000 investment. He will probably tie that with another \$100,000 investment. And when this happens he will have farm units from then on representing a \$200,000 investment.

At some point the investment becomes so high that the means of getting the young farmer started in the farming business has been destroyed. So much capital has been brought together that there is no way of really dividing it. The only thing that can really take that operation over in the end will be a corporate structure or a vertically integrated set-up. In such an operation, outside capital is first. Outside capital carries on the operation, and those that do the actual work are, for all practical purposes, nothing more than hired men.

This is the situation throughout rural America. Some people say it is unimportant because only 8 percent of the population are farmers. We could even do without that 8 percent as far as economists in our country are concerned. It doesn't make any difference whether you are 8 percent of the population or whether you are 25 percent of the population as far as spending or the cost of the production of agricultural commodities is concerned; it is still the same as far as land is concerned, largely speaking. When farmers' profits are not sufficient to buy new tractors, new trucks, paint buildings and build new fences, there is a great drag on the entire economy.

This does not refer to just the 8 percent of the people that live on the farm. This includes the people that live in every rural town in America, that take up another good-sized percentage of the population. This is at least 20 percent of the people, and more likely 30 percent of the people who are directly affected by the income level of farmers. It is important because there is not a single town in the state of Iowa that does not depend on agriculture. In this great Midwest, the heart of the agricultural area, there is not a town under 15,000 that has any other source of income for all practical purposes than the purchasing power of the American farmer, even though there may be a small factory in the town.

Those small rural communities are service centers for

American farmers. That is the only reason they are there. When farmers leave the farm, the same percentage of those service centers necessary to accommodate the farmers in that area are forced to leave also. So all this adds up to one of the basic reasons why there is a continuing economic drag in this country. As many economists pointed out in the past, the level of agricultural prices has been one of the major causes of depression. There are many built-in factors today that did not exist in the past. But still there is a greater backlog of purchasing power in our American agriculture than in any other segment of our economy. So it does not only affect directly the farmer but it affects also every American. Therefore, let us look at the type of economy we have. The average age of farmers is considerably above 50. In any rural community very few of the boys and girls graduating from high school are staying on the farm. Most polls indicate that very few parents are even suggesting that their children stay on the farm. Not because they do not like the rural community, not because they do not like their farms, but because there is a lack of profit in the American agricultural industry. The entire industry, representing more than 13 percent of the nation's total investment, last year returned less than 3.1 percent of the national income.

It is not good business for the American farmer to continue to operate this way. Those leaving the farm are leaving it because of (1) age, desire to take social security or health reasons or (2) economic reasons. The latter can be divided into two categories. Either they have lived off their depreciation as long as they can or else they, as businessmen, can see that they are going to use up their depreciation and therefore take what assets they have left and go into some other field. They likely may pick up a lunch bucket, with no investment, and enjoy a far higher standard of living than on the farm. This adds not only to the problems of rural communities but also to the total problems of urban areas.

I'm not saying that the farmer must have a larger farm than 50 years ago to be a part of the modern agricultural technological industry. But there is more to having an efficient industry than just being efficient in production. The guide rules of economics in every other segment of our economy say increase your efficiency and you'll increase your profits. But this has been untrue as far as agriculture is concerned. In fact as we have increased our efficiency we have really been penalized for that efficiency. We have become the most efficient industry in America and in the world. We have more than doubled our efficiency in the last ten years. Fewer people produce more food than our people consume.

We can be proud of our efficiency; we can be proud of our achievements. With one hour's wages the American people are able to buy more food than ever before in history. We have been able to subsidize the rest of the economy with low agricultural incomes. We have done this as a result of long hours of labor and a lower standard of living simply because we enjoy living in rural communities and have been willing to make the sacrifices necessary in order to stay on the farm. This is a fast changing situation. The area is dotted with commercial feedlots. We hear more and more about vertical integration, about contracts with processors, chain stores and such. We see this agricultural economy tying directly from the financial standpoint to outside investment interests for the first time.

We must not only be efficient in producing but also efficient in selling. We of the NFO have supported any legislative programs or administration policies that we feel will increase farm income. This we feel is not only the duty but the responsibility of any farm organization that is supposed to be representing farmers. We feel that if we do not support efforts that will increase farm income until farmers have equitable prices we would not be fulfilling our responsibility to farm organizations.

WHAT NFO IS DOING

The NFO has supported and will continue to support any legislative programs and administrative policies to increase farm income. We in the NFO strongly advise our members, for example, to vote "yes" on the wheat referendum. The passage of the proposed wheat program will either make or break the farmer. We are joining with the National Wheat Growers, National Farmers Union, MFA and Grange.

What do we feel is the basic problem that the American farmer faces? Our feeling is that if we want to succeed in the type of agriculture we have, we must make a profit.

It doesn't make any difference whether a man is a farmer or a businessman living on the corner of Main street. He must profit in his business or he will start to live off his depreciation. When this happens, his days and years are numbered because it only takes about so long until he has to risk his capital assets even to stay in business. It then comes to the point that he has to make the decision of risking further capital assets or of taking the assets that he has and getting out of that business and into some other.

This is the situation of many farmers today. They are trying

to determine whether to keep their assets and their liabilities in agriculture. This is a decision they must make in the next two or three years, and it can vitally affect the entire future of American agriculture. It is said that the inefficient must go. But for many it's not a matter of inefficiency; it's only a matter of reserve. It makes a great deal of difference when a man started farming. If he started in 1938 or 1940 his farming operation was uninterrupted during World War II. He can be an efficient farmer in the eyes of many people because he can continue to farm. He has a reserve.

But those who came back from World War II and enjoyed two or three years of high farm prices face a different situation. They may be far more efficient than the farmer who started farming in 1938 or 1940 or 1942 or 1944. But it is a matter of reserve. We recognize that in any business or in any industry a man must be efficient in producing. Efficiency is the basic principle of the American free enterprise system. But at the same time we must not say that people are inefficient because they are forced to leave the farm due to circumstances beyond their control. That is not a matter of inefficiency; that is a matter of having started at an inopportune time, and this is the situation developing throughout rural America. There is more that goes into an efficient industry than just efficiency in producing. There must be efficiency and effectiveness.

First, farmers must organize, because there is no substitute for organized strength in an organized economy. If farmers want to price their products, they must go to the market place with equal or greater strength than those that buy their products. Therefore, they cannot solve their problems and then organize. They must organize to solve their problems. This we have been doing over a large territory covering the areas from the Pennsylvania line to western Kansas and Nebraska, from Canada to Kentucky and Oklahoma.

Secondly, farmers must bring together enough of the total production so that the present marketing system cannot fulfill their needs from other sources. Every effort in the past has been directed towards an area of agriculture, and the processors — the buyers of farm commodities at this point — only move supplies from one area to the other and kill the efforts in that local area. A state may be considered a local area in this type of agricultural economy because it doesn't take very long to transport hogs, cattle or milk four or five hundred miles. Therefore, the total supply is affected. If the total supply is not affected, it means that the present buyers of farm commodities only assist each other in meeting problems. Only when the total supply is

affected will the processors providing farm commodities fight each other for the available supplies.

Third, all the production in America can be brought together, but if the farmer does not use his bargaining power and make his bargaining power felt, he would still not have a collective bargaining organization. All he would have done is to establish another marketing agency. It doesn't make any difference whether farmers go to the market places as individuals or in packs and say, "What will you give me?" If you would establish the ability of farmers to price their products, you first must organize, secondly bring together enough of the total supply so that the present marketing system cannot fulfill their needs from other sources. Then you must make your bargaining power felt.

And how do you make your bargaining power felt? By the use of holding actions. There has never been a commodity or a service priced in America on which the holding action has not been used. If you do not believe holding actions are widely used just try to drive up to a filling station, pay what you think is a fair profit and drive on home. Or go into your market for a quart of milk, pay what you think is fair, and go on home with it. They'd send a sheriff after you. They'd probably charge you with stealing. This has been happening to American farmers for years. They have hardly raised a hand to complain.

Holding actions are not to be used indiscriminately. They are not to be used just for the fun of it. They are to be used for a specific purpose — to bring constant pressure on processors and buyers of farm commodities. In other words, if it were not for the fact that labor, for example, can use the strike or the threat of the strike, they would never get any contracts with an employer. Similarly a businessman could not maintain his position in the economy if he let his products be sold as farmers try to sell their products.

These three steps would be useless without a final step. And that fourth step is contracts with processors in order to stabilize prices and marketing conditions into the future. Without contracts you have no ability to maintain any gains that you have achieved, and without contracts you cannot meet your marketing problems. Therefore there is more to pricing products for American farmers than just establishing a temporary price. You must meet the marketing problems of the American industry. Products for which a price can be got must be allowed on the market. Products for which a price cannot be obtained must be diverted from normal market channels and production.

Many of these problems can be met only through contracts with processors. These are the things we have been moving

forward on. We have been doing it under NFO, to which only farmers and producers can belong. This means that whenever they join the NFO they sign a membership agreement. This membership agreement authorizes the NFO to be the bargaining agent for all the commodities marketed from their farms with the exception of those presently covered by marketing contracts. But they are free to market as they choose until a contract is consummated with the processors. The only way a contract can be consummated with a processor is by a two-thirds vote of the members attending meetings. A ten-day written notice must be given, indicating name, time, place and purpose of meeting. Members sign a three-year membership.

Today a small percentage of the total production is used to kill the price level on all production, either in one commodity or all commodities. Therefore, there is another basic principle that we must not overlook. That is, we cannot just work on one commodity. If we were to try to raise the price level of just one commodity, we would have very short-lived success. Every farmer would want to start producing that commodity. But if we work on all the commodities, raising the general price level, then there can be no expanding or transferring of one commodity to the other any more than there is today. But it means then that agricultural production will be increased; the size of the entire agricultural fund will have to be increased. Past history — the 1890's, the early 1900's, the 1920's, the 1930's and again now — shows that the greatest increase in agricultural production has been in the years of the cost-price squeeze. It did not come during the years when the OPA went off nor in the times of the higher price levels. There is always the time when farmers are trying to meet their obligations in a cost-price squeeze.

The contracts the NFO is signing with processors are quite numerous. Some said we would never get any farmers to join our organization, that when we started talking about holding actions we would never have one. Some said that processors would never talk to us. And some said we'd never sign any contracts. We would never have signed any contracts if it had not been for our all-out holding action. As a result of the strength we showed with that holding action, we have been able to continue to look forward to signing contracts with processors, and when progress slows down it is our responsibility, of course, at the most opportune time, to use the strength of our organization to put enough pressure on processors that they will continue to bargain in good faith.

These master contracts recognize the problems of our industry. They also recognize the problems of the processors. A

base price is established. There are seasonal variation prices according to the difference in cost of production throughout the year. There is a surplus disposal program set up with these master contracts. A master contract will not go into effect unless 60 percent of the total U.S. output has been contracted for. With one exception this provision is contained in all of our master contracts, that is on Grade A, Class 1 milk which is represented by the 60 percent of the 10-state midwestern area output. Finally, let me mention our master contracts for livestock. I've tried about three times to out-guess the markets. I raise about four or five hundred head of hogs a year. I've looked at those hogs and estimated that they would weigh 200 pounds. I checked the market and found out that they didn't like them if they were under 200 pounds. If I missed my guess a little, if my hogs shrank a little more than I expected, they would drop the price maybe 75 cents a hundred, maybe \$1.00 or \$1.25. They liked hogs around 230 or 240. So I decided to feed them to that weight. When the hogs got there, they liked them at 190 to 210.

Our master contract provides that if they try to change our incentives, they have to raise the general price level. This could have taken care of any excess tonnage in the past in our opinion. If not, we have to use our surplus disposal program.

A farmer who went to the market one day with his cattle was told that if he had been there the week before, the price would have been much better. He said, "I've been selling cattle 30 years and I told them so, and I told them I never sold last week yet."

We believe this is a problem of our industry. We don't know what all the problems may be as time goes on, but we know that no longer can farmers as individuals meet these problems. In an organized economy they are either going to organize and meet their problems as an organized industry, or they are going to have to relegate themselves to lower and lower incomes and a lower and lower standard of living. This is their choice.

11

Goals and Values in American Agriculture: The Protestant Program

HENRY A. McCANNA¹

I. ETHICAL GOALS FOR AGRICULTURAL POLICY

A CHRISTIAN ETHICAL APPROACH to agriculture begins with the acknowledgment that "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. . . ." God, the Creator, has given man a special position in the world, with a specific responsibility for the fruits of the earth and towards all living things. This is the stewardship of the earth's resources for the nourishment and the enrichment of human life. Thus the production of food and fiber — the primary task of farmers — becomes a service to God and man.

In the light of basic Christian concepts, the National Council of Churches affirms certain major goals of agricultural policy and commends them to the churches and to the consciences of Christian men and women.

A. Opportunity for the Full and Wholesome Development of Persons

General farm organizations, farmer cooperatives and government should be encouraged to develop programs which will enlarge the opportunities for low-income farm families to earn adequate incomes and achieve satisfactory levels of living, either on or off the farm, as the sound basis for wholesome personality growth.

¹Executive Director, Division of Home Missions, National Council on the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

**B. Preservation of the Integrity of the
Farm Family and the Enrichment
of Rural Family Life**

Preservation and extension of the efficient family-type farm as the predominant pattern of American agriculture should be a conscious goal of our national policy.

**C. The Encouragement of Voluntary Association,
Cooperation and Mutual Aid
Among Farm People**

The churches should encourage full membership participation in such organizations of mutual aid and cooperation as a genuine contribution to both Christian and democratic ideals for society.

**D. Conservation of Nature's Resources and
their Development for the Legitimate
Uses of Mankind**

The churches must help all people to see that each of us owes a portion of the cost of conserving the nations' soil fertility.

**E. Adequate and Healthful Diets for the
World's Growing Populations**

Within sound conservation practices and in the light of real national and world need, sustained and realistic abundance in agricultural production should be encouraged.

**F. Fair and Reasonably Stable Levels of Income
for Farm Producers**

Justice demands that farmers who produce efficiently and abundantly, where such production is in the national interest, should not suffer from this fact but should receive economic rewards comparable with those received by persons of similar competence in other vocations.

G. Recognition of Human Interdependence on a National and World Scale

Programs which seek to advance the interests of agriculture to the detriment of other groups or other nations should be shunned.

II. ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE INTERNATIONAL AGE OF AGRICULTURE

God's concern for the needs of all his children for nourishment, both for body and soul, is revealed in his act of creation and in the gift of his Son, Jesus Christ. Our Lord made perfectly clear that man's duty to God includes the production and sharing of the material necessities of life. He described the conditions of salvation at the ultimate judgment to include the fact that we did — or did not — "feed the hungry and clothe the naked."

In today's world the gap is wide, and in some areas widening, between the need for food and available food supplies. A large proportion of the world's population still lives in malnutrition and hunger. A few nations enjoy plenty; with us, agricultural surpluses are a continuing problem. Such nations have achieved a major breakthrough in agricultural technology.

In fact, so great has been the advance in the science of agriculture and in the potential for producing reasonable food supplies for all people that the era now emerging and in prospect has been characterized as the international age of agriculture.

The major challenge of this age is to devise ways to make available to the areas of greatest need both surpluses of food now being produced and the knowledge of how to increase the production of food from their own fields. Growing populations present a further problem and, even with our present rate of technological advance, it cannot be taken for granted that we can continuously feed the growing population of the future.

A. Sharing Our Food Supplies

We welcome the fact that a broader idea of surplus utilization is now being put forward by responsible national leaders under concepts of "Food for Peace." The main focus is not on reduction of our stockpiles and storage bill but on the need of permanent freedom from hunger here and elsewhere.

B. Sharing Technological Knowledge and Experience

We have the opportunity and responsibility to share with others the skills and knowledge which have been so important in the development of our own agriculture. We commend the progress that has been made through both government and privately supported programs of technical assistance. The churches have a responsibility to assure continuance of the notable contribution of their missionaries. We believe more should be trained in agriculture and home economics.

C. Sharing Economic Aid for Agriculture and Food Production

Peoples in the early stages of economic development desperately need capital resources. The gap between this need and the capital resources available from government and private foreign investments is still wide.

In supporting enlarged programs of economic aid to underdeveloped countries by this country and the United Nations, church people, with their deep concern for relief of hunger, should stress the need for special attention to projects which directly promote food production and distribution.

D. Role of Religious and Other Voluntary Organizations

The National Council of Churches and its predecessors have consistently pressed concern for economic development and raising the levels of life of people around the world. Especially through its Departments of International Affairs and the Church and Economic Life, the churches have conducted major campaigns of education and action, have set forth policies, have represented the concerns of the churches to the United Nations and the United States government, and have stimulated both corporate and individual Christian responsibility in relation to humanities' problems of hunger and need. Our Christian faith, our experience in this field and the desperate plight of most of mankind all impel us to continuing and more effective efforts in these concerns.

The National Council of Churches also, through Church World Service, has cooperated with other nongovernmental organizations

in the distribution of food to persons in need throughout the world. These agencies and their overseas affiliates carry on programs for distribution of relief supplies (including food furnished through the United States government under Public Law 480) and technical assistance in over 100 countries. A recent report to the President with reference to the food distribution phase of P.L. 480 stated that "seventy-five million American people support this program through their gifts, their work and their membership in these voluntary organizations." In spite of many complex problems involved, experience has demonstrated both the economic effectiveness and the humanitarian value of this program through voluntary agencies. It should continue to receive the generous support of churches and church people.

E. A Major Global Program

Also commended for support by governments and people of every nation is the world-wide, five-year Freedom-from-Hunger Campaign by the U.N. specialized agency, the Food and Agriculture Organization.

In both purpose and scope this program is commended to our churches and their members. It received the endorsement of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches at its meeting in August 1960. Our churches and church people can contribute tangibly to this constructive effort by informing themselves of the specific needs and objectives of the campaign; encouraging our government to increase its support of the FAO and projects related to its Freedom-from-Hunger campaign; and giving generously to Church World Service so that it with other religious agencies may support projects of self-help and development encompassed by this world-wide program.

III. NATIONAL GOALS FOR THE FIFTH DECADE OF THE MIGRANT MINISTRY

The Migrant Ministry of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. is a Christian ministry. Its foundation is the Lordship of Christ over all of life. Its motivation is Christ's command to "Feed my sheep." Its over-arching purpose is that the more abundant life which Christ came to make available shall indeed be the experience of all God's children who are involved in the tending and harvesting of the nation's crops.

"Abundant life" for Christians means first of all the

redeeming knowledge and love of our Lord Jesus Christ as personal Saviour. It also includes first-class political citizenship, adequate economic levels of living and normal acceptance in the human community.

Abundant life speaks also of individual integrity and participation, duty as well as right, responsibility as well as privilege.

The Migrant Ministry, with equal loving concern for both the farm workers and grower-employers, seeks an abundant life for all, with a balance of spiritual, cultural and material factors.

A. Presentation of the Christian Faith and Call to Discipleship

A primary concern of the Migrant Ministry is that seasonally employed agricultural wage-workers and their families shall have access to such basic ministries of the Christian faith as evangelism, worship and Christian education.

B. Reduction of Agricultural Migrancy to a Minimum

The Migrant Ministry will work to reduce the demand for migratory labor to a minimum through mechanization, diversification of crops, more thorough utilization of local labor supply and all other available methods.

C. Elimination of Foreign Farm Labor Importation Programs

This goal refers specifically and exclusively to the special importance of foreign contract workers for temporary agricultural employment such as that going on under the authority of Public Law 78.

D. Provision of Basic Education and Vocational Training Opportunities for Farm Workers

Governmental and private groups, including the Migrant Ministry itself, will contribute substantially to this goal to the extent that they succeed in involving the people themselves in planning and carrying out educational processes.

E. Extension of Educational Opportunity
for the Children of
Migratory Families

Demonstration of educational projects will be continued by the Migrant Ministry with the aim of stimulating public schools to discharge their legal and moral obligations in this regard.

F. Improvement of Living and Traveling
Conditions and Community
Services for Farm Workers

In view of the deplorable living conditions under which many ex-migrants are settling in so-called "rural fringe" communities, the Migrant Ministry will include these more settled farm workers also in its continuing concern for more adequate housing, health services and transportation facilities.

G. Elimination of Legal Exemptions and
Discriminations

Where benefits to the workers impose undue hardships to grower-employers, steps should be taken to stabilize their income at an adequate level. In situations where the volume of migrancy swamps local facilities, a federal-aid program similar to that which assists educational systems in military impacted areas may hold a solution.

H. Social Acceptance and Inclusion in the Life
of the Local Community

The Migrant Ministry accepts as one of its principal goals the assistance of local churches and the farm workers to understand and put into effect the processes by which the latter are included in the church and the community.

I. Responsible and Democratic Organization
for Economic and Civic Self-Help

Laws and other public policies which have been established to regulate relationships between employers and employees to

establish justice, and to protect all the parties involved, should be extended to include agricultural wage workers.

**J. Flexibility and Adaptability in Goals
and Policy To Meet the Rapid
Changes Taking Place in the
Agricultural Economy**

The Migrant Ministry will make continued, coordinated and creative efforts, in cooperation with churches and other helping agencies, to make positive and progressive their transitional experiences.

**IV. ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN
GROWERS AND SEASONAL WORKERS
IN INDUSTRIALIZED AGRICULTURE
by Shirley Greene**

For the guidance of thought and the stimulation of conscience among men of good will, both within and outside the churches, this study guide identifies the following four areas of concern and responsibility. This listing does not pretend to be exhaustive or final. Individuals and groups using this document may find others of equal or even greater import.

A. To What Extent Is Income Protection for Growers at Fair Levels Basic to Solution of the Economic Problems of Both Growers and Seasonal Labor in Industrialized Agriculture?

Employers have a responsibility to deal justly with their employees under all circumstances. If economic conditions in the industry make such dealing unduly burdensome to the employer, a basic obligation falls upon employers to strive diligently to re-adjust the economic basis of the enterprise.

The ability of growers to provide adequate wages and equitable living and working conditions for their employees depends ultimately upon the economic health of their productive enterprise. To the extent that they may be caught in an intolerable cost-price squeeze due to economic forces over which they have no individual control, justice demands that orderly solutions be sought for the sake of both growers and farm workers.

In the National Council statements, what ethical judgment

may be found upon a frequently expressed grower position which, on the one hand, says, "We can't afford to do more for our seasonal workers" while, on the other hand, refuses to consider participation in programs to stabilize markets and protect grower income at fair and reasonable levels?

B. What Alternatives Are Available to Growers Desirous of Improving the Economic Health of Their Industry?

Growers, like other businessmen and entrepreneurs, are properly prone to examine economic and political proposals for all their possible effects and implications. The National Council's statements as cited above seem to hold out to the grower the alternatives of (a) a cooperative, self-help approach to their income problem; (b) an approach through federal legislation; or (c) some combination of these. Growers and other concerned citizens will want to consider, in respect to these or any other alternatives, such questions as the following:

Questions for study and discussion:

- a. In the complex and interlocking economy of our time, can the individual grower hope to survive economically apart from some form of organized market bargaining power? If such individualistic survival were possible, what ethical arguments could be advanced either for or against it?
- b. How do the alternatives (cooperative self-help vs. government program) measure up by the test of such highly regarded goals and values as these: Freedom of opportunity for both grower and worker? Justice to grower, worker, consumer? Efficiency in production and distribution? Adequacy and stability of income for both grower and worker?

What other values should be identified as criteria for judging alternative approaches?

- c. What is the Christian ethical basis of the view that growers have an inescapable responsibility to seek solutions to their economic problems which will be both just and equitable to workers as well as to themselves?

C. What Ethical Demands Confront Growers and Workers?

Both grower and seasonal farm worker are entitled to an equitable and dependable income in return for diligent and

efficient work. Being bound together in a common economic enterprise, each has certain obligations toward the other. As has been repeatedly demonstrated in other lines of basic production, the fairest and most orderly way of defining mutual obligations and respective rights between employers and employees is through the instrumentality of collective bargaining in good faith between responsible organizations of labor and management.

In agriculture as in other industries, violent opposition to labor organization tends to breed violence and irresponsibility in the labor movement. Christian ethics is opposed to the attitudes and methods of violence on either side.

D. What is the Role of Humane Social Legislation For Seasonal Farm Workers?

Among the legislative protections clearly advocated for seasonal farm workers in National Council policy statements are these: minimum wage coverage, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, full social security coverage, abolition of child labor abuses, minimum standards of housing, sanitation and transportation safety, availability of health and welfare services, and inclusion under the collective bargaining rights of the National Labor Relations Act. Some of these protections, if extended to seasonal farm workers, would involve additional costs to growers; others would represent a more generalized charge upon the whole community, state or nation.

Questions for study and discussion:

- a. May the Christian demand for justice and protection of the weak be denied by growers on the grounds of "economic hardship"?
- b. Under what circumstances may the conscientious grower find that protective legislation for the worker also represents a protection of his economic position against the unscrupulous grower?
- c. What obligation rests on consumers and citizens to support humane social legislation for farm workers? Do consumers and citizens have a parallel obligation in respect to the economic problems of growers? What is it?

V. THE CHURCHES AND PERSISTENT POCKETS OF POVERTY IN THE U.S.A.

A. Why the Church Is Concerned

God, who created the world and man, sent his Son into the world for its redemption. "The word became flesh and dwelt among us." By this mighty act God manifested his sovereignty over all the world and expressed his compassionate love for man. In Christ's ministry as the revealer of God's will and as redeemer of man he expressed compassion for the hungry, the naked, the oppressed, the ill and the poor. He enjoined us to love our neighbors as ourselves, to treat our neighbors as we would be treated, to feed the hungry and clothe the naked.

God continues to speak to us in the events of our time, and as faithful followers of his Son we must respond to what God is doing in the world. God calls upon us to devise economic institutions and activities that will serve the whole man and the common good. All the human arrangements by which men provide for their physical needs, govern themselves in community and nation, and act as stewards of the earth's resources stand under God's judgment.

As we look at the contemporary world in the light of God's continuing action, judgment and grace, we confess that we have failed to fulfill our calling to share equitably the fruits of creation, to eliminate poverty and to overcome its devastating consequences in human society.

We have accepted the benefits of a technological age for our own advantage. We have utilized the institutions of society to protect our situations of privilege. We have closed our eyes to the persistence of poverty in the midst of affluence and have accustomed ourselves to the existence of gross inequalities between persons, groups and communities in our society.

Too often in history and even today our churches have been identified with privilege and have perverted our faith to justify inequality, injustice and poverty.

B. Definition and Scope of Poverty

In this consultation, we were confronted by undeniable and shocking evidence of continuing massive poverty in the midst of a national economy which boasts of its affluence and which possesses technological skills and productivity capable of providing adequate levels of living for our total population.

For example, the lowest one-fifth of American families currently receive an average annual income of approximately \$1,500. Ten million persons aged 65 or over receive \$1,000 or less a year; 7,000,000 people are dependent for all or part of their living on public assistance. Certain population groups such as the families of nonwhite wage earners, farm families and seasonal agricultural workers are particularly disadvantaged because of sub-standard income. There are also geographical areas in which chronic poverty adversely affects nearly all the people in the area.

While some will feel that the poverty line should be drawn at higher levels, the examples cited clearly indicate that substantial numbers of our fellow Americans live at income levels so low as seriously to restrict their opportunities for self-fulfillment or participation in the physical and cultural goods available in our affluent economy.

C. With Reference to Poverty In Rural Areas

We define rural areas as those of 10,000 and under in population, which are rural in relationship and in juxtaposition, though they include more than agriculture. The rural church exists within two types of poverty situations: (1) a totally depressed area where poverty affects the life of the church itself, and (2) an area of general affluence reflected in the church's life, but where some people live in poverty. The latter is the more serious type, and in many instances if nothing is done this problem will affect the whole area.

The church has two roles to play: first, to do something about itself so that it makes the best use of what it has; second, to work with other churches and agencies in becoming itself an agency for total group action, or in exercising a supportive role. Even if the church can't do a job officially, it may select persons who will be supporters.

How can the church work with and serve low-income people in rural areas?

1. Pauperization is sin; the church's work anywhere should be based on the actual needs and desires of the people and upon their will to do, with "outside help" used only as it can be understood and accepted with dignity.
2. Too often the churches assume that people ought and want to belong to the church. A more realistic approach is to help them see their real problems and find solutions even if they choose less accepted methods.

3. Church leadership, clerical and lay, needs to be trained in new and radical methods of initiating action and in guiding low status groups based on: developing indigenous leadership, helping people identify their own concerns, developing mutual associations varied in form to help people help themselves and encouraging participation in the larger community. Such activities might be based upon experiences of the Migrant Citizenship Education Project of the National Council's Division of Home Missions and experiences of the Church in certain metropolitan areas of the United States.

Specific suggestions for the churches in relation to rural poverty on the national scale include: (a) attempts through indigenous processes to provide leadership from low-status groups to sit on local area and Rural Areas Development committees; (b) efforts to assist RAD committees to function through accepted group processes; (c) encouragement to the Extension Service to make training in such methods available for county agents; and (d) cooperation in one or two pilot projects with RAD through the National Council's Department of the Church in the Town and Country.

D. The Challenge of RAD

It is not likely that there will be another opportunity such as the Rural Areas Development program presents at this time. This all-out mustering of both private and public organizations and agencies on the development of rural areas is most opportune. Never before have so many groups joined together for a single social objective.

At stake is the well-being of the 67,000,000 people (more than the total population of either France or Germany) who prefer to live in town and country areas. Having contributed far out of proportion to their numbers to the total wealth and prosperity of this nation and the world, they now in turn must experience full development. It is now most evident that economic development is no longer a question dependent on large centers of population. Indeed, the personal and social values of decentralization may even well be second to the considerations of national defense. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Rural Areas Development aspect of the Area Redevelopment Act is provided over one-half of the allocated funds — plus the fact that these areas contain over one-half of America's poverty.

Nevertheless, even this major thrust cannot succeed apart from two important factors that have a direct bearing on what the churches of America can contribute.

1. The program is based on local initiative.
2. The people who need help the most must find an articulate voice.

It is at this point that local pastors can be most helpful. They, more than any other local group, can aid in the stimulation of initiative, and the pastors can both seek out and help the dispossessed become articulate. To assume that the present county or town power structures will do this is an illusion. Too much of vested interest is at stake. It is up to the pastor and his dedicated and sensitive laymen. Furthermore, this program (RAD) will dissipate itself if forced to spread its relatively meager resources too widely. Economic, and its consequence, social development can only occur if resources are adequate. Old rivalries between town and town must be absorbed into a comprehensive cooperative area development approach. Again, it is up to the pastor as he works with the other pastors of such an economic area to set an example of cooperation and to aid in the process of reconciliation. Economic salvation will never occur apart from such social reconciliation.

The county agricultural agent has the facts on the RAD program, and many such agents demonstrate great skill in community development. Yet, it must be remembered that up until very recently these men were expected to handle only the technical problems of agriculture; the pastor, both by temperament and training, has always been concerned with personal and social development. It is the conviction of many that if we wait until all county agents become skilled in community development, the time for such development will have passed. There is little other choice than for pastors to take the initiative in making themselves available for the program of Rural Areas Development. This is it!

**VI. THE PURPOSE AND PROGRAM OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF THE CHURCH IN TOWN AND COUNTRY
DIVISION OF HOME MISSIONS
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN
THE U.S.A.**

The general purpose of the department is to help the church to appreciate and to achieve its mission in town and country.

In pursuance of this purpose, it is the program of the department to:

1. Stimulate, cooperate with and coordinate the town and country work of the denominations and communions related to the department.
2. Articulate the concerns of the people and churches of town and country areas.
3. Aid in the development and implementation of regional and local ecumenical strategies.
4. Provide opportunities for fellowship and discussion among administrators, educators, pastors and laymen.
5. Encourage and cooperate in the development of programs of continuing education for town and country church leadership, both professional and lay.
6. Produce and/or disseminate relevant literature and audio-visual materials.
7. Stimulate, interpret and utilize research methods and materials.
8. Hold or participate in convocations, conferences and consultations.
9. Cooperate with other units of the National Council of Churches, with state and local councils of churches, with appropriate units of the World Council of Churches and with other religious and secular organizations, associations and institutions at points relevant to the interests of the church in town and country and its effective Christian witness.
10. Such other purposes and functions as may be assigned by the Executive Board of the Division of Home Missions.

A. Committees

The Department of the Church in Town and Country is fortunate in that it is able to function through a number of committees whose chairmen and members are both skilled and dedicated. It is in terms of the work of these committees that the department is able to progress. The chairmen of these committees cooperate so well to gether that for all practical purposes they function as staff members of the Department of the Church in Town and Country and, indeed, the Division of Home Missions.

1. Presidential Commission on Country Life.
2. Communications.
3. Continuing Education.
4. Convocation.

5. Committee on Rural, Economic and Social Trends.
6. Interchurch Relations.
7. Northern Great Plains.
8. Research.
9. Southern Appalachian Committee.
10. In addition there is much inter-disciplinary cooperation through the Director and other members of the Department serving on boards and committees of other units of the National Council and of the following:

Boy Scouts of America

Christian Rural Fellowship

Merom Renewal Project

National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor

National Sharecroppers Fund

Rural Areas Development

Soil Stewardship

4-H Club

VII. SOME CONSIDERATIONS IN ACHIEVING ADEQUATE AND REASONABLY STABLE INCOMES BY FARMERS

by Mervin G. Smith

Farmers have low incomes because (1) their prices are depressed as a result of the imbalance between total United States farm production and consumption, or (2) they have relatively low productivity due to difficulties of adjustments, low technical and management skill and other factors.

The main objective of government farm policies has been to increase farm income. Many kinds of farm programs have been in operation and others are proposed. People should be concerned and learn more about the low farm income problem and improve their proficiency of evaluating and helping our government to develop good and sound farm income policies.

Since the agricultural sector of our economy is interrelated with the rest of the economy, the achievement of agricultural and social objectives both are influenced by farm income policies. In the evaluation of policies, one needs to take into consideration not only the farm income objective but many other objectives, both for agriculture and for general society.

There are some 15 different types of government farm income policies. These are grouped according to their immediate purpose:

- (A) Expanding Demand: (1) domestic, (2) foreign, (3) new uses.

(B) Restricting Production and Marketing: (4) marketing quotas, (5) restricting land use, (6) restricting capital and technology, (7) reducing farm labor.

(C) Increasing Farm Prices and Incomes Directly: (8) price supports and storage; (9) direct payments; (10) multiple prices, market orders, market agreements; (11) low income insurance and direct subsidy.

(D) Improving the Services for Farmers and Their Individual Productivity: (12) cooperatives, marketing, credit, services; (13) direct individual assistance; (14) education; (15) research.

Almost all policy suggestions that have ever been made can be grouped into one or a combination of some of these 15 types of programs. If anyone can classify a new proposal into these types, he might be able to evaluate it more readily. In the past we have had a package of these various types of programs. Presently, we have all types of the demand expanding programs, a number of different programs of restricting and adjusting land use, programs of price supports and storage, direct payments to supplement farm prices, multiple pricing and marketing orders, programs for encouraging cooperatives and other service development programs, education and research.

Improvement in our farm policies might consist of a different package of these types of policies and of more or less emphasis on different types of policies. The package which any one person would suggest will depend on how well he understands the low farm income problem and its causes, how much information he has on the consequences of each policy and on his individual values.

No attempt was made here to put an ideal package of policies together. Instead, an attempt was made to define the low farm income problem, to present and analyze alternatives and to develop a more systematic method of evaluation.

12

Goals and Values Underlying Programs of the Catholic Church in Rural U.S.A.

EDWARD W. O'ROURKE¹

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC Rural Life Conference was established in the 1930's to interpret and teach the goals and values embodied in Christian rural living. The Conference's philosophy springs from a conviction that religion does not end when we leave church on Sunday morning. Rather, the real test of religion is found in applying Christian principles to the practical affairs of business, agriculture, family life, recreation and education.

The NCRLC helps its members recognize and live by an integrated philosophy of life. Goals and values are the integrating forces. The ultimate goal is happiness. Happiness is found in loving and serving God. This, in turn, requires an orderly, purposeful way of life. Thus, we experience a rewarding fulfillment of our human capabilities and an abundance of love and understanding among family and friends. Since we have a body as well as a soul, this orderly living makes legitimate — indeed, it demands — the use of food, clothing, shelter and other material goods. A moderate use of these goods is a source of pleasure and happiness.

Not only is our philosophy of life theocentric; it is Christocentric. Christ is our mediator with the Father, the Elder Brother of all Christians, the greatest unifying force in our way of life. Christ has done much to make religion an everyday, practical affair. He is the Head of an organic Body of which Christians are members. This body He often referred to as His Kingdom. In the Kingdom there is work to be done, a social and economic order to be reformed. Christ carries on this work of the Kingdom through us, the members.

¹ Executive Director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

Order, unity, purpose and goals are the hallmarks of this philosophy of life. We are seeking eternal happiness, to be sure; but to earn it we must establish and perfect the Kingdom of Christ on earth here and now. To the degree we succeed in this responsibility, order and peace, justice and love, happiness and fulfillment are experienced in this life by ourselves and our fellow men.

The public worship of the Church is often referred to as the "liturgy." The primary goal of worship is to pay homage — adoration, thanksgiving, love and reparation — to Almighty God. It is, however, at the same time a "liturgy," a work of the people. In our worship we consciously enlist the material things out of which our daily lives are constituted. Bread, wine, oil and water are used in the seven sacraments. In our liturgy we have blessings and dedications of soil, seed, machines, livestock and the grain, fruit and vegetables which we produce from the land. Through this type of liturgy we are made to realize that all of creation should be employed in the service of God and for the strengthening of the Kingdom of Christ on earth. The liturgy, then, is a way to bring a great degree of unity and integrity into our way of life. It focuses toward a single goal, namely, the strengthening of the Kingdom of Christ. It orders toward that goal both the natural and the supernatural, the temporal and the eternal, the human and the nonhuman objects of our environment.

This approach to the liturgy is especially appropriate in rural parishes. Most of the objects used in the liturgy or for which liturgical blessings are provided pertain to rural life. The NCRLC assists pastors and parishoners in such liturgical observances. Through leaflets and articles in our magazine, through sermons, retreats and days of recollection, we help our members observe the liturgy with dignity and appreciation.

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ORDER

Our concern for the practical affairs of business and agriculture is summarized in a single goal, the establishing of a Christian social and economic order. In the encyclicals of our popes and in much of the literature of the NCRLC, this goal is spelled out. Two reforms are necessary if the Christian social and economic order is to be established:

A. There must be a reform in our thinking and attitudes. We must practice fraternal charity toward one another. We must have more concern for the common good. We must eliminate selfishness and greed from our minds and hearts.

B. Adequate organizational tools must be created to bring about better farm income and the other goals we seek.

Among the organizational tools recently made available, one of the most promising is the Rural Areas Development program. In nearly 2,000 counties and larger areas of the United States RAD committees have been established. These committees coordinate the efforts of private organizations and agencies of the government. They seek to improve agricultural income, develop small industries and expand public facilities. The NCRLC heartily endorses the RAD program and promotes it at the national, state and local levels. We remind our people of their responsibilities toward their communities and urge them to assume positions of leadership in RAD committees. Our magazine promotes RAD. We recently published a policy statement regarding it and we give many lectures on this subject.

National and International Agencies

A discussion of social and economic issues leads necessarily to an evaluation of the government's role in such matters. We teach the principle of subsidiarity, according to which no task should be assigned to the government if it can be effectively performed by a private institution. The necessary corollary of this principle is the responsibility of citizens to take part in such private institutions. This point is emphasized in Pope John XXIII's encyclical, Christianity and Social Progress.

The principle of subsidiarity reflects a value prominent in both Christianity and democracy, namely, the dignity and autonomy of the human person. The government is established to serve the people, not vice versa.

Nevertheless, we are aware of the tremendous influence of government on the daily lives of our people. Hence, we maintain a Washington office where Fr. James Vizzard, SJ, represents our views at hearings of Congressional committees and reports to our members legislative and administrative developments affecting our way of life.

We do not confine our activity to this nation. As Christians we must be concerned for the welfare of the whole human family. This universal brotherhood of man is a value to which our Church is committed. Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, formerly our executive director, has been in charge of our international office in Rome. He has convened leaders of many nations to share thinking concerning economic, social and religious issues on a world scale. He has been active in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, in which he acted as Pope John's official observer.

Among the organizational tools for creating a Christian world order we are especially heartened by the Food-for-Peace program and the several People-to-People programs. In lectures, leaflets and issues of our magazine we explain the great work of the Food-for-Peace program and suggest ways to improve it. We encourage young people to volunteer for the Peace Corps, International Voluntary Services, Papal Volunteers for Latin America and similar People-to-People programs. These programs embody a pursuit of what we call the "corporal works of mercy." These works we value highly. It is, indeed, heartening to see them accomplished on such a large scale.

The Family Farm

However, the greatest institution in and through which we work is the family. The family ranks especially high in Christian values. It is established through the sacrament of matrimony. One of its purposes is to bring children into the world, to love and nurture them and, thus, to increase membership in Christ's kingdom.

Farming remains a family enterprise in the United States. Most of our farms are operated by and for a family. The family farm is an efficient means to produce food and fiber and a force for strengthening family bonds. It is a socio-economic institution which we value highly.

We strive, therefore, to preserve the family farm system in America. We use our usual means of lectures and publications to remind our members of the general public of the value of this great institution. Whenever governmental policy affects the family farm, we are quick to express our concern. We join with other leaders of private and governmental organizations in statements on this subject.

The Cooperative Movement

It is difficult for small family farm enterprises to survive in an economy dominated by giant corporations. Farmers can strengthen their hand by banding together in cooperative credit, purchasing and marketing associations. The survival of the family farm system will depend in large part on the development of such organizations.

It is not within the province of NCRLC to form cooperatives. Rather, our task is at a more basic level, namely, the teaching of

the values at stake in cooperation. We previously mentioned the autonomy of the human person. We now recognize a correlative of that value, namely, the social nature of man and his consequent social obligations. Moreover, cooperation in social and economic matters is an application of the Christian virtue of fraternal charity. Cooperation should be a feature of the Christian social order to which we referred above. Farm cooperatives are among the organizational tools through which a Christian social order can be formed.

Farm-City Relations

The NCRLC promotes better understanding and mutual help among farm and city people. Many rural parishes include farmers, townspeople and rural nonfarm residents. This diversity of personnel makes toleration and cooperation essential. Through lectures, leaflets and magazine articles, NCRLC helps farm and city people gain a more accurate picture of one another's rights and responsibilities.

FAR-REACHING CHANGE

In all these social, economic and religious matters, great changes are taking place. One of the most basic is the shift of population out of agriculture into other occupations. In face of such far-reaching change, two extremes must be avoided. The first is failure to recognize the need for change on our part. The second is to abandon the permanent goals and values which should guide us through change. The NCRLC encourages change among its members and, at the same time, holds before them the timeless theological and philosophical principles which will give them direction and stability while they change.

SUMMARY

Our chief goal is happiness, which is obtained through love and service of God. This, in turn requires an orderly, integrated way of life. Our efforts to strengthen the Kingdom of Christ is a goal which greatly unifies our activities. The liturgy is the primary source of motive and direction in this effort. As a practical sequel to the liturgy, we try to bring about a reform of ideals among our members and, at the same time, to persuade them to

use the organizational tools through which a Christian social and economic order can be formed. Those tools include Rural Areas Development, Food for Peace, People-to-People programs and farm cooperatives. Among the proximate goals are the strengthening of the family farm and the improving of farm-city relations. All of these goals are being pursued in times of far-reaching change. It is important that we adhere to our timeless values lest we change in a hapless, directionless manner.

These values include the dignity and rights of the individual, the social obligations of each, the universal brotherhood of man, the sacredness of the family and the proper use of material goods.

13

Goals, Values and Cooperative Extension Programs

J. B. CLAAR¹

IT IS IMPORTANT that the organizations serving agriculture understand each other and that their various goals and values form a reasonably coherent system. Therefore, we must clearly state the objectives and philosophies which all of us hold and we should periodically examine them in light of present situations.

I would like to state two things clearly. First, the Cooperative Extension Service was established by federal legislation which gives it a job description and sets out certain metes and bounds for its operations. Therefore, when we discuss the goals and values held by the Extension Service we are in reality discussing the goals and values held by the representatives of the people as they established the Cooperative Extension Service and as they have continued to support it through the years. Thus an analysis must start with this federal legislation and with the basic job description which has been laid down for Cooperative Extension. In this description, and in the legislation certain goals and values are inherent; others are apparent from the hearings conducted before the passage of the Smith-Lever Act and from later acts of Congress relating to financing of the Extension Service. In addition to the philosophies, goals and values inherent in the act itself, we must also examine a number of satellite goals and values that have been developed through the years. Many of these undoubtedly will not be unique to the Cooperative Extension Service. They are drawn on the one hand from the basic philosophies and values that underlie our democratic form of government: on the other hand they are a part of the normal values of

¹ Associate Director of Extension, University of Illinois.

an educator. From the standpoint of values, the most unique aspect of Cooperative Extension is its action orientation.

The second point I would like to state clearly is that as a state Extension administrator I speak only for myself in addressing this subject. I believe that these basic ideas are identifiable from state to state and remain rather consistent. Yet each state has great autonomy in this regard, and I would not profess to speak for other states or for the Federal Extension Service.

EXTENSION AS OUTLINED BY SMITH-LEVER ACT

One cannot read the Smith-Lever Act and the hearings that preceded it without reaching two conclusions:

1. The founders of the act had in mind a broad out-of-school educational program to form a bridge between academic inquiry and the problems of people. The basic job of this Extension Service was tersely described in the Smith-Lever Act:

"To aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects related to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same."

Several things follow from this:

- (a) The clientele is all of the people of the various states, except as the act states later, "those people who are formally enrolled in the Land-Grant College as students." Although rural people were clearly to be a target audience, the need to reach all people was also recognized.

- (b) The subject matter of Cooperative Extension was to be agriculture, home economics and subjects related thereto. In early Extension work, the primary emphasis was on production technology in agriculture, on homemaking skills and on the development of youth, because these were priority areas of the day and the extension staff was limited. The scope and program have broadened as other problems became of more relative importance. The hearings show a broad interpretation of this subject-matter job description and Congress has furthered this view by its actions in later years. For example, the funds added in 1953 permitted an expansion of Extension in work on the business side of farming, on agricultural marketing and on public affairs. The Agricultural Marketing Act provided for an expansion of Extension work in the field of marketing, and a section added in 1955 clearly stated the responsibility of the Extension Service to increase its work in the broad area of rural resource development.

(c) The job description of Extension is action oriented. Increasing subject-matter knowledge is not to be the only objective of Cooperative Extension. Rather, an equal objective is to motivate action in the application of practical information to problems.

(d) The methods must be informal, since teaching courses for credit is prohibited.

2. The second major factor which is inherent in the Smith-Lever law is that local participation and authority are provided for in several ways. For example, federal funds are distributed on a formula rather than a contract basis. The plans of work to be carried out in the act originate in the state. Local funds are encouraged, and the personnel policies of the state generally apply.

Before analyzing some goals and values that are either inherent in the act or are commonly held throughout Extension, I think it is necessary to state how I plan to use these terms. I will look upon a goal as a result which Extension hopes to attain. I will look upon values as being based upon beliefs. Individuals hold highly personal value systems when the term is applied to society or to various groups within it. But the idea of consensus is important, for the value must be based on a consensus belief. On the one hand these values become criteria by which goals are selected and by which priorities are assigned. On the other they become the criteria for selecting the methods through which the goals shall be achieved. In addition, these values form the basis for a philosophy of Extension work.

GOALS OF EXTENSION

One of the most significant values of the Extension Service is that within the broad framework of the Smith-Lever Act the goals and means to be used in reaching them should embrace our democratic philosophy; special consideration should be given to the goals and values held by the clientele toward whom programs are directed as indicated through their representatives on program building councils and committees. From this basic belief comes such Extension philosophy as "You must start where the people are." Inherent in the act is the belief that an informal educational, action-oriented program will help achieve both personal and national goals. Therefore, the basic goal of the Cooperative Extension Service is to contribute to the development of the whole individual through educational means, and through the development of the whole individual to help individuals and groups perceive the

difference between what "is" and what "ought to be" in their own frame of reference. An equally important goal of Extension is to help people intelligently apply information relating to agriculture and home economics to these various problems.

I have stated these basic goals in terms of increasing the knowledge and action of individuals as they pursue their individual decision-making prerogatives or as they act collectively in reaching decisions. This is because it is individuals who learn and make decisions and manage change. It would be possible to state the objectives of Extension in an entirely different manner — for instance along such lines as better managed resources, increased levels of production, optimum levels of economic growth, higher farm income, etc. Naturally, the Extension Service expects to contribute substantially to such over-all objectives of society. But I have chosen to treat these specific educational objectives as sub-goals to this basic goal. However, I think it is more meaningful to state these goals in terms of individual learning. Such learning must be the focus of an institution that hopes to make its contribution through action based upon increased knowledge and understanding.

Extension frequently discusses whether or not it should simply inventory these goals as they exist, or whether in fact it is a change agent with regard to the goals as well as the means by which various goals are pursued. In my judgment, Extension is a change agent with regard to both the goals of people and the means by which they pursue them. For example, many rural people have held the value that an advanced education was not important for their youngsters. Today, Extension is actively pointing out the trends that are occurring and the consequences of such a value.

Another value Extension strongly holds is that it should not impose its will or the will of the Extension staff member on the decision makers involved. Rather, it should enlarge the knowledge of people through educational methods with regard to the facts involved, the possible consequences of various courses of action and the alternatives which may be open to them. Thus in time people may have a changed perception of a given situation that may result in some modification of their own value system. This accounts for the value of Extension workers that you must start where people are and go only as fast as they are willing to go. This means an almost certain conflict between individual, community and national goals as well as conflict between the goals of various organizations with which Extension works. Extension works at the cutting edge of change. At this level, conflicts between values and goals are normal, and one frequently

finds emotion, ignorance and confusion. Stating its goal in terms of increased knowledge and individual understanding keeps Extension free of the conflict between the goals so that it may concentrate on its job of objective education. Through this approach a great many of the apparent conflicts between goals can be harmonized when the goals are examined in light of the full information that bears on the problem.

Extension faces a potential dilemma in the situation when the goals of farm families — a major clientele group — come into apparent conflict with other social goals. Should Extension be a champion of agriculture? For example, should Extension lead the fight for increased farm income at any cost? The goal of consumers for cheap food would be in conflict with constantly higher prices for farm products. The point is that no consensus value exists at a given time in terms of such an issue. Extension, in attacking such a problem, helps all groups involved to understand the issues and the problems. Extension helps consumers see the need for "fair" prices for farmers and the effect of low prices on the nation's agricultural industry. At the same time it helps agriculture see itself in relation to the nation as a whole and the consequences of pursuing a goal of higher prices at any cost. Society, through its democratic processes, needs ultimately to make the decision.

Another way to say this is that Extension tries to create full understanding at the various levels of decision making involved and then to carry out its mission assigned by the Smith-Lever law to encourage action. It must accept the goals as defined by the relevant decision-making unit. This may mean that as long as these goals are consistent with such basic goals as the maintenance of democracy, etc., the profit of a given farm unit will not be maximized. The family involved may choose to temper its pursuit of profit, for example, in order to have time to pursue other ends on which it places more value. In this event maximum economic national growth would not be achieved. But Extension would consider that it had fulfilled its mission if it had helped the family to see clearly the alternatives open and the consequences that would result from pursuing the various alternatives. Too, Extension would respect the right of an individual to give up a fortune to become a beachcomber if that decision were made after careful analysis. The goal of increased gross national profit would be given lower priority than recognizing the individual's right to determine his destiny.

In pursuing these over-all goals there are obviously many sub-goals which must be established. Again, there will be conflict between those which can only be resolved as values are

established by the decision-making unit involved. For example, such sub-goals may include the development of a safer agriculture, the conservation of natural human resources, expanded economic growth in rural areas, the maintenance of a strong agricultural sector based on the family farm, increased farm income, increased efficiency in the marketing system, greater understanding of public issues and improved efficiency of homemakers. These are important goals. These become specific educational objectives that Extension pursues. I refer you to the Extension "Scope report" for a more complete listing of them.

In establishing these goals another value of Extension comes into play. This value is based on the belief that people develop their fullest potentials through the process of identifying and solving problems which confront them and that much of this development takes place through group participation and family involvement in local programs. These sub-goals are built up through a give-and-take process that involves value judgments on the part of local councils and other volunteer leaders working in harmony with Extension staff members. Extension is not entirely passive in this matter. It may establish pilot demonstrations, and it often develops materials to help point out problems and program approaches that might be taken to solve them. But it places high value on the judgment of local people after they go through a process of problem identification and study in developing the Extension plan of work. It is through such a process that Extension's emphasis is determined, the emphasis to be given among the wide range of possible sub-goals which might be pursued at a given time. This process is frequently an irritant to Extension workers because they are impatient. But it keeps Extension working where the people are — and in an action-oriented program Extension believes this is important.

ACHIEVING GOALS

I have so far stated a number of Extension Service values that affect the way it works. I shall not take up all of the relevant goals, but only some of the more significant ones and shall indicate how they relate to Extension programs and operations. In summary, the Extension Service reflects the values of Americans, especially farm people. It places a high value on the concepts of democracy, upon such democratic ideals as freedom and the need to undergird these philosophies by its operating procedures. It places great worth on the individual, upon his perception of his situation and upon increasing his ability to deal effectively

with his environment. It recognizes the high value individuals place on achievement and how this relates to the respect and esteem of their fellow men.

In this regard, work and activity are valued in many rural communities as ends in themselves; e.g., the farmer who has his light on first has a certain status. It has respect for the dignity of work and for the significant role of agriculture in our economy. It recognizes a special responsibility to agriculture. But it also realizes that this responsibility must be pursued in light of the value systems of all Americans and that intelligent public action is critical to achieving many of agriculture's goals. It has respect for the role of the family as a unit of society and it places high value upon the development of youth in the family framework. It recognizes that the nation places high value on constantly increasing efficiency, on higher standards of living, on science and technology. Extension recognizes that these are values of all Americans, but that rural people hold some of them more highly than other segments.

In view of these values it recognizes that different methods may be required to carry out some types of programs. For instance, research can show that some farm practices are good from almost any point of view. As an example, certain conservation practices may be economical from the individual's point of view and clearly in the national interest. Extension can forthrightly encourage the adoption of these. But a good answer in the area of farm programs depends upon the collective value judgment of the nation upon the one hand and upon individual beliefs and value judgments on the other. In many such areas no clearly determined national value has been established. Here Extension must clearly restrict itself to increasing understanding of the matter rather than promoting any particular course of action.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE PROGRAMS

As I have implied several times, the goals of Extension will be achieved through educational efforts which involve both increased understanding and intelligent action by relevant decision-making units. In promoting an understanding of the Cooperative Extension Service program, it is important to stress that the potential program is broader than Extension can carry forward aggressively at a given time with its limited resources. Within the broad framework, Extension shifts emphasis with the changing importance of problems, or with changing values that become

the criteria against which the importance of problems are measured. This shift is accomplished through the program development process, which involves thousands of local volunteer leaders in studying these significant programs.

The program efforts of Cooperative Extension have been placed into five broad areas by most Extension Services:

1. Production, Management and Natural Resource Use.
2. Agricultural Marketing.
3. Home Economics.
4. 4-H and other Extension youth programs.
5. Community and Area Resource Development and Public Affairs.

Several trends seem to be apparent in the Extension program area. One of the most spectacular of these is the increased attention to the programing process and to the adjustment of programs quickly in light of changing problems and values. As evidence of this, many state Extension Services have employed an individual at the administrative level to give full-time attention to programs. Most Extension Services have increased their efforts on the business side of farming while continuing a strong program in agricultural technology. The significance of this problem area and the value placed upon it was indicated by Congressional action to increase funds for this specific purpose. Greatly increased efforts have been placed on helping local people organize and study the problems of their community so that they may assess the trends occurring, set objectives for themselves and take steps to manage change in light of these goals. By adding a section to the Smith-Lever law, Congress has recognized both the growing nature of the problem and the value which was placed on it. I believe this work is an example of how changing social values affect Extension work. Through an increased social conscience and an increased recognition of the relation of lagging areas to national goals, greater value has been placed on solving this problem, although history indicates that it has always been with us. Increased efforts are being made to help people understand the public issues and the broad economic forces affecting them. This is being done with both the rural and urban sectors. This effort reflects the increasingly held value that public action, in setting the framework for individual action, should be enlightened action, that it takes full account of the alternatives and consequences of decisions. Increased program efforts have been exerted in a great many states in the area of marketing of agricultural products and informing consumers in "buymanship."

Formal training is providing rapid general upgrading of Extension staffs and many specialized staff members are being placed in field locations.

In the 4-H program increased emphasis is being placed on projects which help young people understand the economy in which they will live, assess available careers and learn more about the demands the economy makes on those employed in it.

The fact that the demarcation between rural and urban areas is not nearly as clear as it was at one time has increased demands on Extension for programs that reach both rural and urban audiences. Resource development work is an example of such a program. Urban people seek to understand the public issues pertaining to resources and agriculture. They want information on areas important to both the town and country, for example, zoning. They also want more chance to participate in both 4-H and home economics programs as well as more ready access to relevant agricultural information.

In our state we feel that a county Extension program should be aimed at the most significant problems facing the people living there. Therefore, in our more urban counties the program tends to be aimed at urban problems. The principal clientele of the Extension Service by far continues to be the farm families of the state. However, more work is being conducted with agricultural service industries, with marketing firms and with professionals who are being employed in greater and greater numbers. By making such adjustments, the Extension Service tries to orient its resources to make the most significant contribution to society's goals through increased understanding and action of individuals.

Though program emphasis changes from time to time, fundamental goals and values have seen relatively little change. In my judgment, Extension in the United States is in a healthy state of development. Extension is making adjustments in both program emphasis and methods to help insure that the people in the various states will make their decisions armed with the very best available facts and knowledge. The input-output data, which is a part of American thinking, is hard to come by when the principal product of an organization is increased knowledge and competence on the part of individuals. Yet the effectiveness of the Extension Service can readily be seen when looking back over longer periods of time. The most significant evidence is the large number of well informed adults who have obtained a great deal of education in subjects relating to home economics and agriculture through participation in the various programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. This is true even though many

adults affected are far removed from the land-grant college campus and from the main road. I am confident that the help of the many local leaders and organizations who take part in the process of determining Extension programs will keep such program emphasis current. With the firm base of fundamental goals and values which has been developed through experience, the Cooperative Extension Service will continue to be a significant factor in national progress and in helping individuals and other organizations to achieve their objectives.

14

Evaluation on an Ethical Basis

TYLER THOMPSON¹

IN ORDER TO give an ethical critique of the programs presented in the preceding papers, I must make judgments according to some theological standard unless I limit ethics to analysis of ethical language only. And it is obvious that I do not want to do this, or I would not have agreed to an assignment involving "evaluation."

I do not want to be misunderstood in asserting that ethics must have a theological basis. I am not asserting that one must "believe in God" in order to make an ethical judgment. If this were true, no Communist, secular humanist or classical Buddhist could make an ethical judgment — an absurdity. All that is asserted is that every ethical judgment reflects a conviction concerning man's real situation, i.e., a theological or ideological conviction.

Not all such convictions held by the same person are necessarily consistent. And this is why ethical judgments made by the same person are often found to be inconsistent. Furthermore, people are often unwilling or unable to enunciate their deepest convictions. Indeed, their formal professions may not correspond closely to their real convictions concerning the things that matter most to them. In this situation it usually proves true that ethical judgments are better clues to real convictions than theological professions. We think of the former as one step closer to action, and we have a strong intuition (shared, incidentally, by Jesus) that "actions speak louder than words"!

These considerations have a bearing both upon my operations in evaluating and upon the operations of those I am to criticize. If my own critical judgments imply theological criteria, I can

¹ Professor, Philosophy of Religion, Garrett Theological Seminary.

hardly do less than make them as explicit as possible. On the other hand, critical judgments about the ethical decisions of the other authors' papers in relation both to their own standards and mine are the meat of my assignment.

From one point of view, my work of ethical criticism may seem quite redundant in the light of what has gone before. Of the 11 preceding papers, four have been quite unabashedly ethical and theological.

If this paper is to be justified functionally, it must be in terms of bringing all of the other papers into correlated ethical judgment within one unified framework. In order to attempt this, I shall take three major steps. First, I shall define a theological standpoint in relation to the explicit theologies set forth in the earlier papers. Second, I shall endeavor to construct a hierarchy among the "clusters of values" suggested. If all goes well, this should emerge coherently from the theological standpoint already promised. Third, I shall subject particular proposals in the papers to criticism in the light of the established hierarchy. In doing this, of course, care will be taken to have due regard for the differing responsibilities of governmental agencies, voluntary farm organizations and churches.

THEOLOGICAL STANDPOINT

All four of the overtly theological papers take an explicitly Christian stance, as befits their ecclesiastical sponsorship. They represent the two organized religious communities most extensively represented in the American farm population. I think it could be shown, however, that the same problems could be dealt with on somewhat parallel lines from a Jewish theological standpoint. This is not surprising, in view of the historic connections between the communities, but it is a point which will be alluded to later.

The four voluntary farm organizations are formally non-sectarian. Membership involves no credal test. Whatever sociological affinities some of them may have to the church, they are not formally identified with it. It would be quite improper for them (according to their own standards) to put forward an explicit theological basis for their programs when they are in point of fact theological united front organizations. People with differing ultimate convictions have found a large enough area of common convictions to make collaboration worth while. Discussion of fundamental theological issues does not come within the scope of their common life. Nevertheless, analysis and evaluation of the

convictional presuppositions of their programs is very much in order. (In relation to the point of this paragraph, the Grange is a special case. Nevertheless, according to my understanding, it still falls within the foregoing description of farm organizations, which would fit the great majority of voluntary membership organizations of all kinds in our society.)

Governmental agencies which deal with agriculture are yet another case. They are prohibited by our basic law from being sectarian. I do not mean, of course, that the law can prevent a government servant from being theologically motivated! But in his influence upon policy he is responsible not only to his own theological convictions but also to the convictions of all those whose servant he is. Often this is not easy! But if his own conviction will not permit him to undertake it in principle, then he cannot conscientiously become a government servant. It seems to me that this understanding of the relation between governmental agencies and community values is quite clearly shown in the papers presented by government servants.

My situation as the critic is different from any of these inasmuch as it is without any formal organizational context. I may take account of the historic beliefs of Judaism, Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The demands of competent criticism would require this even if I were not in one way or another committed to some of these beliefs by personal faith. There is no reason why I should not go even further and take into account the classical beliefs of other historic religions in which I am much interested and concerning which I have the privilege of teaching from time to time. But no institutional connection does, or can, determine the final criteria by which the judgments of this paper are made. It must be a matter of my own faithful apprehension.

In turning to Dr. Shirley E. Greene's paper there is so much with which I agree, stated with emphases for which I am so grateful, that I hesitate to move on to points where I must take issue. His very restatement of the assigned topic shows sensitivity to the nature of the theological enterprise and accurate insight into the intentions of those who planned this program. His use of the notion of a covenant relation as a means of understanding man's relation to God is good, not only because of its historic importance in the Christian community, but also because it roots Christian teaching in its Jewish context as nothing else can. My only reservation, as will be seen, is that this notion is not stressed enough. Its fundamental priority needs to be made clear.

Another excellent emphasis is that placed upon man's condition as a sinner. Contemplation of this unwelcome news has potential usefulness as a nostrum for the rural sentimentality

described in several of the papers. Here, again, an even more emphatic and pervasive use of this insight would be in order.

Identification of man as a sinner sets up and complements the central thrust of the paper: redemption is an expression of God's love, which can be fulfilled only as man responds in love. I am especially pleased with the hint that stewardship, so readily and pervasively applicable to agriculture, is not simply a derivative of the doctrine of creation, but even more profoundly rests on the doctrine of redemption.

This leads me directly to my concern about the paper. It nowhere makes as explicit as it should be made the fundamental priority of redemption in the Christian religion. For example, the first thing of which it speaks in setting forth "The Protestant Thesis" is creation. There is a well established logic in this, if one is seeking to be systematic. But there is also a subtle danger. Creation is the first teaching of Christianity neither in time nor in importance. The matter might be put in this way: the Christian community has from the beginning taken for granted that God is Creator; it has affirmed that he is Redeemer.

The situation is somewhat different in Judaism, but only enough to help make clear the right order of priorities in Christianity. The central creative notion of Judaism is the Covenant. It was this which gave meaning to the proclamations of the prophets. Yahweh had called his people into Covenant relation with himself through his act of deliverance from bondage. Although the later arrangement of Biblical materials somewhat obscures the fact, it seems clear that this was familiar teaching among the Hebrews long before it occurred to them to suggest that he was also the creator of the world. The latter came as a reflective aftermath; the other gave meaning to their existence as a people.

This act of national redemption holds a place in Judaism precisely comparable to the deliverance in Christ, which is the subject of the Gospel. To be sure, the Christian community believed from the first that God was the creator of the world, but that was not what the Christian message was about.

I am not trying to downgrade the creation. It has its importance, as the early church found out. Those who rejected it were the gnostics. They thought of this as an evil world created by a lesser evil deity. God, the Father, sent the Son into the world to save us out of it. Orthodox Christianity has been clear: He who redeems is also he who has created. But it is in redemption that God's character is made known: God so loved the world that he sent his Son. Not because of our worth. Not even because of our potential usefulness. But because he loved us! Only if the

centrality of this point is maintained can an adequate rationale be provided for unlimited concern on behalf of every other human being.

This should make clear the limits of my stricture against Dr. Greene. We are exactly together in the emphasis which we want to make. I have merely suggested some ways in which, as it seems to me, this emphasis can be more effectively communicated. I express admiration for the ways in which he relates his theological insights concretely to the ethical side of agriculture. Brilliantly illustrative of this is his insistence that justice must be seen within the context of love from the standpoint of the Gospel. It might be put this way: unless one understands first that God loves, it cannot even be asserted that he is just. Otherwise, to forgive would be an injustice. Dr. Greene says that the key to all judgment must be the "plumb line which is the law of Love." I don't like either figure of speech (although some Biblical warrant could be claimed for both). But I agree completely with his intention as I apprehend it through its concrete expression.

This brings us to the statement of Bishop George H. Speltz. He relates his paper to that of Dr. Greene by saying that the latter's exposition of God's love (agape) provides the motive for his own recommendations. He then goes on to say, however, that his paper has more to do with philosophy than theology, as that distinction is understood in the Roman Catholic tradition. In this latter judgment he is correct, for he relates all that he has to say for himself to "natural law" rather than "supernatural revelation." The only exceptions to this generalization are his occasional passing references to grace and his extensive use of the great modern social encyclicals of the Popes. These latter (for which I would like, parenthetically, to express my very great personal gratitude) recognize both perspectives. Thus they introduce Gospel teaching concerning redemption into the paper. But its main thrust is an expression of natural law, which in any identifiably Christian form is built upon the notion of creation. Thus a distinctively Christian theological framework does not emerge. Instead, the way is prepared for a moving expression of what Mr. Rohde in his paper calls agricultural fundamentalism. The matter comes to a head in the following passages:

In the mind of the good farmer . . . reverence for mother earth is one with his reverence for God and his parents. Moreover, this feeling quite naturally embraces a reverence for his native country. . . . I think it doubtful whether any other agency can be substituted for agriculture in laying a foundation for true piety. . . . The rural values stressed in this paper [are] reverence for the soil, love of God, love of fatherland, willing acceptance of honest toil.

On this basis must not China and Japan (before industrialization) be the most truly pious nations on earth, and the United States of America the most impious? The question is not asked to find fault. I have a Japanese friend, son of a Shinto priest, who was educated in a Christian mission school. He was called to the Christian ministry and trained in this country to the doctoral level in Old Testament interpretation. One of Japan's leading Hebrew scholars, in the end he became converted to orthodox Judaism. One of the considerations which moved him to his last step was that Judaism seemed closer to the natural piety of his fathers.

Do not misunderstand me. I am neither ridiculing Bishop Speltz's suggestion that work can be a therapy for original sin nor remaining unmoved by the wholesome "rationality and creativeness" of farm life. But this natural setting leads to Christian piety only if it is guided by the revelation in Christ. If we have seen God in Christ, then we can see him on the farm. And if we have seen him on the farm, then we can see him in the factory. Maybe it is a little harder, but the work of redemption is done there too.

PUTTING THE GOALS AND VALUES IN ORDER

Having identified God's self-giving, limitless concern for the welfare of every man as the ultimate source of all value, and the right response to his love as the touchstone of all human goals, we turn to an appraisal of the clusters of values suggested by Dr. Burchinal for the Planning Committee. Let us consider them in the order in which he gave them.

Freedom related to agricultural production and distribution. Freedom cannot, from our perspective, be regarded as an intrinsic value in itself. And yet it is a condition essentially instrumental to the achievement of any value at all. It participates crucially in most of the other clusters of values and must therefore be concretely involved in their discussion. The actual structure it takes in agricultural policy depends upon the value placed upon order, stability, justice, efficiency, et al. Freedom from is never a value; at best it is avoidance of disvalue. Freedom as a positive instrumental value is always freedom for some venture of worth. Opportunities will arise later for discussion of government as an agency and/or enemy of freedom.

Justice. The necessary context for a Christian understanding of this value has been suggested. And this understanding has in some measure penetrated American constitutional, juridical and

political thinking. In any consideration of farm policy it must be reckoned a value of high priority, even if surrounded by some ambiguity of meaning.

Efficiency. This value will be reckoned so importantly instrumental to the general welfare that it cannot be denied. However, it has been, is, and will be in tension with concern for the welfare of those caught at the margin of a rapidly changing industry.

Security. This value can never be made absolute, but it does slow the relentless march of efficiency — and it should.

General welfare. Among all the suggested clusters of value, this comes closest to the heart of the matter. When understood in particular and concrete terms it bears important relation to Christian love. Its concrete interpretation, however, encompasses not only the controversies over farm policy, but most of the political disputes of our time.

Order and stability. These values again are merely instrumental. The particular form of order and degree of stability chosen represent the limitation placed upon freedom in accommodating efficiency to the demands of justice and security in the pursuit of the general welfare!

THE PROGRAM PAPERS

Dr. Cochrane's paper speaks so well for itself that there is little need to speak for it. Philosophical competence, ethical sensitivity and dialectical skill characterize its developing argument. He quite properly refrains from adopting a formal Christian stance (for reasons already suggested); yet at one point he gives a brilliantly succinct and explicitly Christian rationale for a liberal society: "none is good or wise enough to have arbitrary power over any other." The argument as a whole shows quite conclusively, it seemed to me, that under present (and future) conditions we cannot hope to achieve values we demand without some form of supply management.

Mr. W. E. Hamilton employs pronouncements of the American Farm Bureau Federation to come to what appears to be a different conclusion. His paper is a carefully worked out display of the value affirmations of the Federation, with something like pre-eminence placed upon the value of the market system. There is a commendable emphasis upon freedom, but without its proper context of responsibility being made clear. "Active participation in public affairs" is urged, but the possibility that the federal government might be made the instrument of the people in authentic

value achievement seems never to be contemplated. What kind of limitations should be placed upon it? The following passage is extraordinarily stimulating to the imagination:

Programs which make people dependent upon the federal government certainly impair their freedom to decide how they will use their right to vote. Economic freedom and political freedom are interrelated. Neither can be impaired without impairing the other. The man whose economic position depends on a particular program is under great pressure to vote for candidates who promise to continue the program, even though he may differ with them on numerous other issues.

After reflection on the resolutions which Mr. Hamilton reports, and his comments upon them, I have come to the conclusion that one unspoken assumption is necessary in order to make them hang together: government on the national level is inherently demonic in character.

Just one more minor comment. Any churchman who is also a member of the Farm Bureau should be offended by the suggestion that he "make certain that actions taken by his church are within the basic concepts of our American system."

Mr. Gilbert C. Rohde's paper is disarmingly candid. The Farmers Union is dedicated to the family farm ideal — as a heritage from "agrarian fundamentalism." This attachment has led to the repudiation of what Mr. Rohde would regard as the economic fundamentalism of the Farm Bureau. Government at various levels is regarded as a potential instrument for "the economic betterment of farm families on the land." I readily admit that the Union's program for direct subsidies on a graduated basis with maximums seems to me ethically superior and altogether more rational than the price-support system. But I see little sign that it is likely to come within the art of the possible.

I find much that is warm and compelling about Mr. Rohde's presentation. But one wistful passage seems to symbolize the jeopardy in which the family farm crusade stands: "A young farmer's entry into agriculture is becoming more and more restricted. There is a serious question of whether or not a family will ever be able to accumulate enough capital in a lifetime to own the farm and all the machinery and equipment necessary to operate it efficiently."

Mr. Herschel Newsom's thesis is clear: there is an imbalance in the American economy through long established help to segments other than agriculture. What is needed now is parity of income for farmers. This seems ethically unexceptionable. What isn't clear to me is Mr. Newsom's program for accomplishing this end.

The latter part of Dr. Robert J. Lampman's competent paper is commentary upon Mr. Rohde's wistful remark. In 12 years, the farm population has declined by almost half — with every indication that the trend will continue.

The main part of his paper, however, deals with major goals of American economic life. Three of these can be directly related to our established standard: full employment, fair sharing of output and of opportunities and meeting the economic responsibilities of world leadership. All of them can be direct expressions of concern for the welfare of all men. The other goals — satisfactory growth of capacity to produce, efficient use and allocation of that capacity and reasonable stability in the general level of prices are instrumentally related to the same standard.

Mr. Oren Lee Staley's evangelical fervor was both impressive in itself and an aid to understanding the nature and prospects of the National Farmers Organization. He presented the plight of the family farm in a way which heavily underlined what had been said by Mr. Rohde and Dr. Lampman. This darkness heightened the bright prospect of salvation through farmer organization for collective bargaining on lines tightly drawn and carefully worked out. The basic right to engage in this procedure seems undeniable on the theological basis already adduced. Indeed, if he chose to, Mr. Staley might take some encouragement from the papal plan for industry organization, as expounded by Bishop Speltz.

The ethical problems are substantially the same as with labor unions. If the movement succeeds as Mr. Staley hopes, there will be need for widespread reflection upon the ethical issues surrounding whatever instruments analogous to the picket line and union shop may be developed. My suspicion is that there is little clarity or consensus in the farm population on these issues as yet.

There is little need for me to comment on Dr. Henry A. McCanna's kaleidoscopic compendium of Protestant programs. I was instructed by it. Three points will suffice.

First, its theological perspective is not made as explicit nor as clear as I could wish. The doctrine of Creation only is adduced at the beginning. "Basic Christian concepts" are referred to in the second paragraph, but the first paragraph gives no real hint as to what they are. Much later on Dr. McCanna moves to supply this deficiency by reference to the concepts of the Lordship of Christ, grace and judgment.

Second, Dr. McCanna makes responsibility to future generations the subject of one of his explicit ethical goals. He thus refers to the matter raised so sharply for us by Dr. Boulding's comment. However, no elaboration or program is presented.

Third, the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of

Churches appears a wonderfully appropriate response to God's love. However, I am made uneasy by the establishment of "elimination of foreign farm labor importation programs" as one of the stated goals of the program.

I am grateful for Father Edward W. O'Rourke's earnest exposition of the program of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. A series of particular comments may be in order:

1. We are indebted to him for his candid statement and forthright acceptance of the principle of subsidiarity. This principle quite clearly animates the addresses of both Mr. Rohde and Mr. Staley. More serious contemplation of it by Mr. Hamilton and his colleagues in the Farm Bureau would, I think, go rather directly to the heart of the most serious issue I raised with him.

2. Whatever the difficulties involved in the maintenance of the family farm, Father O'Rourke shows quite conclusively why a Christian cannot leave the issue alone.

3. I am fascinated by his discussion of liturgy and rural life. Difficult, at best, to make effective in the present situation of rapid change, the Roman Catholic Church is somewhat better organized to try than are the protestant churches. He convinces me, nevertheless, that protestants should be doing more in this direction than they are.

4. I have a few theological issues to raise with Father O'Rourke, which I shall not discuss at length. I think we can never properly speak of ourselves as establishing the Kingdom of Christ. I think that man's radical sinfulness needs to be more directly taken into account. And Aristotle's teaching on happiness needs to be more radically transformed in the light of the Christian doctrine of redemption.

Dr. J. B. Claar succeeded in communicating to me with vividness his delicate situation as a public educator. There is no ambiguity in his mind, as an administrator of the Cooperative Extension Service, that he is involved in molding ethical attitudes. He is helping people perceive the difference between "what is" and "what ought to be," according to their own convictions. "Extension is a change agent with regard to both the goals of people as well as means by which they pursue them." It is helping people "to take steps to attempt to manage change." And yet Dr. Claar is at great pains to indicate how carefully indoctrination is shunned — or, indeed, anything but a reflection of "the values of Americans." To reconcile these considerations is no light task. The patience and ethical sensitivity with which Dr. Claar confronts it inspire my admiration.

CONCLUSION

God's love, man's sin, God's reconciling power which never can be fulfilled short of our outgoing concern for every man: these provide a framework which can bring all of the goals and values for agriculture to judgment — whether propounded by individuals, voluntary organizations, governmental agencies or churches.

15

Agricultural Organizations and Policies: A Personal Evaluation

KENNETH E. BOULDING¹

THE DILEMMA of the price system is that it has at least three roles to play in society and these roles may easily be contradictory. The first of these three roles is the allocation of resources in response to changes in technology and demand. That is, one of the functions of the price system is to move society in directions such that there isn't too much in the way of resources in any one occupation. We see this in agriculture. For example, in this country we have moved from 90 percent of the population in agriculture to 8 percent in 200 years. We've done this in large measure through the operation of the price system. Nobody said to the farmer, "You have to get out of farming." He just followed Mr. Staley's good advice² and got out of it. In this sense the price system has been a very powerful organizer of our society.

The price system also has a great deal to do with the distribution of income. I am personally very much interested in the price of economics being high and the price of everything else being low. The real income of any individual or group depends on the relative price structure. The higher the price of the commodity you sell and the lower the price of what you buy the better off you are.

The third responsibility of the price system is not, I think, as generally recognized among economists as the other two, but I wish to put it in the trinity on an equal basis. This is the role of organizing the process of economic growth and change and particularly the process of economic development. One of the things the price system does is to decide which are the things we

¹ Professor of Economics, Univ. of Mich.

² Oren Lee Staley, President of the Natl. Farm. Organ.

are going to work on in the way of improvements. That is, if something is scarce and its price is high, we are more likely to work on it to make it more plentiful and cheaper than if it is plentiful and its price is low.

One of the major dilemmas arises between the first two roles. Frequently the role of the price system in organizing the allocation of resources runs up against our sense of what is right and just in the way of distribution of income. We see this of course very clearly in agriculture. In a progressive society, and particularly in a society which has institutions like Iowa State University, agriculture continually declines as a proportion of the total economy. One of the major causes of this is Iowa State University itself! That is, the greater the productivity of labor in agriculture, the fewer farmers there are going to be.

The dilemma is, however, that if you are to get resources out of any occupation, you have to squeeze it. The only way I know to get toothpaste out of a tube is to squeeze the tube, and the only way to get people out of agriculture is likewise to squeeze agriculture. It just has to be made less profitable than other occupations. When the price system is doing this, it's doing fine; this is just what it's supposed to do. If we had a progressive society in which agriculture was profitable, this would be a sure sign of social decay. A high profitability of agriculture would be a sure indication that something was definitely wrong with the society. We have succeeded in progressing for over 200 years pretty well. So agriculture has been unprofitable for 200 years; people have been squeezed out of it for 200 years; it has been technically progressive for 200 years, and all this is just fine.

However, from the point of view of social justice we get uneasy. We look at the 8 percent of people in agriculture and we see that they get only 4 percent of the income. Maybe we can find some other 8 percent of the labor force that nobody bothers about at all who also only get 4 percent of the income. It's just because agriculture is visible that we notice it. But then we still feel, quite rightly, that this is unjust. But the economist says that the only recipe for this problem is increased mobility: if the toothpaste is thin you don't have to squeeze the tube very hard; on the other hand, if the toothpaste is thick you have to put real pressure on it. If you can't get people out of agriculture easily, you are going to have to squeeze agriculture very hard to get them out. You are going to have to do farmers severe injustice in order to solve the problem of allocation.

Suppose the economist says that mobility is the solution both to the problem of allocation and to the problem of justice — that is, of course, if we are looking only at the price system. Now of

course the difficulty is that the price system is not the only organizer of social life and it is not the only organizer of the economy. Besides the exchange system we have what I call the grants system, the system of unilateral transfers. This is composed of taxes, subsidies, grants, budgets, philanthropy. In short it is that part of the economy where you shovel money out and it gets taken away. This is very different from the price system. As a matter of fact, economics does not have any very good theory about it. I've been struggling with the theory of philanthropy. This is quite difficult, really, because foundations are quite incomprehensible organizations. There is no way of telling whether they are doing any good, and I suspect that many are not. That is, after studying philanthropy I decided that we may eventually have to do what Henry VIII did with the monasteries — liquidate them. Foundations can be dangerous centers of irresponsible private power, and the least we can do is to have an anti-trust law for them. The mere fact that you said you were doing good did not mean you could not be a menace to society. The people who set out to do good often did a great deal more damage than the people who didn't — but that is a nasty-minded economist's point of view.

We have to recognize that there is a "grants" sector of the economy and that it can alter the distribution of income, it can alter the allocation of resources and it can alter economic development quite substantially. I would agree with Mr. Thompson³ that it is quite legitimate to use it. In spite of the fact that I am an economist I don't really think the price system can do everything, although I think we underestimate what it can do. I think also that the hostility towards the price system, especially among the theologians, is really quite unfortunate. The market is really a very useful form of organization and we shouldn't really have any prejudice against it.

The way in which society effects allocation and distribution of wealth outside the price system is through coercion, taxation and subsidy, and also prohibitions and law. For instance, as Mr. Hamilton⁴ pointed out, we put quotas on tobacco and this gives a present to all the people who were growing tobacco in 1942. What this has to do with justice I don't know, but as an economist I have a very strong prejudice against it. I have an extraordinarily strong prejudice against coercion as such. This is why I think government is fundamentally demonic. It is an intrinsically evil thing which can occasionally be subverted to good ends. I don't know how this is theologically, but I have a feeling that the

³ Tyler Thompson, Professor of Relig., Garrett Theol. Sem.

⁴ W. E. Hamilton, Director of Research, Amer. Farm Bur.

Lord uses the devil for His own purposes and that as a matter of fact if it were not for the devil we might not have such an interesting world. Where would redemption be if it were not for the devil? Not that I think we can wholly avoid being coercive. Even though I have always wanted to be an anarchist, I have never quite been able to make the grade; I have to admit the need for a little government in society. But I have a certain sympathy with the feeling that whenever you decide to employ coercion you want to look at it three times. Coercion is a dangerous shortcut to social justice. It often goes along with the use of quotas, quantitative restrictions and the limitation of supply, and these can easily result in a freezing of an obsolete system.

FARM POLICY PROBLEMS

It is now time to turn to the problems of agricultural policy. Now this isn't economics, and I am not speaking authoritatively as an economist. In the first place, I think it is unjust to discriminate either in favor of agriculture or against it. I am against agricultural fundamentalism and I do not agree with the view that virtue peculiarly resides on the farm. In fact, a case can be made the other way: that farmers are dull, cloddish and selfish and that almost anything decent that has ever gone on in the world has happened in the city. Civilization, after all, is a product of the cities; the very word tells us that. As a matter of fact, even most agricultural improvement is a product of cities. The improvement of agriculture is not due to farmers, who have usually resisted it. It is due to all these city folks who come out and shake it up. So in a way I am almost an agricultural nonfundamentalist, though on the whole I would like to think that virtue is fairly evenly distributed. Christianity, incidentally, is unfailingly marked with the stamp of Jerusalem and Tarsus. There's nothing rural about it; it is an extremely urban product.

But all joking aside, I think the principle of no discrimination is a vital one, whether this is about Negroes or farmers, and it is just as wrong to discriminate in favor of people as it is to discriminate against them. Now this is not to say that we exclude counterdiscrimination. You can sneak in a case for the state discriminating in favor of the farmer on the grounds that everybody else discriminates against him. I will admit this in theory. But on the whole I won't really admit it in practice, because I think we have put far too much into agriculture. We have overredressed the balance absurdly. We now know too much and do too much about agriculture and not enough about other things.

Counterdiscrimination may justify helping the poor but it does not justify helping the farmers. Agricultural policy has been sold under the name of justice on the basis of a wholly fallacious syllogism. The major premise is, "We ought to help the poor." We all agree to this, especially professors. The minor premise is that farmers are poor, and the conclusion is that we ought to help farmers. The difficulty here is in the minor premise. Some farmers are poor and some farmers are filthy rich. When you help farmers you tend to help the rich more than the poor; this has been pointed out previously.

My next point is that we do want to continue Iowa State University. We do need to continue the process of technological development and the increase in knowledge even if this does away with agriculture altogether, as I suspect it will do. Agriculture is really a terribly primitive way of raising food. I expect that this process of the diminution of the agricultural population will go on until what we have always thought of as agriculture becomes perhaps almost a negligible part of the economy. Whether we approve of this or not there is not much of anything to do about it. Anyone who advocates plowing under Iowa State University is under a delusion. We are not going to stop this process and we have to learn how to ride it. Once we have been chased out of Eden there is no way back; the angel with the flaming sword stands there. Once we have eaten of the fruit of the tree of knowledge there is no place to go but onward to Zion. We cannot go back to innocence and ignorance. The basic principle of my goals and values for agriculture is that if we are going to have policies they ought to be people-centered and not commodity-centered. We cannot do justice to a commodity; we can only do justice to people.

This is why I advocate abolishing the Department of Agriculture and also the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce, for it is absurd to have commodity pressure groups in the executive branch. We have got quite enough of them in the legislature. I would very much like to reorganize the executive branch and have a Department of Science and Research, a Department of Poverty and Economics. That is about all we would need. That policy should be directed towards poverty, towards knowledge. There is practically no excuse for directing it towards agriculture as such, for agriculture is not an important enough sector of the economy.

We may soon get to the point where drycleaning is a more important industry than agriculture, and I want to worry about the family drycleaner just as much as I want to worry about the family farm. These laments about the family farm seem to me

mainly hokum. In the first place, I think the family farm is here to stay — we aren't going to get rid of it. It is an efficient unit, especially in livestock enterprises. Cows almost have to be part of a family, as they need tender loving care. When we go over to algae, perhaps this will be the end of it. But this is still a long way ahead.

PROFESSOR'S GRADES ON FARM POLICY

How bad is American agricultural policy? The only physical product of a professor is grade sheets, outside of books, which don't really count. So I suppose what I am expected to do in evaluation is to give out A's, B's and C's, and I am quite prepared to do this. It may be a gross example of the original sin of human pride and presumption, but it is still what professors are paid to do.

What I have tried to do is to assess, first of all, American agricultural policy in general, and then the policies which are advocated and promoted in the preceding papers to see how they stack up against the three tasks of the economy: allocation, distribution and growth.

For American agricultural policy as a whole, in point of allocation it gets a B, because we have succeeded in getting a lot of people out of agriculture. We could have done it better and more humanely. We could have done it faster. We ought to do it faster. But we aren't doing so badly. So this gets a B. In point of distribution (social justice) I think it gets a D. Social policy is clearly unjust if it subsidizes the rich. We have an agricultural policy which is based on price supports. If you don't sell anything, however, it doesn't matter what price you don't sell it at. Agricultural poverty arises out of the fact that the poor have so little to sell. From the point of view of distributional justice, therefore, we make quite a low grade.

From the point of view of growth and development we make an A plus. We might even make it an A plus plus. We have done extraordinarily well on this — and all for the wrong reasons. The genius of our whole society is that we always do the right thing for the wrong reasons. This is much better than doing the wrong things for the right reasons, which is what I think the Communist side often tends to do. We have been extraordinarily lucky. For instance, we set up Iowa State University, which is very much against the interests of agriculture and particularly against the interests of agricultural fundamentalists. We did this on the grounds that the way to make agriculture prosperous is to make

it efficient. Of course this isn't so. If you make agriculture efficient you make agriculture unprosperous and all the rest of us prosperous. So you see the non-farmers really ought to have to set up Iowa State. But it was the farmers who did it. This is one of the cases where ignorance was bliss.

I would argue that even our price support policies, foolish as they are, have been good from the point of view of economic development. They have introduced a certain stability into agriculture which has, I suspect, increased the rate of technological change in it, and we would not have had this degree of technological change if it hadn't been for the price supports. So everything we have done for justice has created injustice and growth, and on the whole growth is much more important than justice. If we don't have growth we can't afford to have justice. This is the best of all possible worlds, obviously.

If you compare our agricultural policy with policy in almost any other sphere of life, it stands up extremely well. Compare it with national security policy: here we have spent 500 billion dollars on national security since 1950 and the answer is, "Dig your own holes, boys." If we had achieved a corresponding degree of success in agricultural policy, we would be saying, "Look, we're terribly sorry. We don't have any food, but how about digging your own garden?" By these standards agriculture has done very well indeed. Compared with almost all other policies, agriculture stands at the top, in spite of the fact that we have done most of the right things for the wrong reasons.

In conclusion, let me go down the list of the various organizations that seem to be represented in these papers and see if I can hand out a few grades. The Farm Bureau first: I would give it a B on allocation, because it is almost the only farm organization which is not fundamentalist and which recognizes that if agriculture is going to prosper, it has got to be small and people must get out of it. This point of view is very sensible. On distribution I give it a D. The Farm Bureau consists mostly of people who have licked, personally, the problem of poverty in agriculture, and they have no interest in people who have not. The Farm Bureau has persistently fought any attempt to solve the problem of poverty in agriculture, apart from the solution of letting things take their course. This, of course, is a solution of a kind — but a very expensive one. In regard to growth I would give the Farm Bureau an A, especially in regard to commercial agriculture. But on second thought I might reduce this to a B for failing to care about economic development in the poorer sectors.

The National Farmers' Union gets no more than a C on allocation. The Brannan plan, while not perhaps an official doctrine of

the NFU, is nevertheless close to its heart. This would have pauperized American agriculture permanently and subsidized people to stay in it instead of subsidizing them to get out of it. It would indeed have eliminated the surplus of commodities but not the surplus of farmers. On distribution of income I am tempted to sneak the NFU a B on account of its warm heart and its real sensitivity to the problem of poverty. On the other hand, its remedies are either worthless or discriminatory. The danger of all policies of price or income support is that they might be generalized, on the grounds that anything which is good for farmers is good for everybody. I have been advocating around Michigan, for example, that we declare automobiles an agricultural commodity. It would solve our problems nicely if we could put a parity support price on them. If we could not sell them at that price, the government could stockpile them. We could ship them abroad under P.L. 480, and they could be used as chicken coops in Siam. This would be (for Michigan) the best of all possible worlds. From a growth position, here again NFU gets a B. It is not hostile towards technical development but it is not what I would describe as enthusiastic about it.

I've given the Grange a C on all three counts. The Grange ought to go back to whatever classical gods or goddesses it worships and think again. Really, it ought to get past the 1920's. I think that on almost any score its policies have been unrealistic. It is still wedded to McNary-Haugenism. It hasn't learned that dumping is a thing that makes you lose friends and alienate people. From the point of view of the growth objective this is absurd. The way to get income parity is to get people out of agriculture, and the way to get people out of agriculture, as I suggest, is to increase mobility. But the Grange doesn't want to do anything about this, as Mr. Thompson suggests; it just doesn't have any policy, really, as far as I can see, except what it had at the time of Calvin Coolidge's veto. Where has it been since 1920? I don't know. It's my business to be frank.

I think the National Farmers' Organization also ought to get a C on all counts. This seems to me a most extraordinary pipe-dream if ever I saw one. It should read some of the studies of whether labor unions have succeeded in diverting the national income to labor, which on the whole economists agree they haven't. Collective bargaining is extraordinarily inefficient as a means of redistributing income, absolutely the least efficient and the most costly method there is of doing it. If anybody can organize enough farmers to do collective bargaining on any scale which would make any difference I would be extraordinarily surprised. Here again, from the point of view of realism it doesn't make any sense.

The NFO doesn't organize mobility out of agriculture; it tries to keep people in agriculture. It is not even really proposing to control production. If you want a monopoly you have got to control production. If you want to exploit the rest of society you have got to control production. Just holding a few supplies off the market occasionally has little effect. In fact, the more successful you are at it the less successful you are going to be. People will stay in agriculture. They will produce more. You will just have an increasing problem and a fundamentally unstable social system. The NFO is very good for morale. As a matter of fact this is also the main function of the trade union: the NFO keeps people busy (I'm all in favor of this) and gives them an interest in life. Thus, sociologically I think it's wonderful. But economically it makes no sense.

Now we come to the churches, and I propose to jump the gun and amalgamate the Catholics and Protestants — while amalgamation is perhaps a hundred years off. From the point of view of social policy the Catholics and Protestants are almost indistinguishable. This is one of the things that I find gratifying. The ecumenical movement has gone a long way here and the differences seem to be small. I seem to have given them a B on all counts, not quite an A. On allocation I would say they are almost going up from C to A. They used to be agricultural fundamentalists but they are beginning to realize that this is unrealistic. On the other hand, they are beginning to think about how to organize mobility, which is a very important ethical problem. Too few people are concerned with this and I think this is enough to raise them to an A.

On distribution I'm not going to raise them to an A — especially the Protestants on account of the Mexicans. I am very annoyed with the National Council of Churches and I have been fighting it for several years now because it wants to discriminate against Mexicans. That is, it's a national council of churches; it preaches an American Christ; it wants to keep Mexicans out so that we can all be nice little rich Americans together. Very often the only hope for really poor people is migrant labor. At this point the church is not facing up to the realities of the world at all. It thinks America is secure in its little Tokugawa Empire; it is willing to dole out little bits to the rest of the world, but it is not going to let them in. I have been fighting this battle of ethnocentrism and nationalism in the National Council for quite a while and I have finally decided that from the ethical point of view this is the weakest link in the council's whole structure, just as the weakest link on the part of our Catholic friends is their unrealism about population.

Population is another question and a large one. But obviously if we are going to have death control we have got to have birth control too, just as, if we are going to have Iowa State, we can't have a lot of farmers. If we are going to have modern medicine we have to control population. There is no way out of this. We have got to control it morally, of course, and I expect that is the only way to control it. The worst thing, however, is not to face the problem and to refuse to talk about it. The Catholic Church has a very grave responsibility at this point which, incidentally, it shares with the Communists. But this is beside the present point and does not have much to do with agriculture or even with farmers. I doubt if the birth rate is any higher among commercial farmers than it is among professors. I am always embarrassed about this because I have five children myself, which makes my Malthusian speeches sound a little hollow.

On growth I think the churches get a B in the sense that they are not quite aware of the implications of it but that they are coming along in this way, and perhaps I can almost say that they get an A.

Now we turn to the United States Department of Agriculture. I give it a D on allocation, and I am in favor of abolishing it. There is no excuse for that big building in Washington. It deals with much too small a part of the economy. There has been a tremendous misallocation of very scarce resources into what I call the intellectual side of agriculture, which has resulted in a severe absence of these resources elsewhere. I can give it a C on distribution, actually, because it has not really emphasized the major problem; but perhaps that really is unfair because it gets bullied by the Farm Bureau. The Department did try to tackle poverty in the Farm Security Administration and things of that kind, but the great agricultural middle class didn't want to have anything to do with poor white trash, and that was the end of that. On the whole, therefore, I would say that we have done very little and that our conscious policies have done practically nothing towards abolishing poverty in agriculture. On growth I think the Department gets an A. I think it is very good on this.

I have got now to the universities and the extension services, which will be the last. I give them a C rising to A on allocation; that is, I think 25 years ago they were not realistic about it. Now, thanks to Iowa State University, I give the universities a pretty good score. On distribution I am not sure how good a grade I can give them because the universities and the extension services are still very fundamentally middle class. I am terribly worried about the thing I mentioned earlier, which is the separating out of our economy the 75 percent who make it to affluence

and the 25 percent who don't. The universities are not doing anything for that 25 percent; they just can't be bothered with it. From that point of view they don't get a very good grade on distribution. On growth they get an A plus; this is where most of it comes from.

For those who like tables, my grades are summed up below. And for those who do not like my grades, I can only suggest what I once told a student who made a similar complaint — that this was an unjust world and that education was intended to prepare us for it. Perhaps even conferences have the same objective.

EVALUATION OF AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

Organization	Allocation	Distribution (Justice)	Growth
The United States	B	D	A+
The Farm Bureau	B	D	A
National Farmers' Union	C	B	B
The National Grange	C	C	C
National Farmers' Organization	C	C	C
The Churches	B	B	B
The U.S. Department of Agriculture . . .	D	C	A
The Universities and Extension Services	C to A	C	A+

16

How To Judge Institutional Programs

ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.¹

TO EVALUATE a program of social action it is necessary to have criteria for selecting the objects to be evaluated and for making judgments of relative value. We have to determine the facts of the case, the "reality situation," and we have to decide whether the events and policies that exist are to be regarded as desirable or not. We may agree, let us say, that the rate of farm labor mobility has become increasingly responsive to changes in the level of nonfarm employment. But we may differ greatly in our judgment as to the desirability of this supposed fact.

Moreover, the specific value criteria involved in evaluating particular programs are never independent of still other value standards. In a preconference memorandum, Lee Burchinal listed six broad classes of issues concerning goals and values in American agriculture and rural communities that seem especially important and relevant. These six categories of issues were said to be associated with (1) freedom, related to agricultural production and distribution; (2) justice; (3) efficiency; (4) security; (5) general welfare, including questions about the role of government; and (6) order and stability related to community organization.

It does not require much reflection to note that none of the broad criteria suggested in this list stands alone as an absolute standard. To what extent does freedom turn out to be consistent with justice? How far can we press efficiency without endangering security? To evaluate is necessarily to balance and weigh different values implicated in the same concrete decision, act, policy or program. It is rare to find a case in which one, and only one, value is of clear and overriding importance as a basis

¹ Chairman, Department of Sociology, Cornell University.

for a major decision. Most human action is multi-valued and is permeated with ambiguities and conflicts of values. Most institutional policies and programs concerning American agriculture involve a great multitude of judgments as to what the realities of the situation are and a complex set of interdependent value judgments.

It might be thought that the complexity and contradictions to which we have just pointed represent a passing phase of contemporary programs. It might be supposed that clear and consistent policies will emerge as action programs are based on increased knowledge and logical analysis. But the tension between contradictory values is not a temporary and accidental aspect of current programs and policies. It is a permanent and inherent characteristic of value systems in human societies. Oppositions and contradictions among major values are inevitable. Theoretically we might have complete agreement that each of a finite set of values is valid and must be used as a criterion of conduct. But even in such a case, balancing of the demands generated by differing values involves at least the tension of deciding how much each shall count. In this sense all value systems have an "economic" aspect. So long as men cannot do everything at once, they must allocate time and energy in the service of one value rather than another. The human world is a world of inescapable choices among values. Not all values can be simultaneously and equally satisfied.

The values of liberty and equality are clearly central themes in our democratic traditions. They are closely linked historically. They appear together in the Declaration of Independence, in the Gettysburg Address, and in other classic statements of national credos. Yet it can be shown quite definitely that liberty and equality are in various ways inherently contradictory. In concrete cases, your freedom to hire and fire me is a restriction on my freedom. The institutional arrangements necessary to guarantee farmers "economic equality" with urban occupations (whatever this means) may diminish farmers' freedom of action. The fact that such oppositions are not always total nor immune to compromise does not allow us to blink away the real tensions and incompatibilities. From the standpoint of the operator of a large-scale commercial farm in the Imperial Valley, the values of freedom and efficiency may seem to call for maximum mobility of hired farm labor. From the standpoint of the migratory worker, the situation may result in violation of values of freedom, equality, individual dignity and humanitarian values. Farm programs may be able to work out politically viable compromises among the conflicting values. But they will rarely be able to abolish the contradictions.

So far we have suggested three main points: (1) judgments of fact and value are partly separable, but also interdependent; (2) policy judgments involve multiple values; (3) some contradictions and oppositions of values are enduring and inevitable.² The issues involved in these propositions would seem to be crucial in any evaluation of institutional programs, but they are not always made explicit. Nor are they always taken into account in appraisals of the merits of agricultural policies.

A fourth, preliminary point is that values are not found in completely separable, discrete units which combine with other values in purely additive fashion like laying one brick upon another. Rather, particular standards of desirability combine with other values in ways which modify, often radically, the original meaning of each component. Emphasis upon the worth-whileness of efficiency may be linked with values of individual achievement and humanitarianism. The actual meaning of efficiency changes if, instead, it is combined with values of nationalistic superiority and racism, as with National Socialism in Germany.

Fifth, value emphases and value conflicts shift with changes in the social environment. There is a two-way interplay between values and other aspects of the existing situation. Values affect the social structure, economic processes and technology. In turn, existing social structures, economic processes and technological developments react upon values. Under early American conditions of scarce labor, open resources and small-scale, decentralized economic production, freedom of enterprise had a meaning radically different from that implied in our present society. In an urbanized and industrialized society of tight interdependence, the concrete implications and actual meanings of freedom necessarily change.

We have to face the phenomena of urban sprawl, mounting agricultural surpluses, urban and rural slums, smog, water pollution, soil erosion and silting of reservoirs and hundreds of other instances in which the freedom of some individuals and social groupings creates conditions found to be noxious by others. Many of the pressing problems of modern American society are simply different guises of what an economist I know calls "the universal smoke nuisance." By this phrase he calls attention to all these situations in which the individual finds a given action profitable—his gratifications from burning trash outweigh the immediate

²We recognize that this contention may be disputed on the grounds that there are unified philosophies of life in which all values are hierarchically ordered in the service of a single unifying conception of the good life. Our reply would be simply that we have been unable to discover actual cases of individuals or social groupings devoid of any value conflict.

costs to him individually — but the collective outcome is a condition generally evaluated as undesirable. Where each finds it advantageous to act in a way that has consequences unfavorable to all, some type of social regulation must be invoked, if it is decided to reduce the undesired effects. Parking meters and traffic signals restrict my freedom to park and drive as I please. But existing technology has created a situation in which other aspects of freedom as well as other values call for some social regulation.

Sixth, and lastly, the generalized standards of desirability that we are calling values are not directly related to specific institutional forms. Thus, a genuine commitment to freedom as a worth-while condition of human life certainly is compatible with more than one specific set of economic and political arrangements. There are limits, of course; not all institutional forms are equally compatible with this value. But we have to be cautious in assuming, without careful analysis, just what any particular set of arrangements implies for any given value. It may be recalled that the Taft-Hartley legislation was condemned by some as a slave labor law. The wisdom of that particular legislation certainly can be debated. But it is questionable whether it marked the end of freedom for labor unions. Federal farm programs no doubt have many implications for freedom as a value; but the presence of regulation does not of itself allow us to say whether there has been a weaker or stronger commitment to freedom as a value.

From what has been said thus far it follows that for full consideration of institutional programs the evaluating observer needs to know: (1) the existing conditions to which the programs apply, (2) the values involved in the goals of the program, (3) the value implications of the means proposed to attain projected or implied goals and (4) the probable consequences of the programs upon both existing conditions and the values held by the members of the affected population themselves. In short, we require knowledge of conditions, standards of evaluative judgment and serviceable predictions of consequences.

MAIN TYPES OF CRITERIA FOR POLICY

By what standards can we judge programs designed to affect American agriculture and rural life? What are the main criteria we conceivably might use in judging the desirability of one or another policy? Merely identifying the more important possible bases of judgment would appear to be an essential, if rarely undertaken, step toward greater clarity.

Surely the most obvious criterion for policy would be the preservation of the status quo. This position may not be merely a matter of unreasoning conservatism. It can be argued that the vested interests represented by the social and economic commitments of the rural, or more narrowly agricultural, population have a genuine ethical claim to protection. In this view, the on-rushing technological and economic changes are destroying the moral basis of our society — as when a lifetime of farming ends in the obliteration of the individual's total enterprise in spite of his industry, frugality and maximum efforts in rational entrepreneurship. Left to itself, it may be said, the remorseless cost-price squeeze will continue this social and spiritual destruction. The best stopping point is now; the goal: to preserve the present situation. Something like this criterion was involved in the early programs of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in the form of the historical "base" of past production on individual farms.

It is conceivable that our policy might be primarily oriented to some criterion of humanitarian equity. Such a standard of justice would call for a definition of need, which necessarily implies a standard for deciding what is an appropriate or decent level of returns and way of life for rural people. An acceptable level of living might thus be defined for all rural people, for all agricultural workers, for all farms, for all commercial farmers or for any other segment of the population. To use an occupational or residential criterion, of course, is to introduce a kind of status justice into the economic process. Any test of need must face the question of differentials in need, depending upon social rather than sheer subsistence-physical requirements. Distribution of rewards on a need-criterion basis inevitably involves governmental action. Establishing policy for such action necessarily is a political act. Any policy of a "just standard of living" which expects to be implemented must therefore accept political involvement.

We might attempt through national governmental action to set agricultural policy or rural life policy in terms of politico-military security. The criterion would be to maintain sufficient numbers of people in rural and farm settings under conditions which would provide agreed-upon amounts and kinds of human and physical resources for survival under various military and political circumstances. For example, a dispersed and properly equipped and trained rural population might be envisaged as survival insurance under certain assumptions concerning post-strike conditions in a nuclear war.

Institutional policies and programs might be guided in part by

aesthetic-expressive values and considerations of physical and mental health. The maintenance of open areas, plant cover, animal life and protection of soil and water might be justified by values of recreation and health and maintenance of an aesthetically satisfying environment. As urban congestion and its physically and psychologically irritating and debilitating accompaniments increase, even a task-centered, pragmatic and unsentimental people may come to rank these values higher in their appraisals.

Policies and programs concerning agriculture and rural life may be based upon and judged in terms of certain values of character or personality development. It may be believed, for instance, that the family farm provides a setting especially conducive to the development of self-reliance, ethical individualism, high evaluation of work, or any one of dozens of other characteristics. Although evidence demonstrating the alleged effects is scanty, beliefs of this kind may be important in the politics of agricultural programs.

If we allow ourselves to recall that in the field of foreign relations the United States since 1945 has done a very great many things that would have been regarded as altogether impossible and unthinkable a generation earlier, we may feel free to speculate further. It is possible to imagine circumstances under which the nation might seek to increase agricultural production for distribution abroad. The test of policy might then be production needed to meet international commitments, even when domestic supply-demand conditions would not have dictated so large a volume. Unlikely as this policy line now seems, it should nevertheless be on our list.

Under certain other conditions, we can imagine that the guiding criterion of policy would be reduced to sheer pressure-group effectiveness in the political process. The reference here is to a situation in which narrow political expediency came to override most of the other values we are reviewing.

Finally, policy might be guided, in whole or in part, by the touchstone of economic efficiency, expressible in various kinds of maximizing formulae. The basic criterion here would be the optimum allocation and utilization of factors of production in the economic system as a whole, or within the agricultural sector.

The above sketch of types of criteria for establishing and judging policy is intended to be merely suggestive and is very far from being complete. It may serve, however, to render somewhat more concrete the idea of a complex set of really major value considerations which influence institutional programs. We must immediately hasten to add that our listing must not leave the impression that policies are based alone upon such values.

Policy is based also upon knowledge, lack of knowledge, error, mistaken beliefs and a variety of specific situational influences. Furthermore, in the actual processes of policy determination, legislation and administration, a merely permissive or supportive consensus on values may be no match for the driving power or "clustering" impact of powerful leaders and groups with clear-cut objectives serving specific but strong interests. Whatever may be the part played by values in action programs, the standards we have reviewed provide convenient points of reference for our evaluations as observers of programs.

In evaluating institutional programs it is useful to keep in mind the two different senses in which our ordinary language uses the term value. We find ourselves speaking quite naturally of value in the sense of an evaluation of an object, as for example, "the family farm is of the highest value in our civilization," or "rural slums are a disgrace to our affluent society," or "free public education is one of our most valuable national assets." In this type of usage the standards by which the judgment is being made are left implicit. On the other hand, we also use the word value to refer to standards or criteria for evaluation — to conceptions of desirability which guide our particular appraisals of events, men, policies, or any other objects of regard. Throughout this paper we shall be thinking of values as the standards of goodness, appropriateness and the like by which value judgments are made.

It is essential to make these distinctions explicit, for the preceding papers use several different implied definitions of values. Mr. Cochrane's paper, for example, makes values refer to intensity or degree of need to live according to certain beliefs; these beliefs, in the first place, were "... concepts of ways of living and making a living which people feel obliged to follow." Thus, values are conceived as degrees of need to live according to concepts of a worth-while life. This conception of values overlaps with the notion of value orientations as used in the well-known formulation of Clyde Kluckhohn. However, it contains a motivational component that is conceptually separated in most anthropological and sociological analyses.

In the remarks to follow, the problem of evaluation is first approached through brief reviews of those papers which were available to the writer in advance. By selective comments upon the papers, both the objects and the criteria of evaluation hopefully may be brought into focus. Then in the concluding section of this paper, certain general problems of policy will be examined against the criteria provided, on the one hand by contemporary social reality and on the other by historic American values.

SELECTIVE REVIEW OF CONFERENCE PAPERS

In the statement of Rev. Father O'Rourke we find the conception of a single unifying goal for social action: the establishment of a Christian social and economic order. We must note, of course, that the single goal may not be universally accepted in a religiously pluralistic society lacking an established church. And, we must be attentive to actual differences in interpretation and emphasis as the goal is specified in terms of particular policies.

The paper by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Speltz provides a philosophic background for a well-defined position concerning the involvement of religion in the concrete social and economic affairs of our times. Necessarily such an admirably concise review of these complex questions has had to pass quickly over points which merit extended discussion. Because of my own sociological work on values in American society I was struck, for example, by the brief comment that "... The good of the person is a true end whereas freedom is but a means and requires further specification before it can qualify as a value." Here we are in the hazardous realm of the historically derived connotations of words. As I understand the term value and the term end, I suspect that many millions of Americans have regarded freedom as an end and a genuine value. Whatever the assumptions, e.g. about human nature that may have been concealed in the regard for freedom as a value, freedom has not been conceived as entirely nebulous. Indeed, as I appraise the historical record I have the impression that freedom has often been thought of and felt to be an intrinsic part of the "primacy of the person" and inseparable from the unfolding of personality. One may hypothesize that there is probably some positive correlation between a high evaluation of individual freedom and the view that human nature is mostly good, or at least is not radically evil, under proper conditions of freedom.

With regard to the main points made by Msgr. Speltz concerning the characteristics of a rural way of life, I see a need to specify just what particular properties of rural living, or more specifically of the family farm and private property in land, lead to the values historically believed to be fostered by rural living. This specification becomes a crucial datum for policy determination in an increasingly urban and industrialized world. As urbanism permeates the country areas it is essential to know more exactly how desired values are developed and maintained under various social conditions.

Both Rev. O'Rourke and Msgr. Speltz lay stress upon the desirability of order and integration in life styles. A variety of

specific goals of church programs are seen as means organized around a unity of religious purpose and devotion. So, for example, work is valued as a means of personal development, life on the land as a condition favoring piety and property in land as a support for the dignity of man. A general reluctance to approve centralized state power rests partly on the belief that personal freedom and dignity are best protected where power is diffused.

It may be important to observe that certain industry-council plans may be open to question on the grounds that they would create gigantic concentrations of power over and above unions, firms, cooperatives, trade associations and other agencies of economic life below the level of the national state or of the "peak association." The dangers of a corporate state obviously have to be carefully weighed against the merits of particular proposals for national politico-economic organization.

Another point meriting more attention than can be given here is the ethics of "self-sacrifice." The idea of self-sacrifice for the common good easily lends itself to distortion in the struggles of the secular world. Perhaps all we can say just now is that if the individual does not include himself in the ethical equation, his sacrifice for others will not have the quality of a principle generalizable to other men.

In the closing paragraphs of his paper Msgr. Speltz poses a crucial dilemma of values — "... which is the ultimate norm for determining goals and values in agriculture: will it be the ethical-religious norm or the technological-economic?" In pointing directly to the ambiguity of national policies in regard to the relative weight of these two sets of values, this paper sounds a theme that recurs, explicitly or implicitly, throughout the various papers.

In noting the connection between the goals and values of the Extension Service and the "job description" and "metes and bounds" laid down by federal legislation, Mr. Claar's paper suggests that in reality one is discussing the goals and values held by the representatives of the people. I am sure that this statement is intended to be taken in a very broad and free sense. Certainly there are directors of Extension in some states who would bridle at the suggestion that the goals and values of their programs were predetermined by Congress in the establishment of the Cooperative Extension Service. We all know that local conditions, local interests and pressures, distinctive subcultures and many internal organizational processes generate values and goals of a most complex array over and above the rather formal dictates of legislation.

If a genuinely analytical social history of Extension is ever

written, it will have to give particular attention to the phrase "all of the people" as a description of Extension's clientele. I am thinking not only of the fading rural-urban boundary but also of migratory farm workers, low-income farmers and rural people of various minority, racial, ethnic or religious groups. It seems reasonable to suppose that data and objective analysis would show many fascinating variations and changes in local policies and practices in different states and regions. Naturally enough the leaders of the Cooperative Extension Service do not wish to state its goals in a manner likely to make the program a focus of intense controversy or political conflict.

In a society which pays great homage to education, it is no doubt wise to state Extension's objectives in terms of education. As Mr. Claar puts it: "Stating the goal of Extension in terms of increased knowledge and understanding of individuals keeps Extension free of the conflict between the goals so that it may concentrate on its job of objective education." The consequences of what Extension does, however, are not, and cannot, be neutral. Education is always education for something; it is always relevant to values. One may say, that we will simply inform farmers of modern methods of economic management, and let the farmers decide what to do. But by what we teach and what we omit, by how we teach and to whom, we inevitably influence choices and shape the character of our society. Extension does in many ways reflect widespread values in the environing society; but it is very far from being a mere mirror, a simply passive transmission agency.

In the early paragraphs of his paper Mr. Rohde points to tremendous changes which have occurred in the twentieth century in technology, in the economic situation and in the social pattern of U.S. rural society. Without making the point fully explicit, he clearly is suggesting that objective changes in the social system have definite and important effects upon values and beliefs, either in changing the latter directly or in producing strains and tensions. In common with several other papers, Mr. Rohde's statement emphasizes the connection between a desire to preserve values of freedom and the dignity of the individual and an agricultural fundamentalism which "involves a judgment that the family farm as it performs the social function of feeding and clothing the nation is a superior institution."

It seems correct to say that one form or another of agricultural fundamentalism has characterized the general farm organizations. I would suggest in addition that the conflict of ideas and values that has emerged as agricultural fundamentalism results in part from the identification of certain highly generalized and

basic values with particular, historically limited institutional forms.

I hope I may be forgiven for saying that the principle of economic justice stated by Mr. Rohde's paper to be indisputable is surely one of the most vigorously disputed indisputable propositions known to history. The whole nub of the parity concept is that parity of income, like the medieval "just price," does not even appear to be automatic or inevitable. The laissez-faire free market was not automatic or inevitable either, but for a long time many people believed it to be so, and in believing this they made it partly true.

We should take special note that Dr. Greene's first major step is to disavow any special theology of rural life on the ground that "... Christian theology does not separate men into groups, classes or categories and offer a different gospel for different states of mankind." In this ultimate religious universalism lies one of the main foundations for the ethical universalism which is a central component in the ruling systems of values and beliefs in our society.

Dr. Greene presents a concise summary of some of the main elements in Protestant theological postulates: the omnipotent, creating God, the divine-human covenant, the ethical tension of the limited freedom of the fallible human creature confronting his divine mandates, the centrality of Jesus Christ, the law of love, the radical evil in the world, the sinful nature of man, the struggle for righteousness, the reality of rebirth and redemption. The relations of these doctrines to ethical criteria for policy are sketched in broad outlines, beginning with the statement, "Love, in short, is the essence of God's will and purpose for man."

It surely is a clarifying note to have a distinguished churchman, known for his interest in rural life, given a penetrating refutation of rural fundamentalism: "...for every virtue attributable to country living and to the agricultural vocation there is to be found a countervailing vice."

Also, I have not heard elsewhere a more pithy statement of the view that basic religious beliefs provide no basis for deducing precisely the most appropriate economic doctrines and economic arrangements. The writer does not find a religious basis for giving absolute sanction to any particular economic system or accompanying ideology. Any given religious position, at the level of basic doctrine, leaves open a range of possibilities in this area of life, as in others. The limitation on the Christian's capacity to give religious prescriptions for complex and specific human problems is generalized in this statement: "If Christian faith could provide such definite and specific answers, all Christians would

inevitably belong to the same political party, the same farm organization and the same school of economic thought. That such is not the case is testimony to the wide margins of freedom and the vast areas of responsible decision-making which God has left in the hands of His children." What is available instead is a generalized religious value standard, the Law of Love, plus a specifically religious motivation to apply this principle in all specific cases.

When the basic doctrines are applied to particular questions of policy implicated in goals and values, it becomes clear that no value stands alone in the empirical world. Stewardship may conflict with freedom, and freedom with justice, and so on. Does stewardship involve "rational problems of population planning and control?" Clearly, it does in the views of some people; to others it clearly does not. Since policies ultimately must be translated into specific terms, such questions are not easily solved by initial agreement on highly general beliefs and values, although such agreement may nevertheless be highly important in a variety of ways.

I have said elsewhere that the meaning of freedom as a value is not to be fully apprehended by particular historical expressions of it in American institutions. Freedom as a value is surely compatible with a fairly extended range of social and economic arrangements. In any case it must be understood that no one can be free from all consequences of his action; in the universe as it is he can ask no more than to be free to choose and to cope as best he may with the consequences which flow from his choosing.

There is no doubt that Dr. Greene is doing us a service in making explicit the fact that parity is an ethical concept, analogous to the old doctrine of just price. The criterion he proposes for justice in this area is that diligent farm families operating efficient farms should receive net real returns (level of living) equivalent to their counterparts in other economic pursuits. How diligent? How efficient? Shall we equalize marginal real returns through the market? Can we? If not, why not?

In short, real value conflicts are immediately raised as soon as we begin to consider policies in the concrete. I would press this point much further had not Dr. Greene partly obviated the need by his forthright statement that "... human goals and values are forever in conflict with one another."

With reference to the discussion of community as a value, I hope that as a sociologist I may be permitted to welcome the comments of a theologian. However, I really had not been aware that any unusual fog had settled around the term. Varying definitions no doubt sometimes trouble the casual reader, but this is

a difficulty easily remedied. And we must remember that there is no point in quarreling with definitions, only with the consequences of using one rather than another.

Research has added impressive evidence in support of the idea that the human being is an "open system" requiring continuous multiple interchanges with his environment, especially his social environment. Experiments on sensory deprivation suggest that much varied physical stimulation is necessary to psychological balance. There probably are profound psychobiological bases for the need of human beings for social interaction. All this is important to know as a touchstone of policy. But it will not help us very much in determining how to create the conditions for effective community under present-day conditions.

An important assumption, often made, finds expression in Dr. Greene's contention that "... the rural life is, by classic definition, composed of small communities of intimately and sensitively interacting human beings and families." And this situation allegedly provides optimal social conditions for the expression of the Law of Love. Clearly this is a view difficult to test by exact empirical means. Nevertheless, it may be valuable to interject a note of skeptical caution. Some of the most insensitive behavior this sociologist has ever observed — indeed, callously brutal might be an appropriate term — has occurred in small rural communities. It is appropriate to point out that lynchings in the South for many years were rural phenomena of great frequency. Country air does not automatically create virtue.

In the same cautionary spirit, it should be noted in passing that it is not at all certain that the tide of urbanization will lead to a totally homogenized culture. Indeed, it is possible to demonstrate that such total uniformity cannot occur under the conditions of urban life in our society in any foreseeable future. The sources of diversity lie deep in the nature of man and in the essential processes of large-scale social systems. This is not to discount severe threats to individual freedom and social diversity in the modern world. But the issue is far from simple. Not all the trends point to automatons living in bleak conformity in a regimented society, to complete homogeneity in beliefs and values.

Rev. McCanna's concise summary of goals and values affirmed in the programs of the National Council of Churches provides rich material for discussion precisely because it indorses particular policies and programs. It advocates support of the Freedom from Hunger Campaign, asks for elimination of programs importing foreign contract labor for temporary agricultural employment,

approves collective bargaining on the part of employers and employees in agriculture and advocates legislation to protect seasonal farm workers. It clearly confronts the existence of massive poverty in rural areas.³ It does not hesitate to declare that "pauperization is sin."

In coming so close to concrete issues, the religiously related views expressed in this paper will at some point attract the attention of critics who will wish to deny that religious values call directly for the particular types of policies and actions here advocated. When Rev. McCanna calls for local pastors to "seek out and help the dispossessed become articulate" he also notes: "To assume that the present county or town power structures will do this is an illusion — too much of vested interest is at stake." We see in these considerations the eternal dilemma of social religion: to change the world it must be involved in the world, and in the world of power and material interests the church has a difficult role to play. Studies of the local pressures brought to bear upon clergymen who bring religious norms to bear upon controversial issues do not encourage us to believe that Protestant pastors will be allowed to depart radically from views tied in with the social and economic interests of their congregations.

The recurring theme of value conflict which runs through the papers already reviewed comes to full and explicit expression in the presentation by Mr. Cochrane. As evidence for this judgment I cite only two samples of his forthright exposition on this point:

Abandonment of the long-run myth of ultimate deliverance from all conflicts among our deeply cherished beliefs and values will enable us to divert otherwise wasted energies into lines of action that minimize the discomforts of our conflicting beliefs and values.

...and more specifically:

...a fair return to agriculture cannot be achieved without some management of market supplies, hence some sacrifice of entrepreneurial freedom.

Although the mode of statement is careful and restrained, Mr. Cochrane's paper leaves little doubt that severe conflicts of

³In this it is at one with views expressed by the President's Study Group on National Voluntary Services, A Report to the President, Jan. 14, 1963: "A startling fact is that over half of the poverty in America is rural poverty. The number of rural families with inadequate income exceeds the number in urban areas. About 6,200,000 rural families have an annual income of less than \$2,500. We have excess productive capacity in agriculture, declining rural population and decaying towns and villages."

values probably will center around governmental agricultural programs in years ahead.

In general, I concur with Mr. Cochrane's analysis of American value patterns and their relation to the basic economic and political situation now confronting our agriculture. Indeed, the 1951 edition of my American Society⁴ contained an analysis of values which stressed the clustering of emphases upon activity, work, achievement, success, practicality, efficiency, science and secular rationality, material comfort and progress. At the same time, that analysis showed enduring and powerful commitments to a moral orientation involving ethical universalism. Also, to humanitarianism and to the values (sometimes conflicting) of democracy, freedom, equality and the dignity of individual personality. The analysis pointed, finally, to nationalism-patriotism and to sentiments of group superiority and racism as other main foci of evaluation. Drawing upon further reflection and the analyses of others, the 1960 edition stressed the importance of activism and moral orientations. Both analyses emphasize multiple conflicts among values. The analyses also showed how the dynamic economic interdependencies of our society create trends toward greater involvement of government in economic life and of economic interests in political and administrative processes.

Having noted these major points of agreement, it is necessary to register some questions and a possible difference of emphasis on the relation of values to public policy. Mr. Cochrane says: "Policies and programs stand or fall depending upon whether or not they are in line with basic beliefs and values. What does this mean? How long and how widely must policies and programs diverge from basic beliefs and values before they fall? Clearly one can imagine programs that would so obviously and radically violate important values and beliefs held by a majority of the voting population as to fall completely outside the range of political feasibility. But the limits of tolerance are rather wide, and the boundaries very fluid and vague. There is a vast range of permissive public opinion within which a variety of programs are conceivable. Within that range the important practical question is: how closely does a program have to "fit" what values of which sectors of the electorate and of its leaders? In the book Public Opinion and American Democracy, V. O. Key, Jr.⁵ has shown that in many situations there is only a loose relationship between general public opinion and specific legislative and executive action in

⁴Williams, Robin M., Jr., American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. Alfred O. Knopf, Inc., 1951.

⁵Key, Valdimer O., Jr., Public Opinion and American Democracy. Alfred O. Knopf, Inc., 1961.

the national government. This circumstance implies the need to pay close attention to the values and interests of articulate and well organized segments of the public.

CONCLUSION

A return to the nineteenth century's concepts of unlimited economic individualism and "boycotting government" is literally impossible. Nor are the American people prepared to let sub-marginal farmers starve nor even to let unrestrained market processes work out their full impact upon the agricultural sector. Humanitarian and equalitarian values stand opposed to the consequences that would ensue from unregulated technological and economic change. At the same time, considerable resistance to new social controls has been generated, not alone by selfish interests but also by commitments to values of independence and active mastery of environment. High evaluation of certain material standards of living and strong attachments to symbols of social prestige render many rural people too dependent upon money incomes to allow them to renounce their involvement in the market. As one upstate New York broiler producer recently said, "We have to keep running in a race where everyone does better than a 4-minute mile."

Complete entrepreneurial freedom is incompatible with several of the other important goals and values desired by our farm people. Because we want several incompatible things, the agricultural programs of the future will continue to represent complex compromises among different values and goals. There is a limit to the subsidization of comparatively well-off commercial farmers that will be politically tolerated in an urbanized democracy. There is a limit to the acceptability to the conscience of the public of the mass misery of migratory farm workers or of the rural slums of stranded populations. A societal equilibrium is not identical with an economic equilibrium. Nor can a societal balance — however we may define it — be found by frozen commitments to vested interests. The only hope for an effective agriculture and an enduring rural life is in selective change and adaptation to new conditions. There is no simple panacea. Some answers will be found in research, teaching or extension services. Some will be devised by individuals, by cooperatives, by local communities, by private voluntary associations. A very substantial amount of governmental regulation and guidance will continue. New social inventions will be needed and will emerge — new forms of organization, new procedures.

We cannot say whether or not a more sophisticated understanding of value conflicts and value priorities will gradually develop in our society, permitting greater effectiveness in achieving a humane and free society in an interdependent and changing world. But these papers surely represent a step in the direction of increased clarity and depth of comprehension.

17

An Evaluation by a Political Scientist

ANDREW HACKER¹

I SHALL CONFINE myself to a few impressions about the preceding papers and shall try to be both brief and candid.

THE THEOLOGIAN

I must confess that to me the points made by the theologians are uniformly disappointing. Almost without exception they explore the niceties of religious doctrine. Surely there is no need to propound and rehearse the various theological principles at such length. More annoying, scarcely any effort at all is made to relate these generalized propositions to the specific problems of agricultural goals and values.

I had hoped something would be brought out about the problems encountered by priests, ministers and churches in rural settings. There seem to be several reasons why this was not done. The first is that most of the theologians represented here are from administrative offices and theological schools — not from the countryside parishes.

Moreover, the theologians are from the respectable, articulate and well-organized sects. But it is my impression that a large proportion of rural Americans are affiliated with fundamentalist churches. Fundamentalism is still a strong force, especially in the countryside, and it would be instructive to have its social viewpoint stated. My impression is that the fundamentalists are conservative in temperament and often quite intolerant in outlook. At all events, I should like to hear their viewpoint.

¹Professor of Political Science, Cornell University.

Also lacking is the viewpoint of a Negro minister from a rural church. Almost six million Negroes still live in rural areas and this group, which is stongly oriented to religious life, deserves our attention. Their churches are also fundamentalist, although in a rather different sense from those of their white neighbors.

Finally, theologians generally do not like to get themselves involved in social, economic and political controversy. This is why the points made are at the rarified level of principles rather than in the arena of problems. If principles are general enough — and most involved here are — then there will be little argument over them. Indeed, the avoidance of controversy is characteristic of the parish minister whether he is in a rural or an urban setting. The typical cleric is not a free agent. If he is a Protestant minister, he is dependent upon the good will of the dominant members of his congregation. And these, for the most part, are the better-off people in his community. They are not ones to appreciate a minister who rocks the boat. For it is, after all, their boat and they are quite comfortable in it as things are. Roman Catholic priests can take a more independent line if they have a sympathetic bishop. Some bishops are willing to give their support to outspoken parish priests, and in several such cases the Roman Catholic Church has had a distinguished record. But most bishops are conservative, and priests lower down in the hierarchy understand that silence is expected of them on social issues.

Those who have been active in the religious life of America have never been notable for defining social goals and values. It was probably too much to expect that the theologians would depart from this tradition.

RURAL VERSUS AGRICULTURAL

I was impressed with the comment that we ought to distinguish between "rural" and "agricultural" America. Needless to say, this distinction was not and could not be maintained, for the overlapping is inevitable. But to confine ourselves to the goals and values of only "agricultural" Americans is to limit our thinking to the problems of approximately 8 percent of the population. Put another way, the "rural" population of the United States in 1960 was about 54 million, but the "farm" population was only 14.8 million. Thus approximately 40 million Americans live in rural areas but do not earn their livings by farming. I should have thought that our major concern would be with the 54 million citizens who comprise rural America and not simply with the

14.8 million who are in agriculture. The quality of rural life leaves much to be desired and calls out for discussion on our part. Certainly the goals and values of the Americans with whom we are concerned are as much related to their rustic place of residence as they are to the ways in which they secure their incomes. At all events, none of the papers demonstrated that "rural-farm" people are far different from "rural-nonfarm" people.

THE FAMILY FARM

There was much concern over the future and the fate of the family farm. Most of the papers conclude that the family farm is a good thing and ought to be preserved. Yet what emerges most strikingly is that the family farm is, in actuality, a small-to-medium-sized business, and its proprietor is a member of the middle-to-upper-middle class. For it was pointed out that to rate as a family farm a farm must be capitalized at \$100,000 or more. This is hardly a modest enterprise. There appear to be about 2 million of these family farms, and I was persuaded that they are doing quite well. The 2 million farmers who run them belong to articulate groups such as the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange and the Farmers' Union. While there may be differences of opinion between the various associations and their respective members, the conflicts are within the middle class, and success for one line of policy need not spell disaster for those who adhere to another.

The attitude seems to be that farms capitalized at under \$100,000 do not rate as family farms and hence fail to embody the virtues characteristic of their wealthier neighbors. These other farms apparently are not long for this world, and the view seems to be that those who own or work them ought to begin packing for a move to the slums of Chicago or Oakland. There were no suggestions as to how a farm with assets of less than \$100,000 might raise itself to the optimum level. It is clear those families, also numbering about 2 million, who are on the doomed nonfamily farms, experience a rather grim existence and perhaps deserve some consideration.

Indeed, whether we are talking about "rural" or "agricultural" America — or both — much of the problem is southern. Taking the 1959 figures, there were 3.7 million farms in the United States and over 1.6 million of them were in the South. Considering the relative populations of the southern and nonsouthern states, the South has far more than its share of farms. This is a point which certainly is worth some time exploring.

PORTRAIT OF RURAL LIFE

The goals and values of rural America involve a discussion of the attitudes held by rural Americans. If one finds this characterization consonant with one's own value system, then there are few major problems in the realm of rural values. If, on the other hand, rural values seem to be wanting in several significant respects, then basic attitudes may be in need of an overhauling.

I will attempt to characterize — at the risk of caricaturing — these attitudes.

The rural American is a "superior" individual. He possesses the virtues of self-reliance and independence of mind, and has a strong sense of family ties and religious values. He is strongly patriotic and proud of his nation's pre-eminent status in the world. The rural citizen looks on himself as a successful person, and he tends to be not a little impatient with those who have failed to equal his record of attainments. Thus he is opposed to government hand-outs or welfare benefits, for it is questionable whether upstanding individuals should be taxed to support those who are patently undeserving. The rural American has also been successful in that he is a member of the white race, belongs to a Christian church and had parents or earlier forebears who came from Northern Europe. Those who failed to gain these attributes through an unfortunate choice of parents are looked upon as somewhat inferior. The rural American, then, may be somewhat lacking in compassion for those not as successful as himself; but there is probably little point in shedding tears for those naturally incapable of rising to the higher virtues.

The rural American is persuaded that his perception of reality leaves little to be desired. He knows what he knows, whether by intuition or other means, and the knowledge he has is correct knowledge. Intellectuals and others who question conventional values are regarded with suspicion, as are most new ideas. There are no new problems that require new modes of thinking; on the contrary, we ought to return to traditional patterns of behavior if we are to solve our problems.

On the political level the rural citizen is distrustful of democracy. In contrast to what occurs in urban politics, those who live in rural areas are deferential to their betters and permit them to run the affairs of government. Thus a banker-lawyer-merchant class is allowed to dominate party and political offices, for that group knows best what is in the public interest. There is not the populism that one encounters in the cities, where the masses insist on making their views known and having them translated into political policy. The rural citizen respects those who by position and attainment are his rightful rulers. This makes for stability in politics and orderly relations in the community.

18

European Perspectives of Agricultural Changes and Societal Adaptations

E. W. HOFSTEE¹

BISMARCK, the famous German Imperial Chancellor, once supposedly said, "He who speaks of Europe is wrong." When Bismarck made this statement he was referring to the political unity of Europe, which according to him, was an illusion. But even years later when we try to look at Europe as a whole we often cannot avoid the feeling that this statement still holds true in a wider sense than Bismarck imagined. Europe shows such a diversity in almost all aspects of human life that often European unity seems to be a creation of the imagination. The study of agriculture, rural life and agricultural policy in that part of the world particularly can evoke this feeling.

There are countries like England where only a small percentage of the active population is working in agriculture. But there are also countries like Italy whose economy still depends on agriculture to a high degree. There are parts of Europe like Denmark, the Netherlands and Belgium where the output per acre and the production per animal are on the average higher than anywhere else in the world. On the other hand, in northwestern Ireland and southern Italy productivity in agriculture is still at an extremely low level. In the Netherlands almost every young man who wants to become a farmer gets a vocational education in agriculture and, after he becomes a farmer, he has the most extensive agricultural extension service at his disposal.

In some other European countries education in agriculture is far from what it should be. In Northwestern Europe in particular the way of life of many farmers hardly differs from that of modern middle-class people in the cities, while in some parts of

¹ Professor of Rural Sociology, Agricultural University, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Southern Europe illiterate peasants are living in almost the same way as their medieval forbears. In a country like Germany protection of agriculture as a national policy is a long-standing tradition. Elsewhere in Europe free trade is deeply rooted in the minds of policymakers, and protection for national agriculture is still accepted only hesitatingly. In some countries a matter-of-fact attitude towards agriculture and rural life by the general public is more or less common. In other places there is still a strong tendency to ascribe all kinds of special virtues to agriculture and rural life. People still often think in terms of the German sociologist Tönnies. For them the village is the noble "Gemeinschaft" and the city is the bad "Gesellschaft." When one lectures about agriculture and rural life in an objective, non-emotional way, he runs the risk in certain circles in Germany, Austria and Switzerland, for example, of meeting a vehement, emotional opposition. But the same lecture in similar circles in England, the Netherlands or Denmark would only evoke a matter-of-fact discussion.

And so one could go on for some time, even if he considers only the part of Europe west of the Iron Curtain.

But notwithstanding all these great and important differences between the various countries, Europe is more than a mere geographical concept. We cannot deny that it makes sense to look at Europe as a whole — at least at the non-Communist part of Europe. And even more than that, it is necessary to look at Europe as some kind of unit if we want to understand what is going on in that part of the world. We can blame many students of social and economic life in Europe for still being so strongly impressed by Europe's diversity and being so strongly involved in the study of national problems that they forget that those problems often can only be understood when they are seen in relation to the problems of Europe as a whole.

It would lead us too far to investigate here the historical, cultural, social and economic conditions which mean that the European countries will face a common future on the one hand and will act as more or less separate parts of the world on the other hand. I want especially to point out that this holds true for agriculture and rural life.

When we study the development of social and economic life in the rural districts of Europe, regardless of the many differences which exist and which have been emphasized here already, it is rather astonishing to perceive that everywhere the changes in Europe are moving in the same direction. It is hardly necessary to say that the establishment of the European Economic Community — the Common Market as the Anglo-Saxon countries

continue to call it — has nothing to do with this. Only during 1962 did it really begin to influence the economic aspects of agriculture in the six countries. In 1961 the six came to a fundamental agreement as to the future agricultural policy of the Common Market. And the fact that they agreed must — at least partly — be explained as a consequence of a conscious or unconscious feeling that regardless of existing differences, they face the same troubles and have the same perspectives.

What are the forces which shape conditions and will shape the future of agriculture and rural life in Europe? The answer will be different according to the student's point of view. The sociologist, the economist and the agronomist will emphasize different aspects of the phenomenon. I think it is my bias as a sociologist which makes me consider the sociological, or better perhaps, the socio-cultural aspect as the most fundamental one.

DISAPPEARANCE OF TRADITIONALISM

The most important feature of rural life in Europe is perhaps the rapid disappearance of traditionalism. The attitude towards change is the essential characteristic of traditionalism as a pattern of culture as contrasted with the modern-dynamic pattern. In a traditionalistic culture man considers change essentially wrong and dangerous. For him the norms which regulate behavior come from the past. Past ways of doing things were right. Thus these ways must govern in the present and also in the future. The traditional man, because of his strong ties with the past and the stability of his society, at least in his own surroundings, shows a strong self-confidence in his behavior. He knows exactly what he has to do in his trade, in his family and in his community. He knows the customary sequence of these actions.

If a man takes part in modern-dynamic culture, it means that in principle he has a positive attitude toward change. Such a man believes that in trade, in family life and in society as a whole change may lead to more adequate provisions for the existing needs. Therefore he is willing to consider the value of anything new which comes to his knowledge and is willing to ask himself whether it can contribute to his goals.²

²About the modern dynamic pattern of culture versus the traditionalistic pattern and its influence on agriculture and rural life, see several publications of the department of rural sociology of the Agricultural University of Wageningen, as for example: E. W. Hofstee, "Veranderend Platteland," *Landbouwkundig Tijdschrift*, 1962, pp. 671-90; E. W. Hofstee, "75 Jaar ontwikkeling van de Nederlandse landbouw," *Driekwart eeuw plattelandsgroei*, Nederlandse Heidemaatschappij, Arnhem, 1963,

The origin of the modern-dynamic pattern of culture probably is to be found in the Italian Renaissance where, for example, Leonardo da Vinci clearly represented the modern man. From there it spread over Europe, but for ages this new way of thinking remained restricted to a relatively small elite. Only in the eighteenth century did the modern-dynamic culture gradually penetrate larger numbers of the population finally reaching the lower classes. The process of the development of the modern pattern of culture and the passing of the traditionalistic one is not yet completed.

In general the modern pattern of culture developed rather late in the rural districts. This is not only, and probably not primarily, a consequence of the isolation of the countryside. In several rural districts where we find a well-to-do class of farmers, the modern pattern of culture developed as early, and sometimes even earlier, than in the nearby cities.³ But the majority of rural people were poor and, along with the lower classes in the towns and cities, they were relatively late in being influenced by modern ways of thinking.

Generally speaking, the modern way of thinking among the farmers, came first into being along the shores of the North Sea. Here, already at the end of the eighteenth century and in the first half of the nineteenth century, clear symptoms of a changing mentality could be perceived in some districts.

But since the end of the 19th century and in particular since World War II the modern-dynamic culture spread very quickly. Gradually it gained ground in the southern and eastern parts of Europe and penetrated also into the minds of the rural population in the poorer districts where small-scale farming prevails. Only a few years ago it seemed that in some rural areas there were pockets of resistance against modernization, but this resistance is gradually breaking down.

There are still important differences, of course, as to the degree to which modern-dynamic culture is accepted. In France, for example, a clear distinction can be made between the country north and south of the Loire. But more than ever the modern pattern of culture is becoming characteristic for agriculture and rural life in Europe.

pp. 92-129; E. W. Hofstee, "Sociological Aspects of Economic Growth in Agriculture," *International Conference of Agricultural Economists, Mexico, 1961* (in print), B. Benvenuti, *Farming in Cultural Change*, Assen, Van Gorcum and Comp., 1962, R. Bergsma, *Op weg naar een nieuw cultuurpatroon*, Assen, Van Gorcum and Comp., 1963.

³A rural district in which the modern-dynamic pattern of culture came into being at the end of the eighteenth century is described in: E. W. Hofstee, *Het Oldambt*, Groningen, J. B. Wolters' Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1937.

The penetration of the modern-dynamic pattern of culture means that the rural population is exposed to new ideas and new types of behavior in all spheres of human life. Just being willing to accept change does not determine, of course, what type of change will take place. The outcome depends also on the alternatives to former ways of thinking and former ways of behaving and on the choices made from these alternatives.

URBAN POPULATION AS REFERENCE GROUP

We come to the second factor of decisive importance for the development of agriculture and rural life in Europe, namely the rural population's acceptance of the urban population as their reference group. It is not necessary to mention the factors which caused the opening up of the countryside to urban influences in Europe. They are essentially the same as in the United States. Ultimately they led to the same results, namely an increasing acceptance of urban values and a striving for an urban way of life. But it seems to me that there are differences in the history of the urbanization of the countryside in Europe and in America. It is important to stress in this respect that in Europe, World War II is a clear reference point. Urban centers, of course, already had considerable influence on rural life in many parts of Europe long before the war. But the changes were gradual. Rural life, even in areas where the modern-dynamic pattern of culture was completely accepted, was regulated by a set of norms of its own which differed from that in the cities.

The rural population, for example, had their own ideas about a reasonable standard of living. The level of wages and prices was lower than in the cities. The kinds of social and economic services which were considered normal and sufficient in the country were simpler than those the urban population desired and they were fewer in number. The same holds true for cultural services like education and recreation. Urban life was still more or less foreign to the rural people. The countryside was a world of its own. City life had few temptations for the rural population, and when one migrated to the city it was for economic reasons, not because one liked it.

All this has changed very quickly. It should be pointed out that even after the war, agricultural policy in many European countries consciously or unconsciously is partly based on the assumption that the rural society is a world of its own with its own values, its own standards and its own mentality. Plans for social and economic development of rural districts are often

made as if rural life was still more or less independent of what was going on in nonrural society.⁴

But the real development in rural areas since the 1950's has shown that this assumption is out of date. In all European countries farmers and farm laborers are now demanding the same incomes, the same housing facilities, the same opportunities for education and other kinds of cultural services, the same shopping facilities and so on. But they want more than the urban standard of living. Regardless of what one hears of speeches at meetings of farmers' unions or country women's associations which seem to indicate the opposite, farm people also wish to become mentally like the city-dweller; they want not to be "different."

It should be emphasized that this urbanization of the countryside is a thing essentially different from the assimilation of the modern-dynamic pattern of culture, though the two often go hand in hand. Man's assimilation of modern patterns of culture — thus his acquisition of a positive attitude towards change — means that he is not tied anymore to tradition. He is more or less free to choose his future behavior and his future mental interest. Whether he chooses to be interested in urban material and non-material culture is another question.

As was already mentioned, in some rural areas in Europe where the modern-dynamic pattern of culture developed early in the 19th century, the way of life remained for a long time and in many respects clearly different from that in the cities. The desire to equal the city dwellers is more recent. On the other hand, the impression is that in the more backward parts of Europe the desire for the pleasures of city life came first and was followed rather slowly by the development of the modern-dynamic attitudes.

PEASANT'S ATTACHMENT TO FARM

A third factor responsible for the rural social situation in Europe, seemingly more or less in contradiction with the two discussed already, is the strong attachment of the European farmer or peasant to his farm. It is very difficult, of course, to establish how much this attachment has to do with farming as a profession

⁴A clear example of rural planning in which the growing influence of the urban way of life on the attitudes of the rural population was insufficiently taken in account are the plans for land reform and rural reconstruction in southern Italy in the post-war period. But also the planning of the Zuiderzee-polders in the Netherlands after the war shows still signs of an underestimation of the rapid changes which take place in the minds and the behavior of the rural population.

and how much with an attachment to the land as such. But there can hardly be any doubt that the European farmer has an emotional relationship to the land and the homestead which have been in many cases owned and used by his family for many generations. The fact that land still adds to a man's social status may be of some importance too. It must be admitted, and research shows,⁵ that farmers with a modern outlook display more rational attitudes when comparing farming with other possible professions.

It is also clear that a man under the spell of the pleasures of urban life is sooner tempted to leave the parental farm than the farmer's son of the 19th century who considered his village way of life self-evident. But this does not alter the fact that leaving the farm is a decision even a modern European farmer will not make easily. In this respect there are probably still some differences between the American and the European farmer even if in America being a farmer means also more than just having a job.

I have dwelled rather long upon these socio-cultural phenomena, though several aspects of them have been discussed many times before in Europe as well as in America. But I believe that they seldom or never have been discussed in this combination. It is just such a combination of these three factors which is responsible for the development of a structural crisis in European agriculture and for a revolutionary change in European rural life, which will also have strong repercussions outside Europe itself.

The economist will perhaps consider the acceptance of the urban population as a reference group as the most important of the three. This is because this factor culminates in the desire of the rural population for higher incomes. But in various combinations with the other two factors it can lead to different economic results.

MEANS TO HIGHER INCOME

If the European farmer wants a higher income, there are in principle four different means to reach that end. (1) He can try to produce more with the same labor force. In such case he can get a higher income for himself and can pay higher wages to his laborers. (2) He can try to produce the same as before with less labor and reach in this way the same result for himself and the reduced labor force. (3) He can also try to solve the problem by asking a higher price for his products or for some kind of

⁵ See for example: Benvenuti, *op. cit.*

additional payments, so that he gets a higher income for the same contribution to the national product. (4) Finally, he can leave the farm and try to get a job outside agriculture which pays him a higher income.

Of these four means the farmer can use the two mentioned first only when he is willing to accept certain changes in the way he manages his farm. Like social change, if technical and economic change is to be rapid, important and enduring, it can only come about when traditional attitudes give way to a certain degree of modern-dynamic thinking. If, however, farmers are still traditionally minded and they come nevertheless under the influence of city dwellers and city life, they will be inclined to see the solution of these problems in protection, relief measures, guaranteed prices, etc. When the government is not willing or not able to support them sufficiently, they will often be more inclined to leave the farm than farmers with modern attitudes.

As far as I know, there is no research or report explicitly mentioning the reactions of the "traditional" and the "modern" farmers in this respect after accepting the urban group as a reference group. Yet I have the impression that these reactions can be perceived in the divergent attitudes of farmers in the various countries and regions of Europe and even in the ideas of the policy-making bodies.⁶ The discussions during the rural social conference of the European Economic Community regarding the attitudes towards price regulations, relief, social security measures, etc., in Rome in 1961 were very instructive.⁷ The Italian delegates, representing employers as well as laborers, expected almost everything from government measures. But the delegates of the Netherlands, representing probably the most progressive agricultural population of the "six," were far more inclined to consider improvements in agriculture as an important means for a better level of living in the countryside.

It is clear that traditionalistic peasants' lack of modern attitudes works in two ways. On the one hand, they are not able to make the technical and economic changes necessary to get a higher income from their farm. On the other hand, just because they are traditionalistic it is difficult for them to make the big

⁶ Benvenuti, *op. cit.*, shows, that on the one hand farmers with a modern pattern of culture are inclined, far more than traditionalistic farmers, to consider it as self-evident, that their sons will choose a nonagricultural job if that will give them a better living than farming. On the other hand, he shows that just because they are good farmers and earn a good income, more of their sons stay on the farm, than do the sons of the traditionalistic farmers.

⁷ See the mimeographed proceedings of this conference in French, German, Italian and Dutch, edited by the Commission of the European Economic Community, Brussels, 1961.

step from their old profession and their old environment to a new job and a life with city people.

EFFECT OF URBAN STANDARDS

There are indications, however, that peasants in backward areas tend to leave their farms to get the higher income they want. For example, the traditionalistic peasant in southern Italy, feeling the desire for a better life, often tends to leave the land. A number of farms newly created in southern Italy through land reform have already been abandoned again.⁸ In the most progressive parts of Europe, on the other hand, hardly one acre of land goes out of use, even where natural conditions are not very favorable.

Thus the effects of the acceptance of the urban population as a reference group can differ depending on whether it is combined with a modern mentality or not. Its combination with a traditionalistic outlook is not without importance for European development. But this way of reacting, of course, is not dominant. The combination of two factors has been of decisive importance: an increasing diffusion of the modern pattern of culture and an increasing awareness of a higher urban level of living. Thus the majority of farmers were able to react to their desire for a better living by increasing their productivity. But this does not mean, of course, that they were not also interested in higher prices.

The complete acceptance of the urban population as a reference group came about only after World War II. But there was a considerable influence of urban centers on rural life at a much earlier date. This I have already mentioned. This effect was clearly noticeable in the more progressive parts of Europe at the end of the 19th century. At the same time the modern pattern of culture began to spread more widely. Thus the effect of the combination of the two factors began to demonstrate itself. This stimulated a technical change in agriculture resulting in an increase in agricultural production which can be perceived in the greater part of Europe since that time. The growing population of Western Europe and the rising level of living gave the farmers an outlet for their higher production. But the farmer did not try to

⁸In his paper for the third congress of the European Society for Rural Sociology, Sankt Wolfgang, Austria, 1962, Professor Manlio Rossi-Doria, University of Naples, said: "Rural exodus from these areas has taken on proportions of a wholesale flight although the actual agricultural resources and prospects could, in many cases, offer alternative solutions." M. Rossi-Doria, "Problems of Planning in Underdeveloped Areas," *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol. II, no's. 1/2, 1962, p. 108.

raise his income only by increasing his production; he tried also to manage with less labor.

In spite of higher output per farm the labor needed to farm each acre went down. This could have led to different results. It would have been possible that the number of people working on the average farm remained the same but the average size of the farms gradually increased. In fact, however, the development was reversed. Though there are differences between the various regions and the various countries, the general tendency has been almost no increase in the size of farm, up to the end of World War II. Often the acreage per farm even went down.

It follows from the foregoing that this development must lead to a decrease in the number of people working on each farm, meaning a relative decrease in the dependent labor force (farm laborers, family members working on the farm) as compared with the number of independent farmers. The strong attachment of the farmer to the farm meant that he tried first to raise his personal income by increasing his production and, second, he reduced the number of co-workers. Leaving the farm was his last resort.

Let us take the Netherlands as an example of this development.⁹ From the beginning of the twentieth century until the end of World War II the average size of farms in that country did not change very much. It fluctuated among farms proper from 11 to 12 hectares (27 to 30 acres). Since the end of the 19th century the Netherlands reclaimed much waste land so that the surface of cultivated land increased from 2,057,000 hectares in 1888 to 2,552,000 hectares in 1959. As a consequence the number of independent farmers (in this case market gardeners included) increased from 160,000 in 1899 to 233,000 in 1947. Notwithstanding this considerable increase in the acreage of cultivated land, the number of co-workers on the farms did not in fact increase at all and was in 1899 as well as in 1947 about 330,000. This means a considerable decrease in the number of co-workers per farmer. In 1889 each farmer had on the average 2.1 male co-workers working on his farm, but in 1947 the number of co-workers had declined to 1.4.

⁹ Figures on the development in this respect in other European countries are given in several papers for the conference in Bad Godesberg (Germany) on structural agricultural policy in relation to regional economic policy in Western Europe in 1961 (*Agrarstrukturpolitik im Rahmen regionaler Wirtschaftspolitik in west-europäischen Ländern*, Berichte über Landwirtschaft, Sonderheft, 175, Paul Parey, Hamburg and Berlin, 1962). For Switzerland also: Wilhelm Gasser-Stäger, *Landflucht und Verstädterung*, Festschrift für Professor Dr. Fritz Marbach, Stämpfli & Cie, Bern, 1962, pp. 548-571. For Germany see: "Gemeinsames Gutachten von Mitgliedern des Wissenschaftlichen Beirats beim BML und von wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Beratern der Kommission der E.W.G.," Brussels, 1962.

After World War II the desire of the rural population for a level of living comparable with that of the urban population became much stronger, and at the same time the readiness to accept technical change and social change in general increased. This led primarily to a sharp increase in agricultural production. But the wish of the farmer for a higher income also caused an ever swelling number of co-workers to leave the farms. The switch to other activities was facilitated by the high level of employment during almost the whole period after the war.

In the postwar period the Netherlands showed for the first time in history a considerable decrease in the total number of people working in agriculture. Although a certain number of small farms disappeared, this decrease consisted almost exclusively of co-workers, in particular hired labor but also family members working on the farm.

Thus the number of co-workers per farmer declined from 1.4 in 1947 to 0.8 in 1960. It is interesting to compare this development concerning the number of co-workers in agriculture and industry. In 1889 the number of co-workers per employer in industry (including handicraft) was 2.7, not much more than in agriculture (2.1). By 1960 the number in industry had increased to 7.4, or about 9 times as high as in agriculture. During the early 1960's the decline of the number of co-workers in agriculture has been so rapid that if the development should continue at the same rate no co-workers would be left at all by the late 1960's.¹⁰

The situation for the Netherlands is not in all respects representative of Europe as a whole. But this tendency toward a decrease in the number of co-workers per farmer, particularly during the postwar period, is more or less general. It is clear that this trend leads to a situation in which year after year the one-man farm dominates the agricultural scene more and more. One gets the impression that policymakers and even agricultural economists and rural sociologists in Europe are not clearly aware of this fact or its consequences. In general they know that the number of hired laborers and family workers have been decreasing more rapidly than the number of farmers. But they do not realize that this decline in the number of co-workers per farmer is a long-term trend in European agriculture; neither do they realize that it means in fact that year after year the size of the average farm in Europe as an economic unit is declining. The traditional statistics, which measure the size of farms in hectares or acres of land and not in numbers of workers per enterprise as

¹⁰A detailed survey of the development in the Netherlands is given in: E. W. Hofstee, "75 jaren ontwikkeling van de Nederlandse landbouw" (see footnote 2).

is more usual in industry, contributes to blur the real development in this respect.

It is not fully realized either that under existing conditions the growing dominance of the one-man farm constitutes the background of one of the major problems for agricultural adjustment in Europe.

We can put it this way. The European farmer desires more than ever a level of living comparable to that of the city dweller. On the other hand he does not want to leave the farm. Thus to reach his ends he has used two means, increasing his production and reducing the number of people working on his farm. In the postwar period he used both means to the utmost. But when he has reduced the number of his co-workers to zero and his farm has become a one-man farm, there is no further possibility for the farmer to increase his personal income by cutting down on the number of laborers. In some cases part-time work outside agriculture may help, but in modern European economic life there are not many opportunities for part-time workers. If the farmer on a one-man farm wants to keep his income in line with that of the rest of society, he can only do so by increasing his production still more than he did before he discharged his last co-worker. He will be encouraged to try to get a still higher yield from his arable land and his grassland. He will try to reclaim waste land. He will try to keep more hogs, cattle and chickens. A comparison of areas where small farms dominate with areas where farms are bigger clearly shows that the total output of small farms is increasing much faster than that of larger farms.

We see here one of the most important roots of the structural crisis which is threatening European agriculture and which is in some countries an undeniable fact. The ever increasing number of one-man farms is propelling European agriculture toward overproduction. If at the moment the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and other countries which traditionally export large quantities of agricultural products to Europe are afraid of the European Community and its possible high tariffs for agricultural products, they are looking at the symptoms and not at the causes. Economic Community or not, agricultural production in Europe will continue to increase very fast. This is because European farmers want both to enjoy a higher income and to stay on the land. I am against high tariffs. But it must be recognized that it is even possible that lower tariffs and lower prices for agricultural products in Europe would stimulate agricultural production even more than higher tariffs and higher prices. It is this increasing European production which in fact limits imports from other countries.

TREND TO OVERPRODUCTION

People in charge of the agricultural policy of the Community are already convinced that overproduction is unavoidable. In the beginning of the existence of the Community they still hoped that a certain equilibrium between supply and demand could be maintained. But that hope has vanished. Warnings from the side of sensible policymakers and of economists and sociologists that for the future of European agriculture it is necessary that the number of farms in Europe be drastically reduced are mostly answered by an angry howling from the side of the farmers and their unions.¹¹ And if they are supported by mighty but, in this field, ignorant political leaders, the chances for a clear and purposeful policy in this direction are few.

But these leaders cannot alter the fact that the majority of European farmers will have to face a catastrophic situation. It is estimated that in the postwar period the increase of the production per worker in agriculture in the Netherlands was one-third to one-half the result of the decrease of the number of co-workers per farm and the rest the result of the increase in production. In other European countries the situation is similar. Notwithstanding that everywhere there are existing systems of guaranteed prices, subsidies, etc., this increase of productivity was hardly sufficient to keep pace with the increase of the average income of the nonagricultural part of the working population. In most European countries there is still an important difference between the wages of farm laborers and workers in industry,¹² and many farmers still earn less than industrial workers. As was discussed in the foregoing, the possibility of increasing the personal income of the farmer by reducing the number of his co-workers has almost come to an end. If Dutch farmers, for example, should want to compensate for this lost possibility by a still higher production, they would have to try to increase the rate of growth of agricultural production by 50 to 100 percent as compared with the rate of growth during the postwar period.

An accelerated increase of the production would lead within a few years to an unsolvable problem of overproduction. This

¹¹Characteristic was the vehement reaction of the German farmers on the report "Gemeinsames Gutachten, etc." of eight agricultural economists mentioned in footnote 9. The farmers even barricaded the streets of the university town of Göttingen by way of protest against the conclusions of the report in which it was indicated that a high percentage of the farms in Germany have to disappear in the near future.

¹²A comparison of the wages of farm laborers and industrial workers for a number of European countries was made in W. Abel and D. Zöllner, Landarbeiter in Westeuropa, Schaper, Hannover, 1954, and P. von Blanckenburg, Landarbeiter in der europäischen Industriegesellschaft, Agrarsoziale Gesellschaft, Göttingen, 1960.

overproduction would cause more serious problems than the existing surpluses in America. First, it would consist primarily of perishable, high-priced commodities for which it would be difficult to find an outlet in the low-income countries, even against heavily reduced prices. Secondly, even with the European Community, Europe remains a continent with many national governments. Thus it would be almost impossible to carry out a coordinated policy to deal with the surpluses. Probably overproduction would lead to severe production restrictions closing that alternative as a means for future adjustment. Even an increase of production at the same yearly rate as in the postwar years will lead very soon to overproduction, so that we can expect the increase of production in the future will not be faster but slower than it was during the last few years.

European farmers can expect little help from higher prices for agricultural products in the future. The long-run tendency is toward overproduction. Thus it can hardly be expected that in the long run the relative price level for farmers will be much better than it has been in the various countries in the postwar years. Perhaps the establishment of a common price system in the six countries will mean somewhat better prices in the beginning for some products and for some countries. But in the long run the best that the farmer can expect seems to be that the agricultural price level will follow hesitatingly the general price level. That, of course, does not help him when he is not able to expand his production.

ALTERNATIVE: REDUCING NUMBER OF FARMS

Because the possibilities for an increase of the total production are limited and the reduction of the number of co-workers has practically come to an end, there remains only one solution, namely a drastic decrease in the number of farms. But this decrease must come quickly if a disastrous situation is to be avoided. Suppose that in the Netherlands the rate of growth of agricultural production is the same as in the postwar period. Also suppose that the farms which would disappear would be of average size, and that the number of co-workers per farm remains at the same level. Then every year about 5 percent of Dutch farms will have to disappear if the increases in the farmers' income are to keep more or less pace with the increasing incomes of the rest of the population. In fact, as was pointed out, an increase of production as in the postwar period seems almost impossible.

In addition the small farms will disappear first so that more

than 5 percent of the farms will have to disappear to effect the necessary reduction of the total number of people working in agriculture. A decrease of the number of farms by 50 percent in ten years, according to this calculation, would be certainly the minimum to maintain the present unstable equilibrium. This seems extremely high. But even Denmark, which shows almost the highest production per capita in agriculture of all European countries, must have a 50 percent reduction in farms to give the farmers a satisfactory income according to a calculation by the Danish agricultural economist, K. Skovgaard.¹³

It is clear that a decrease in the number of farms by 5 percent every year will have a tremendous effect on rural life. Every year about 3 percent of the farmers die or retire. That means that even if not a single one of them would be replaced, the number dropping out would not be large enough to bring about the necessary decrease. In fact, of course, many farmers' sons will succeed their fathers. This means that if the necessary decrease has to be effected, every year an important percentage of the able-bodied farmers will have to shift from farming to non-agricultural jobs. In view of what was said about the attachment of the European farmers to the land and homestead, that would mean an agonizing decision for thousands and thousands of farm families. It seems almost impossible to imagine that farmers will be able to realize this self-inflicted reduction. On the other hand, the striving for a higher level of living is so strong that the younger farmers especially will go a long way to get what they want.

The decision to leave the farm will probably be made easier as labor conditions on the one-man farm become more and more unfavorable as compared to those in nonagricultural jobs. For the industrial labor force a limitation of the working hours and long weekends and vacations have become normal or will become within a few years. The increasing percentage of one-man farms means that for the farmer these conditions are not only unattainable but that, on the contrary, he becomes more and more tied to the farm. Thus from the social point of view the development of agriculture in Europe has also led to conditions which, as it seems, cannot last for long.

Thus because of the changes in the attitudes of the farmers regarding their own position in society, the family farm and the agricultural population in Europe are in a critical position. But it seems almost certain that this position in the near future also

¹³K. Skovgaard, "Dänemark," *Agrarstrukturpolitik im Rahmen regionaler Wirtschaftspolitik in westeuropäischen Ländern* (see footnote 9).

will be endangered by forces from the outside. Definite symptoms of an important activity by big business in agricultural production in Europe can already be perceived, though these symptoms do not show themselves yet as clearly as in the United States. The growing concentration in the processing of agricultural products and in the retail trade of food products leads to an increasing demand for a regular supply of agricultural products of a stable and good quality which the multitude of small farmers often cannot provide even with the intermediary of farmers co-operatives.

This, more than possible lower prices, motivates an increasing number of big concerns to develop plans for the mass production of agricultural commodities and to carry out their plans. In some branches, like the production of broilers, large-scale production is already dominating, and it seems almost impossible to stop this development. The threat which this possible large-scale production in agriculture means for family farms is so much more serious because it shows a special interest for the products which are the basis of the existence of the small farmer, such as eggs, poultry, pork and milk. A development of any importance of agricultural production by big concerns would mean the end to thousands of small farms.

European farmers as a group are not able to face this threat. That would only be possible if they could organize production and marketing in a much better way. That would require not only a considerable reduction in the number of farms but also a better and more extensive education of the average European farmer, a better system of land division, better farm buildings, better roads, more machinery and better equipment in general. Here again we meet the element of time in the problems of family farm adjustment. One can hardly imagine that it would be possible to bring about all the necessary improvements in time so that the family farm would be a match for big enterprises in agriculture. The speed at which technical change and change in the attitudes of farmers are realized is too low to meet the growing difficulties.

Let us take as an example the system of land division. As is known, Europe inherited from the past a system, or perhaps better, systems of land division unsuited for modern agriculture. In some parts of Europe thousands of acres of fertile land lie fallow¹⁴ because the system of land division does not permit a

¹⁴In Germany much land lies fallow because the owners are working in factories and have no time or no interest to use their land. The land cannot be used by full-time farmers because the parcels are so small and so widely scattered that it does not pay. The Germans even invented a special word for this phenomenon, viz. "Sozialbrache" (social fallow).

profitable use. The American checkerboard system of land division may not be well adapted to modern conditions either, but in Europe the situation is much worse. Improvement is very expensive and time-consuming. In the Netherlands where conditions are still better than in several other European countries, about 60 percent of the total acreage of cultivated land is in urgent need of re-allocation. An amount equivalent to about 7 percent of the total net income of farmers and farm laborers is spent in carrying out re-allocation schemes. But if we should go on in this way it would still take about 50 years before all the land that requires re-allocation could be handled. Almost the same could be said about farm buildings. Though in Europe after the war mechanization of agriculture developed rather quickly, technical equipment for European agriculture lags behind the economic requirements. This is in large part caused by the multitude of one-man farms, which are too small to make modern equipment profitable.

CONCLUSIONS

Time does not permit picturing other aspects of the problems of agriculture and the countryside in Europe. I could dwell upon the necessity for physical reconstruction of the rural areas in Europe. Europe is covered by thousands of small villages, originating from the Middle Ages, which served the needs of the rural population. They have become inadequate. The decrease of the rural population, the development of modern traffic and in particular the changed needs of the population mean that many villages are on the decline and should disappear. But there has scarcely been any effort toward a systematic redistribution of trade centers. The old people cling to their village and the authorities responsible hesitate to act or do not see the problem. As a result the countryside is beginning to suffer from unsatisfactory service and also from defective social organization, as for example is shown by the declining participation in all kinds of organizations, clubs and other institutions.

It should be emphasized that, compared to that in the United States, social, economic and political life in the European countryside is much more institutionalized. Therefore changes by private activities are much more difficult than in the United States.

What has been said will probably be sufficient to demonstrate that agriculture and rural life in Europe are in a serious crisis which will demonstrate itself in the years to come still far more clearly than it has already. As far as history can tell us, the

European countryside faces the most important and the most sudden change of its existence. Even the existence of a class of farmers as a separate group with its own social, cultural and economic characteristics is at stake.

The situation would not be so desperate if the farmers, their organizations and the governments were fully aware of what is really going on and would try to find an adequate solution for the problems. Agricultural economists, rural sociologists and many experts in the administrations become more and more convinced that only a quick and radical change of the social and economic structure of the countryside can save at least part of the values of rural life and of the system of agricultural production based on the family farm. The official discussions on agricultural problems, however, continue to move for the greater part along the lines of prices, tariffs, import quota, etc. The farmers blame their governments and ask for better prices, more free trade for themselves and higher tariffs for the agricultural products from other countries. The farmers' unions and the agricultural press, as far as they understand the real problems, do not have the courage to contradict the farmers and to tell them that higher prices and tariffs will be of no use without a total reconstruction of agriculture. The governments continue to spend millions and millions on subsidies, etc., but they do little to further this reconstruction.

It is characteristic of the situation that questions relating to agricultural price policy, subsidies, etc., have created an argument for breaking off the negotiations about England's admittance to the European Economic Community and that, on the other hand, this same Community has not yet any fixed plans for the improvement of the structure of European agriculture.

Leading politicians often speak about agriculture in romantic and sentimental terms which belong to the past. They talk of farmers being the backbone of the nation, about their being as strong — that is, as numerous — as possible. They orate on the virtues of the simple peasant, on the industrious farm laborer who saves his money penny by penny and is at the end of his life the owner of a small holding, on the necessity of the country's own agriculture providing food in the next war, and on the farmer as a stable element in the political life of the nation. They repeat all those obsolete slogans which camouflage the real situation and the real problems of agriculture and rural areas but which are unfortunately still so dear to many inside and outside agriculture. We can say that in general European agricultural policy is for an important part aiming at false goals because it is based on unrealistic values.

It must be admitted that in some countries a change in the attitudes of the governments and even of the farmers' unions can be perceived. But it is only a beginning, and in other countries of Europe not even that beginning is present. Most governments and farmers' unions have so strongly identified themselves with the policy of the past that it will be almost impossible for them to change quickly to another way of thinking about the problems of agriculture in Europe and their possible solution.

European farmers suffer on the one hand from increasing feelings of despair about their future and on the other hand from the wrong idea that the only means to defend themselves against the threatening dangers is to cling to the existing social and economic order of agriculture and rural life. They do not see that their own desires and their own activities have undermined this order and that it is collapsing.

What Europe needs is an organized activity of people who are not committed to the point of view of the policymakers, who are able and willing to diagnose the problems of agriculture and countryside objectively and who can show the farmers what chances there are for an independent class of farmers to continue to exist in Europe.

In this respect the United States can be congratulated for having an organization such as the Center for Agricultural and Economic Development which, as I understand, accomplishes a function of importance in this respect for the American farmer.

19

Dialogue

TYLER THOMPSON:¹ I would like to direct a question to Dr. Hacker. He said that as a political scientist he didn't deal in goals and values, that he just dealt in ideologies. At the beginning of my paper I said anybody who deals in goals and values must deal in ideology whether he realizes that he's doing it or not. I wonder if we could begin this dialogue by clarifying the relationship between what he was saying and what I was saying.

ANDREW HACKER:² Everybody's got goals; everybody's got values. Ask the truck driver, fisher, barber; they all have goals and values. People talk to you about philosophy all of the time. Funeral directors even have a philosophy of embalming. There's lots of ideology around, but I'm not interested in discussing ideology. I'm interested in talking about ideology — what it stands for, the interest behind it, emotional attachments and so forth. I'm willing to listen to anybody. But when my comments are made they won't be on the substance of what people say. My ears tune to the actions and involvements people are seeking to rationalize and describe. That's my approach; that's my outlook.

THOMPSON: Is there any difference between that and what I was talking about when I said, "You know, we're just agreeing with Jesus: 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' and 'not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord... but he who doeth the will of my Father...'"³ Are you saying anything different than he was saying?

¹Tyler Thompson, Garrett Theological Seminary.

²Andrew Hacker, Department of Government, Cornell University.

³Matt. 7:21.

HACKER: No.

SHIRLEY E. GREENE:⁴ I wonder if Dr. Hacker would be willing to apply this to himself and tell us what he really was meaning to say in his paper in what I can only take to be highly satirical discussion about "superior" people. What was he really trying to tell us about rural life? Could he get behind his own verbiage and reveal himself to us?

HACKER: Whenever I find groups who consider themselves superior, I always look on that group with suspicion. I think all of us can say we accept this. Anyone who claims he's pretty good because he has a light skin and happens to be an American, or is better than other people because he happens to have a certain background, a certain sum of money — people who feel this way always meet a great deal of suspicion on my part. I began to study this because of the question of rural representation in legislatures and the justification for extra rural weight. Much of this came down to the "superiority" of rural people.

CHAIRMAN: Are you satisfied, or do you want to go a little further?

GREENE: I'm satisfied. I appreciate that comment. But I think that his own analysis and description of the nature of rural life is as one-sided as I've ever heard from the rural romanticists in their description of the virtues of rural life. I think the truth is in between.

SOURCE OF GOALS AND VALUES

J. L. VIZZARD:⁵ I can readily understand why the first meeting on goals and values didn't get very far, since, first of all, those attending were exclusively social scientists, of which I am one myself. However, the illustration of what happens when their goals and values have not been referred to religious inspiration or moral convictions is found most grossly in the statement of Mr. Hamilton of the Farm Bureau. I thought it almost grotesque that the Farm Bureau should have a formal statement encouraging their members to keep their churches straight rather than

⁴Shirley E. Greene, secretary of Church in Town and Country, Board of Homeland Missions, United Churches of Christ, St. Louis.

⁵J. L. Vizzard, Society of Jesuits, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Washington, D.C.

expressing some degree of humility and need for the churches to keep the farm organizations straight. The idea of what is straight in this moral sense should come from the churches. Perhaps it is not coming clear enough. But that's where it should be coming from, not from the Farm Bureau or indeed from social scientists.

GREENE: Part of the problem is that we represent and speak from three different intellectual frames of reference. One is theological, which some of us have tried to represent, although some of us who pose as theologians have tried to master some of the rudiments of social science also. The second group who express themselves are the social scientists, who also bootleg a bit of theological concepts at certain points. Then we have the organization people, who may be theologians or social scientists as we are, but who are spokesmen for their organizations. Thus, it seems to me the discourse has gone on at two levels. We who have not been responsible for an organizational presentation have been able to deal very broadly and abstractly with ideal formulations of goals and values. I think the organization people might well have shared some of the same goals and values, but they must speak for their organizations. Let us take a specific illustration of this: the discussion about the family farm. The Farmers' Union and the NFO put a great deal of emphasis on the family farm as such as also did Reverend McCanna.

IS IT THE FAMILY OR THE FARM?

I think if we had proper time for discussion, we'd find ourselves, or most of us, agreeing that the family is the ultimate value and that the family farm is an effective means of strengthening the family. It is the instrumental means on which all hands focused. If Mr. Rohde cares to comment on this, I'd be interested.

IS THE FAMILY FARM DISAPPEARING?

GILBERT ROHDE:⁶ It is true that I reflected the ideas of our organization and the aspirations of the people that make up our organization. What we are concerned about is not necessarily that everybody who lives on the land should be permitted to stay there or should be subsidized so they can stay there. We recognize that there are some families who are not on economic units by

⁶Gilbert Rohde, president, Wisconsin Farmers Union, Chippewa Falls, Wis.

whatever standards you would set up. According to Ken Boulding these farm families are not going to be permitted to stay, because the man who may have a good strong economic unit today may find himself at the bottom of the efficiency level because he just doesn't have sufficient size — and so he is going to need help.

As the enlargement of farming goes on — as we capitalize these farm units into larger and larger units and we approach the hundred thousand dollar figure of capitalization — it would seem to me that the Congress, the farm organizations and the theologians ought to be tremendously concerned about what happens next. The average age of farmers in this country is about 56 years old. They have used the financial strength they were able to obtain as a result of inflation after World War II to be financially strong enough to enable this kind of expansion to go on. Their problem now is to transfer this equity to a new group of farmers — young people. In many areas, entering into farming is already restricted; young people just can't get in. I suspect that within 8 to 10 years, unless a policy is established to undergird the family farm as we know it today, there will be very few family farmers.

HARD CHOICES

E. W. MUELLER:⁷ I think the reason we are here is because of the changes that are confronting us as a part of our present social pattern. Changes come into the picture as a result of people having choices. When the tractor was invented the farmer had a choice to make. Was he going to use horse power or tractor power? Back in the 30's REA became available and he had a choice of whether he wanted electricity or not. The choice again changed the picture. When we make these choices what do we consider? This is where part of our values come in. Why do we choose what we choose? That is one question I want to leave with you.

Do we make our decision on the basis of economic fact, on the basis of opinion or on the basis of basic beliefs and goals? This is the point that we want to get at. We are here to help people rather than an industry, because people, not industry, have values. They must make choices for which they can be responsible, which they can live with. And the fact that we can make choices makes us responsible beings. When people make choices they should consider the economic facts. This is basic. They should consider

⁷E. W. Mueller, National Lutheran Council, Chicago.

other values and the fact that they have a responsibility to their creator. Here's where the theologian comes in. How can he help people to make the adjustments that need to be made? What have the theologians to offer? What have the economists to offer? How can we blend these insights?

EMERSON W. SHIDELER:⁸ I think we need to subject our whole discussion so far to a bit of philosophical analysis, in order to exhibit a fortuitous combination of relatively unrelated values. We have been substituting one for another without considering that these two are not directly related at all. One is the value intrinsic in a rural way of life. The other is a very real value for which all of us are concerned: the security and stability of family life. Still another value which has no necessary connection with these other two at all is the problem of the production of food and fiber. We are now capable of producing sufficient quantities of food and fiber quite independently of family farming as such. But we are still arguing that in order to preserve stability of the family it is necessary to keep these families in a business that is no longer necessary as a business. We need to re-examine the relationship between these two values.

I have the strong suspicion that whatever values there are intrinsic in a rural way of living might better be preserved by separating people from the farming business and putting them on two-acre units where the family raises a garden of its own and perhaps keeps livestock around as interesting pets. Then provide the economic basis of the family by working for a wage in a local factory. I see nothing intrinsically desirable in as far as the stability of the family is concerned in having people working in the field.

W. H. STACY:⁹ Are not theologians and social scientists mainly concerned with the worth of human personalities in an increasingly complex society? Where human personalities achieve their worth, historians tell us, is in their relationship to God. The theological concept is terrifically important. As we try to think our way through the changes that are increasingly threatening the value of human personality, we come together, then, to build these analytical approaches into a consistent look at the future. Why can't we think of the family farm and the family life, the family itself and all these other concerns more distinctly in terms of the worth of human personality? This implies that if we are

⁸Emerson W. Shideler, professor of philosophy, Iowa State University.

⁹W. H. Stacy, associate professor of sociology, Iowa State University.

living in today's society and reaching toward tomorrow's society, we must make the adjustments which help human personalities to develop values in this type of work.

IS THE FAMILY FARM SOMETHING SPECIAL?

ROSS B. TALBOT:¹⁰ I think someone should clarify Professor Boulding's position. He's all in favor of the family; he just doesn't see any need for the farm. Dr. Shideler's point was much the same. This is what Dr. Stacy is saying too. It seems this is the real question: Is there something special about the family farm?

ROMANTICISM DIRECTS US

LEE G. BURCHINAL:¹¹ I hope what I'm about to say does not represent heresy in relation to my present employment. However, my first integrity as a sociologist is to the best estimation of truth as I know it from research. I think if we have any belief in the integrity of the human mind you must agree on this premise. Therefore, I find it very disquieting to hear assertions made, inferences drawn and beliefs projected as if they were truths, and to know there is a considerable volume of literature which could be reviewed and applied to the particular questions under discussion.

I am very happy Dr. Shideler has indicated that he doubts there is any intrinsic value for family stability or, to use Dr. Stacy's phrase, human personality development, associated in any particular locale where one lives or with any particular way which one carries out an occupational role — in this case, the farming occupational role. I not only share this doubt but I think I could shatter any illusion that these are true. I don't wish to be misunderstood as saying therefore that we are speaking against farming or farm families. All I wish to assert is that there is a great deal of research literature which shows that youth from farming communities or rural communities do not compare favorably with youth from urban areas in terms of mental health. In terms of school attendance rural youth do not go as far in school. There are a number of values either associated with the farm

¹⁰ Ross B. Talbot, professor of government, Iowa State University.

¹¹ Lee G. Burchinal, assistant to the chief, Farm Population Branch, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

family or the farm community which deny opportunity to understand the importance of education today. When they migrate to urban areas, rural youth do not succeed as well in moving out of the unskilled or semi-skilled jobs into the clerical, sales managerial, administrative ranks and so on. I don't wish to extend the argument too far, except to document the point that there is nothing intrinsically more valuable about the youth being reared in rural areas.

What we do, however, is to develop a mistaken image. We select certain farm families, perhaps those from which we came, or those which we know best, or we select cases which are more successful or more energetic or have acquired greater education. Then we project this very favorable image, but unfortunately of a very limited group, into the entire population of the rural farming communities. As I see it, the danger in this ideology is that it blinds us to the extremely important work we should be doing. To the extent that we extol all the virtues of the family farm and assert there is something intrinsically necessary about the family farm and its development we're not going to be very excited about the disadvantages of the rural community, particularly for youth today.

ALTERNATIVES

GREENE: I think Emerson Shideler has helped us in taking apart the question of high standard of living on one hand and the technique of producing the nation's fiber and food on the other. I'm a little perplexed concerning his statement about not needing family farms in order to produce the food fiber. We've got to produce it some way.

I'm not anxious to defend the proposition that the family which lives on a family farm is a better, a somehow generically superior family, than a family that lives on a college campus. But what is the best way to get the nation's food and fiber produced? From the point of view of human welfare I suggest simply, for the sake of argument, that there are three ways which we can do it. One is by family farms; one is by industrialized agriculture; one is by a pattern of collective, communistic, state-owned farms.

Of these alternatives, I prefer the family farm as a way of producing the nation's food and fiber. I have seen too much of what the industrialized agricultural pattern in this country, at least under present economic circumstances, has done to human personalities. I've seen the casual labor people; I've seen the braceros and I've seen the migratory labor families living in

their shacks, their children deprived. If Mr. Burchinal is concerned about the level of educational achievement in family farms, let him take a look at the record of children of migratory agriculture labor. From the human point of view, this is not a good way of getting the nation's food and fiber produced. I don't know that I have to argue here against the collective or state farm in the communistic pattern. It seems to have difficulties as an economic unit of production, and I suspect that as a part of a totalitarian pattern of life it has its negative elements from the point of view of personality development.

HACKER: May I ask that you strike from the record "totalitarian"? Think of the Israeli Kibbutz. Those are not totalitarian.

GREENE: Thank you. There may be possibilities of communal land ownership, with family operation within such a pattern.

On the basis of considering the alternatives, I am still a defender of the family farm, though I hope not in the romantic tradition.

CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call on Mr. Brewster. He's done some very interesting research and I think it would be to our advantage to listen to him.

JOHN M. BREWSTER:¹² My point of departure will be the statement by Mr. Rohde. As I understood his statement, there's nothing romantic in it. He is not denying another way of getting started here. I think there's a tendency to think that people who talk about the family farm are stating a romanticism they don't actually subscribe to. This has a long history to it, and I've always been very much interested in it. I think the day is gone when we think of a causative relationship between agricultural family farmers and democracy. I think the substance of Mr. Rohde's point is not that of romanticism, but a very practical problem of ways and means to transfer to another generation operating control over a business.

Now, I'll come to Dr. Greene's point. In my judgment, it is a basic, legitimate, hard-headed, sensible question of alternative ways of producing food and fiber in a proficient way. There is no empirical evidence anywhere that I know of, that society can get its food and fiber requirements produced for one penny less cost by a system of larger than proficient family farms. If you take it

¹² John M. Brewster, agricultural economist, Agricultural Adjustments Branch, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

from a cost point of view, society is indifferent as to which system is used in terms of present day farm technologies. I don't know what we will have 20 years from now in technologies, and I'm inclined to think that farm people are committed to technical advances. In terms of available technology, society cannot get its food and fiber provided for one penny less cost. Mr. Rohde's statement recognizes there are more families in farming than there are proficient farms. If I understood correctly, and the statement was perfectly consistent, Mr. Rohde is saying that in agriculture or proficient businesses, you look where you can utilize a complement of equipment and get the cost down as close to the minimum as possible. That there will be a reduction in farm population is in Mr. Rohde's figuring. He's not taking the position of increasing the present number of farms in agriculture and the present number of people in agriculture. Mr. Rohde is concerned about ways and means of transferring to oncoming generations operative control over the proficient operating units in agriculture.

I think from a policy point of view or the social point of view we can produce the amount of food and fiber one way or another. Then, under that kind of condition it seems to me family considerations are a legitimate concern. If I've got the substance of Mr. Rohde's point, this concern for proficient family farms could be more adequately expressed in a way that would not be waylaid by a lot of irrelevant sharp-shooting at romanticism to which people who speak on behalf of the family farm don't actually subscribe.

FAMILY FARMS ARE FINE

OSCAR E. ENGEBRETSON:¹³ I have spent 33 years as a rural pastor and I don't think I've ever lived in a rural community that was anything like what has been described here. I don't know where you could find it in the area I traveled. It was mentioned that the rural people were isolated and provincial. I wonder how many of my people have been to California or Florida this winter. And if you listened to the topics discussed in our Kiwanis meeting and if you looked over the programs of the women's clubs and the conversation among the people, I think you'd find that they ranged very widely.

I spent some time in Brooklyn and I think there is a lot of

¹³ Oscar E. Engebretson, Committee on Research and Social Action, Madison, Minn.

provincialism there, because they felt the world ended at the boundaries of New York. One man I met had been only to New Jersey.

When we get the weather reports at my home, we find the whole nation in the picture. We talk about the weather in New York, Washington and Phoenix. In New York the weather chart stops in New Jersey.

I call attention to this because I do not think the picture we've heard here is a true picture at all. After 33 years I am more than ever convinced that the family farm is a wonderful way of life. I do not believe that a marginal farm or sub-marginal farm — an uneconomical unit — can be preserved. But I think there are certain values that come from living on the farm.

I would like to ask two questions. We sometimes see statistics showing lower mental health in the rural areas. I would like to know if these figures are taken across the whole nation, which would include the sharecropper, persons on sub-marginal farms in the depressed areas and on uneconomic units. I would like to see a study made.

BURCHINAL: There has been — in Minnesota last year.

ENGBRETSON: In northern Minnesota or southern Minnesota?

BURCHINAL: The entire state.

ENGBRETSON: We're thinking now of a good, basic farm. I would like to ask if a study has been made on the kind of farm we would like to see, a good economic unit, to see if there's any handicap.

The second thing I wondered about is the effect of the farm on family stability since so many have said they don't think there's any particular advantage for family stability. I was always interested in a map printed in the newspaper annually that contained the number of marriages and number of divorces for every county in Iowa. You didn't have to look at the counties; you knew perfectly well that when the rating was high, 1 to 3, 1 to 4, the county had a large urban population. The more rural the greater the spread. I served a congregation of 160 families with one broken home. I served another one of 600 families, where we happened to have six. At the present time I'm serving 500 families in a rural area and I doubt very much that we have more than one in a hundred. Somebody has said that farming was the only business where the family, the board of directors, sat together around the dinner table three times a day, which would have something to do

with family stability. I'd like to know how you explain those figures if the family farm does not give some help in making it stick.

LEAVING AGRICULTURE HURTS TOO MUCH

ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.:¹⁴ The discussion should have one more fact; the low-income families we keep talking about are not geographically concentrated in Minnesota. Most of the low-income families are in the South. Most of them are uneducated and unskilled. It seems perfectly clear on the economic balance that a great many of them are going to be squeezed out. This doesn't necessarily mean that we squeeze them out of rural life. Sometimes that's unfortunate. One of the main things in the realm of practical policy that this country confronts in the next 15 years is not to stop some of this movement out of agriculture, but to provide better ways of easing the transition in such a way that it is not socially demoralizing to the people who are involved in it. We have not done very well in this regard so far as I can see. In fact, I think our institutions are just about 100 years behind the times in coping with the realities of American life, which includes the highest rate of family mobility in any country for which we have adequate data.

BURCHINAL: I wish I could follow Darwin's injunction in everything I do, namely that I would try my best to accumulate all the evidence contrary to the particular hypothesis or theory I would be testing. So frequently, when we have a particular belief, prejudice or expectation that things are going to come out a certain way, we become highly selective in utilizing bits and pieces of information to support our belief. We tune out other data which are just as available to us, and we simply don't perceive them. Or if we perceive them we ignore them because they simply do not fit the mind-set that we have at the particular time. This is a human tendency which I think theologians have a certain concept to cover. However, I use this incident to come back to the divorce record.

Pastor Engebretson was entirely correct. No matter what state you go into data resemble that of Iowa where the divorce rates are five to eight times larger in the metropolitan area as compared to our rural counties. However, this fact does not tell us very much about the state of marital relations in urban areas as compared to rural areas. The divorce rate is only a very crude measure of marital relationship or adjustments. I would

¹⁴Robin M. Williams, Jr., chairman, Department of Sociology, Cornell University.

bring in another fact, and then I would not offer any interpretation. Dr. Robert Blardin of the University of Michigan found that in marital happiness ratings and other kinds of indices which we could use as measures of the quality of the marital relationship the wives' perception of their husbands' love was lower among the farm wives than among a random sample of urban wives living in Detroit. In measuring another factor, perception of love, the ability to express love increased in direct proportion to the length of time the wives had resided in urban areas. In terms of their own reports, wives who were second and third generation urbanites were able to express a freer and wider variety of love and relationship to others than were the farm wives. Now these data stand contrary to the data showing lower divorce rates in rural areas than in urban areas.

We had one person comment about the migration differentials and adjustment to urban sectors. Let me refer to studies of Hathaway and Monachesi.¹⁵ They obtained a random sample of students at several grade levels in schools classified farm, nonfarm, small town, etc. In various measures using the Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory, the farm children came out less satisfactory by usual criteria of mental health than the urban children. These results should disturb us. These results indicate that any romanticism we have about the intrinsically, innately better way of life on the farm simply does not hold up under the objective scrutiny of research. I would not argue that the farm situation cannot be a highly conducive situation for personality development and human experience. It is for some families; it may be for more families. But what I would adamantly argue against is that the rural environment necessarily provides a better setting than any other residential setting or occupational role.

KENT KNUTSON:¹⁶ I left the farm, I chose to leave it and I don't want to go back. I like city life and I choose to stay there. But I don't think I am romantic about city life either.

Professor Boulding's paper told us about a toothpaste tube and the market process pushing the toothpaste out. I am quite willing to accept that necessity. But I don't know that anybody believes or cares very much about where the toothpaste is going. If the toothpaste is to be squeezed out into the city, I am not sure that we have solved any problems at all.

¹⁵ See Starke R. Hathaway and Elio D. Monachesi, "Rural-Urban Adolescent Personality," in *Rural Sociology*, No. 24 (Dec. 1959), pp. 331-346.

¹⁶ Kent Knutson, professor of theology, Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.

I live in the suburbs of the Twin Cities where we are overwhelmed with the problem of taxes and transportation and we have unemployment — even if the cities do provide circumstances for a better kind of life. Perhaps we should settle for a slightly less valuable life if we can disperse our population in such a way that they can use the land and the space that we have in this country to some kind of advantage.

OSGOOD MAGNUSON:¹⁷ I am inclined to join those who are displaying points of view. I don't find any real disagreement between Mr. Burchinal's and Mr. Rohde's point of view. I had the privilege of working with older young people in an agricultural extension program. I am quite inclined to agree that, in many instances, parents who live on a farm are, not through any fault of their own but through lack of exposure, frequently unable to give adequate counsel to their young people in the selection of an occupation or a vocation. I think this is a result, in part, of isolation rather than in lack of desire to be helpful.

I am also very concerned about this matter of entry into agriculture and about the kind of leadership that will exist in the rural communities as well as in urban communities in succeeding generations. Certain facts already indicate that those who remain on the land will be those who are economically successful in management. We may get so concerned about a farmer's economic ability to stay there that we might fail to provide other forms of training and education for him in terms of his citizenship responsibilities, his activities in the political arena, his responsibility as a Christian and a witness in that community. I feel we need to make some real efforts to do something seriously in this area.

ONLY TWO MILLION PEOPLE

HACKER: There are 54 million families in the United States as of the 1960 census and here we are worried about two million — not the rural trash, not the small-town people, not the people of the cities — just two million rather grade A quality people who really don't deserve all our attention.

We don't know quite what to do with the others. We're running into walls. We can't adjust our minds, for example, to hillbillies in Chicago or people who are really very substandard in

¹⁷Osgood Magnuson, assistant to the director, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Minnesota.

the countryside. Our resources, such as in Extension, do not reach these people. So what do we do? We shunt them off. We hear about them from time to time — the migrant workers, etc., but we aren't prepared to do much about them.

There is a tension between the intellectual social scientist and the practitioners. Part of this is ideological. The typical social scientist is a liberal. He's worried about civil liberties, civil rights, neighborliness, etc. The typical practitioner in this field tends to be rather conservative and worries that the liberal social scientist is digging up all sorts of uncomfortable information about injustices and poverty which he just uses to prove his point since "he wants big government intervention."

Many of our disagreements are on the ground of liberalism versus conservatism. We haven't mentioned this, but I think it is a fact.

PROVINCIALISM, IGNORANCE WILL NOT DO

As for development of personality, I think the rural personality is stunted, restricted, narrow, parochial and blind. There is a certain smugness. There is an attitude of "we don't approve" even though the facts get in the way or "gee, there must be better facts somewhere to substantiate our point of view because it is true."

If we are going to talk about the personality in 1963, then we have to talk about a personality that is, to use the old-fashioned term, a citizen of the world. He is someone who is tainted by a variety of experiences, someone who has brushed up on all sorts of ideas, someone who has seen and lived with all sorts of people and who understands them. This is just not the case in rural America. Sure, they watch television, but they see what they want to see. They filter out all the facts that lead them to interpretations that are discordant to them.

If you want to say that the good life is based on the premise "ignorance is bliss," all right. Live in a small town or in the countryside with a constricted view of reality. You just cross your fingers and hope that the world never comes to your doorstep. And it will. I recommend a marvelous book, called The Small Town in Mass Society,¹⁸ which shows how, whether you like it or not, the small town is more and more directed by the outsider, Washington. All sorts of centers of power are stretching

¹⁸See Arthur J. Vidich, "Small Town in Mass Society," Princeton University Press, 1958.

their tentacles to the small town. You can't cut yourself off. This is why, when one refuses to encounter the world, he develops a certain frustration tension about being pushed around. That is not good for the development of personality.

Personality that is free and developed has to be based on knowledge, on an understanding of the world. I don't see this in provincial America. I see it much more in metropolitan America.

Finally, I want to point to one of the ways in which emotional attachments and personal interests really becloud our own ability to discuss important issues. I'm talking about the family. Is the family necessary? Can the family alone do the job in the 20th and 21st century? It was okay when you had a sheltered situation with parental authority and without outside influences. But I'm not sure that the family as it is presently constituted — I'm talking now about the 54 million families — can do the job required of them in bringing up children.

There are alternatives which don't abolish the family. Most families need important supplements. Maybe we ought to have government marriage counselors inspect families and make sure they are going along all right. Maybe we ought to have ways to take kids away from the families periodically just to make sure they are going along all right. The family is not as strong as it used to be, and it can't be reinvigorated of its own accord. But I don't think our imaginations and our minds are really wide-ranging enough to solve that problem.

INTRINSIC VERSUS INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

V. L. STREMKE:¹⁹ My comments are directed to those concerns of interest which I felt Emerson Shideler and Osgood Magnuson were expressing. I feel that we have been wrestling with the question of intrinsic against instrumental values. What kind of normative system of values are we implying or assuming?

I do not wish to suggest that in this kind of meeting we should be able to formulate or adopt a satisfactory or acceptable system of values which becomes a norm for us. However, we might be able to discuss it in terms of assisting persons and groups, in moving toward the formulation of such systems, which then would allow for values such as security and stability. Perhaps my question is at this point, "Is it possible for this kind of group to make explicit some of the implied or assumed values which

¹⁹ V. L. Stremke, associate professor of practical theology, Central Lutheran Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebr.

perhaps constitute a system?" Failure to do this perhaps then would reflect the predicament of many of our people. They don't have an adequate system of values, and for this reason they get hamstrung on instrumental values — subsidiary values. They have not been able to gain a proper focus in terms of an adequate system from which to derive the answers they are seeking.

LEO R. WARD:²⁰ I am especially grateful to the man who raised the question of normative considerations. One of the things that surprised me is our discussion over the possible excellence of life on the farm as compared with possible excellence of life in the city. Why have we made that so central? I thought the main question was the good life on the land. I should like to start and finish with the assumption that a good life is possible on the land and is being achieved also in the city. There was the strong feeling on each side. With such a tremendous amount of social data, there is still strong feeling on that question. I suppose that when we have very strong feelings on the question, we're not too free. Perhaps that doesn't prepare us too well to decide what to do.

It's a silly question to ask where the good life is being better achieved when you haven't discovered what it is that is being achieved. Several overtures were made towards that by the religious leaders. The Reverend Greene said we test this by the norm of love, if we can use that word. Maybe that's true. Love is the highest value and we test everything in relation to it. I'm not sure how to formulate it, but maybe that is satisfactory; maybe it isn't. Bishop Speltz said a natural law criterion is the test of good and evil in man's conduct and in his life. I would imagine that for any group in America where theologians and social scientists are together like this the natural law statement is just so many words. We don't know what it means. It would have to be examined critically, historically, existentially, to see what is meant by natural law. What are the problems with which this alleged notion of natural law might wrestle?

I think we finally have to consider whether there are some kinds of standards of value. Generally we neglected that — whether perhaps there is some standard of value that holds for all value. I hold that there is, for all human values. Health values, recreation values, psychological and mental values, moral values, social values and economic values and human values — all of those things come back to some one central criterion. Father O'Rourke said the highest value in temporal life or human life is happiness. Dr. McCanna said that is an Aristotelian thing. But this is a very bad

²⁰ Leo R. Ward, professor of philosophy, Notre Dame University.

translation of Aristotle. He doesn't use the word. He points to the great difficulty in using a word like happiness as a goal. If I use that word and say, "That's what I declare as the highest standard of value and highest human value," there is a great difficulty, for if there are 40 of us here, we have 40 different meanings for that word. We're trying to talk in 40 languages, and we can't communicate.

GILES C. EKOLA:²¹ We ought to ask the question, "What is the contribution of the two million farm families?" I think their contribution is in feeding the nation. We should ask the intellectuals, "What is your contribution to the American scene?" I think this expresses our mind. We are interdependent and interrelated and we need to do some speaking on these points.

THE CHANGING POLITICAL SCENE

MAGNUSON: We recognize that mobility of rural population is going to continue, that this 1 to 8 ratio characterizing rural overrepresentation in some legislatures is probably going to become more than 20 before it is corrected. Recognizing, too, that ultimately it will be corrected, how would you suggest those in the minority to align themselves with others of like political concerns to effectively present cases in our governmental structure?

WILLIAMS: I have three comments. First, about intellectuals: There are liberal intellectuals and there are conservative intellectuals. Abusing intellectuals has been described as like a blind man beating his Seeing Eye dog.

Secondly, the question of family stability. This has been treated as if it were a self-evident value. I am sure it is an instrumental value of sorts, but there are other aspects to family life besides stability. We need to ask what the conditions are which bring those out. I mean such things as kindness, sensitivity, self-insight, creative work, constructive relations with other people, etc. We have mainly discussed ideologies and institutional arrangements. This is certainly important enough, though we haven't discussed much, except for Mr. Ward and Mr. Stacy, the basis on which we decide whether these things are worthwhile or not.

The final comment is in reference to the political aspect of

²¹Giles C. Ekola, assistant secretary, Department of the Church in Town and Country, National Lutheran Council, Chicago.

the farm problem, which I agree is very important. One of the things that happens with the unrestrained processes of technological and economic development is that these developments are harsh in their impacts on various people in our society. When the corner grocery store is drummed out of business by the chain store, that is tough. When the fueling points on the western railways were cut out by diesels the best citizens in those towns suffered the most. They bought the barns; they put up the parks; they had to suffer. We are pressing on our population very hard with these tough changes. The dispossessed laborers and tenants, submarginal farmers, uneducated blue-collar rural migrants to San Jose and Detroit, etc., are not having a lovely time of it. They are confused in their attitudes; they are bewildered, frustrated and hurt; they are angered and revengeful. They are the stock of which extremist political movements are made.

I don't believe in pistol-point politics as a desirable state of affairs. We have to take into account a massing of resentments as a consequence of abrupt social change which infringes on strategic sectors in our society. The plight of many of the rural people who have moved into our cities is not at all happy. Some new institutional arrangements are probably necessary in order to cope with the amount of mobility that seems inevitable in our society with the other values which we have.

HACKER: I am glad Mr. Williams spoke first because I think I can answer the questions on politics with reference to what he said.

I recommend that everyone reread James Madison's 10th paper in the Federalist series. This is an important document in American political law, and it has set the standard for political participation. What Madison said in 1787 was that our politics are a politics of interest. Each of us has one or another interest, and we seek to secure these interests through political participation. Madison was a premature Marxist. He said the most important interests are economic, in particular, property holdings. He said there are other interests; presumably he implied that we could have racial, religious and moral interests. Furthermore he said there are interests within property; for example, manufacturers versus bankers, commercial people versus farmers, etc. The assumption we have carried through for almost two hundred years is that every American has certain identifiable interests clear to him which he can pursue with political processes. This just isn't so anymore. There is a small minority of Americans who have interests they can identify. Middle-class farmers, for example, decide whether it is in their interest to vote one way or

another in a wheat referendum. Upper middle-class farmers decide at a different level on the wheat referendum. Other people have interests: the small businessman with significant property knows his interests; the Negro knows his.

The trouble is that most of us have become rather amorphous — rather generalized citizens with vague interests in peace, prosperity, the sound dollar, social status — nothing we can really get our teeth into, nothing we can vote for, nothing we can support one party or another against. There has been a good deal of talk by social scientists about development of America as a mass. More and more of us are mass people. I don't mean a mob. I just mean people who feel helpless and frustrated. Both candidates seem to say the same thing. No matter whom you elect you know he is going to betray you, etc. And this makes political participation very difficult. Why should I go out and work for the Republican Party? What is in it for me? My colleague on the Republican Committee is an important man. He knows what is in it for him. Not me! I can't see the dividends. This is the sort of question confronting tens of millions of Americans. This is why we have apathy. We have high turn outs for elections. But after election very few participate in the parties. Very few people join political interest groups. I think what we are going to have to say is that there is no real sure-fire remedy.

This is one of the developments you get in an advanced metropolitanized culture. I don't want to say industrialized, because we are getting beyond industrialization; only the minority of work is in factories now. We used to say urbanized, but we are getting beyond that. Now it's metropolitanized. What has happened is that we have torn down the old structures of the entrepreneur. Almost everybody in the world works for a salary, belongs to some organization. Suppose I work for General Electric. Do I say that what is good for General Electric is good for me? Well, some people do take that view, but we don't think that is the acme of citizenship.

It will be a new politics. It will be politics of the mass society. Not mobs, not revolution — it is going very quietly. But we are increasingly powerless, helpless. I think that anybody who goes into politics here has to really have a reason. Most of us just can't dig up the reasons, and that is the change from Madison's time.

WHAT ARE THE BASIC GOALS?

ARNOLD PAULSEN:²² I would like to try to challenge my friends in theology to see if the goal framework we use in the more cold, hard, technical discussion of economic politics is adequate to cover the goal framework of Christian theology. We say, for example, that society has basically four goals in trying to guide and mold the economy which provides people with the material basis for social activity, religious activity, etc. One goal is justice — trying to organize a system so that the people get what society deems is approximate. Thus, different groups have an equitable share; different individuals have an equitable share; we have income tax which redistributes, etc.

The second goal is growth or progress. Economic growth is much discussed and we are concerned with achieving a higher standard of living.

The third goal is something called stability or status quo. That is, we usually think that although some changes may be happy in a general sort of way, change is disagreeable, at least large amounts of change. And then finally we say that the economic policy is concerned with freedom. Freedom of the people to decide where to work, how much to work and what to work on. This is economic freedom. Now I suppose Ken Boulding would put survival as some kind of over riding goal before you can embark on the pursuit of these four goals.

Political scientists provide us with a concept by which we can understand these four goals by saying, for example, that different groups feel justice is defined and achieved when they have a larger share and someone else has a smaller share. By their vote, their power in the political arena through committee chairmanships and other devices of power they can pursue their collection of these four goals. When their weight is balanced against other groups we find a sectarian system in which economic policy is made.

Is this a sufficient and broad enough framework within which Christian theology can operate? I would say these four goals are oriented towards something called a good life, probably largely weighted in a material sense, but also in terms of nonmaterial satisfactions in the area of stability and freedom. If we look at Christian theology, it is concerned with the good life. The good life involves a sizable amount of spiritual activity, certainly a sizable amount of moral activity; also some social things are involved here. I wonder if theologians use another set of subgoals

²² Arnold A. Paulsen, associate professor of economics, Iowa State University.

under the good life such as justice, growth, stability and freedom? I would like to challenge the theologians to spell out a little more of a subset of goals constituting the good life, which would balance off in some sense these sectarian economic policies. I suppose the theologian thinks the economic system ought to be organized so as to provide an opportunity for people to make a living — while they are serving God. This gets around to such things as full employment, adequate pay and maybe honorable jobs. I suppose theologians would deny that the economic system could be so organized that it would develop the God-given talents of man to the fullest: education, health and so on. These are two suggestions of what might be included in the subgoals constituting the good life from a Christian theology standpoint.

E. W. O'ROURKE:²³ I think Arnold Paulsen's observations are very useful. He's done a good job of making the relationship clear. But I might go one step deeper than the economic order. One of the first divisions to be considered would be the institutions. Here is the individual in his development; here is the family in its development; here is the community in its development. The well-being of these three human institutions might be used as a unit of measure, the effect the economy might have on those. Or again, it might be looked at from the point of view of the effect of these particular economic policies upon the individual with respect to his rights and dignity; on the opposite side the other concern would be the common good. We find the use of the phrase "common good" very prominent in theology and in the circles in which I move. Some Protestants use "responsible society" as a parallel expression. To add something to what Mr. Paulsen said, I think these are the two approaches we might make to get one degree deeper than the mere economic measure that Ken Boulding used to give us all grades. I'm not complaining about the grade; I think he might have done the right thing for the wrong reason or the wrong thing for the right reason in that regard.

GREENE: Rather than to go where Mr. Paulsen tried to point us theologians, namely to a definition of a subset of values under justice, growth, stability and freedom, I would like to refer again to what I regard to be the super set of values which stand above and which discipline and give meaning to justice, growth, stability and freedom, and the other economic values the economists and sociologists cope with.

²³E. W. O'Rourke, executive director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines.

At the top of my hierarchy is the value of love. Love in the Christian concept is good will. Love is primarily an act of will, which is necessary when you speak of loving the unlovely, loving the enemy and so on. Willing the good for the neighbor, even as I will the good for myself. Love is also mutuality. Love as it comes to expression, then, in the family, in the community, in a cooperative, in the business organization, in the farm organization, in the various forms of human association. Love is the disciplining principle of all these. Love in these terms is the most intensely personal of all human experiences and also the most intensely social. It's the bridge between what we sometimes rather spuriously define as the personal or private sector of life and the social or public sector of life. One can only love an individual, an identifiable person. On the other hand, you can't love by yourself. So you are immediately involved in a loving community, in loving relationships.

God has set us in communities, and the only dignity we achieve is in terms of our relationship in communities. This is not to deny the ultimate of individuality or the importance of the personal. I argue that the very experience of personhood or the very achievement of personhood is a combination of putting what God has given me as a being into the context of community or society. Love in the Christian definition is the ultimate expression of this concept of person in community. I would say that from my point of view, which is from within Christian theology, you start from this as the supreme value in human experience and derive all the others. Justice is an expression of loving persons in communities. Growth is desirable because of what it contributes to persons.

RELIGION GIVES CLUE TO POLITICAL, SOCIAL VIEWS

HENRY McCANNA:²⁴ I shall have to take issue with Reverend Greene on this point, because I think that he is stating a theology. Even in terms of Protestantism this would not be universally acceptable at all. So long as we've broken open this matter, I think we should speak also for those who are not present. For the most part, those of us who are here are in the social action camp on this point. There is a very strong element, within Protestantism at least, which sees the Christian community as the only valid one, and that to build up the Christian community is the ultimate

²⁴ Henry McCanna, executive director, Department of Church in Town and Country, National Council of Churches, New York.

goal. At the head of the hierarchy of values of this Christian community is not love so much as the holiness of God. The love of God is merely one attribute of His holiness, and this holiness is an absolute from which stems all the rest. It demands an absolute obedience, a thoroughly worked-out system of behavior. We have conflicts in goals and values in our societies because we have strongly different points of view theologically. Most of us are familiar with the study of the Detroit area showing the relationship of man's political and economic and social life to his basic religious orientation. It points out that somehow his basic orientation causes him to come out somewhere. We could even come to a consensus and still not answer the problem because there are a great many Christian people who are not here to give their point of view.

THE SCOPE OF CHRISTIAN CONCERN

THOMPSON: I want to point out the practical importance of what's just been stated. One of the most overtly theological books I've read in a long time is the blue book of the John Birch Society. If one wants to understand what's wrong with the John Birch Society, he has to understand it theologically. Fortunately, Robert Welch makes this easy because he's so expressly theological. However, a bit of expert analysis is needed to show that the fundamental reason the John Birch Society comes to the conclusion it does is precisely because the God to whom the Society is expected to respond is not concerned about all men. There's only a limited class of men about whom God is concerned; therefore, God's servants are under no obligation to be concerned about those who are not God's concern. This is the fundamental starting point of Robert Welch's thinking.

Incidentally, the most persistent difficulty the Christian church has had throughout its whole history has centered around the question of the range of God's concern. Christian doctrine rightly understood would lead one to expect the most meaningful manifestations of sin to come within the church itself. And this is what has happened. In one way or another the church has always been involved in this tendency to delimit the area of God's concern and hence to justify and rationalize, completely ignoring those who have run outside, and those who were haters of God and whom God hates.

I think the remedy for this is fundamentally Biblical, because the point of view which is very common, as Dr. McCanna points out, is a hard one to maintain in the face of Biblical witness. But

it can be maintained because the invincibility of faith is such that anything can be maintained in the face of anything.

I want to relate these few remarks to the starting point. I find, approximately speaking, that the scheme proposed is, in relationship to other schemes that have been proposed by other people in other times and places, a relatively satisfactory kind of scheme. But Dr. Greene's point is this: any Christian formulation always has to be subject to what we call an eschatological demand; that is to say, a demand which can never be fulfilled — it cannot be worked out ever in a satisfactory form. Any formulation that men ever, under any circumstances, reach is under God's judgment. And it will be found by other persons in other times to be unsatisfactory in one way or another.

Let's take the question of justice. A Christian has no right to say that God is just until he says something about what justice means. Justice, meaning every man gets his due, by any standard you please other than love, cannot be a service to God. God forgives . . . this is unjust. It can't be otherwise if the standard of justice is something other than that it is just to give a man what is best for his own good and welfare as God understands it. This is what is just for him. In our society, I'm happy to say, one of the contributions of our long Hebrew-Christian tradition is that our standards of jurisprudence are very considerably, though not wholly, affected by this notion of justice. Our penal theory for example, is based upon a remedial conception. Even when the rationale given is that of restraining a man from harming society, this has something to do with his own ultimate welfare, inasmuch as his welfare can never be understood except in relationship to the ultimate welfare of everybody else. There is no separating, Christianly speaking, a man from the society in which he lives.

I could go on with the others. Freedom — there is the paradox that the highest freedom is slavery to Christ. The most summary book of Christian teaching in the New Testament is the epistle of Ephesians. It is an anonymous book which summarizes the teaching of Paul and some of the other letters and some other motifs. If there's anything that's made clear in the book of Ephesians it is that there is no possible limit to the extent of God's concern. It is God's intention, the mystery hidden with God before the foundation of the world, to include all things — man and presumably nature, too — within the community. Then the whole book works out in an organic way what this involves. I don't see how one can stand in the face of this book and ever think of anything in all creation as standing outside of God's concern and therefore outside the limits of man's concern.

One of the sharpest expressions of this eschatological

dimension says, "Be imitators of God as beloved children." In other words, it is put in the social context here.

The only other word in the New Testament which is comparably explicit is one of the most familiar verses that comes at the end of the fifth chapter of Matthew: "You, therefore, must be perfect as your Father in Heaven is perfect." It is a kind of summary of what has immediately been said before, where Jesus is reported to have said, "Love your enemies. Do good to them that do harm to you." This is often quoted by itself, but the point that follows is what gives it real power. "Love your enemies. Do good to those that you'd be most disposed to want to do harm to, that you may be children of your Father who is in Heaven." It couldn't be made more explicit; it couldn't be made more particular; it couldn't be made more concrete. It isn't abstract; it's related to a particular situation. Whatever situation most tempts you to hate somebody else and to do harm to him, that is the situation of the maximum demand upon you for the expression of love.

THE ROLE OF THE THEOLOGIAN

VIZZARD: Reverend McCanna was right in describing another kind of motif which grows out of historical documents. Holiness is a very solid tradition in Christendom. We live in an ecumenical era when some of the rough edges are being worn off. Perhaps the church is approaching a kind of consensus which will serve it well in the job that has to do with the future. Nevertheless Christendom is not altogether agreed as to the preciseness with which all Christendom is bound to these motifs in the historical events. That is, the beliefs and values of the Christian community tend to change as the moods change, as the research changes and the needs change. So it isn't possible for the social scientist to look to the theologian for absolute values, but perhaps he looks to him for a confession of faith as to those criteria by which to come to certain judgments regarding values and beliefs. But do not look to us for final answers; we are not absolutists, though some think we think we are. This means the Christian community does not have any ideal society or perfect society to present.

O'ROURKE: When we try to relate that which the theologian teaches with that of the economist and social scientist the useful means of making the correlation would be in the realm of philosophy. Philosophers, after they establish their metaphysics,

examine the data the various special services provided. Then eventually they work their way toward an ethics that is the logical conclusion of these metaphysical principles when applied to the facts that the special sciences afford us.

ROLE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENTIST

BREWSTER: What is the role of the economist? As an economic analyst, I think my job is to clarify the consequences of different alternatives. My job is not to take the role of advocate about any policy discussion. That's not what I'm expected to do as an analyst, as an economist.

GREENE: There is no such thing as a pure economist. There are only liberal economists and conservative economists. Until you know which a man is, you don't dare read his writings at all, because you have no idea what kind of a conclusion he's going to lead you to until you know where he started from. I think you economists are trying to kid us when you say you just deal with pure facts and pure theory without an orientation of your own or building toward objectives you believe to be true.

BREWSTER: I was defining a role, a function and not a person. There's no individual alive that lacks goals of his own, and I wouldn't make any claim on anybody to be free of what he thinks to be his own needs. If I'm engaged in making a comment, an analysis of the economics of farm size, there are facts and conditions to be taken account of in making the analysis. An analyst is doing a different job from one who takes a position and says that this is what he believes ought to be done. When you are trying to measure, you say what will happen if such and such is done as compared to what will happen if such and such is done. We are discussing here the role, not how the economist behaves or the theologian behaves.

THOMPSON: I would like to say a word about the role of anyone undertaking a discipline. The ease of achieving a high degree of objectivity, that is, of not being involved, depends on the kind of subject matter we're dealing with. In the subject in which I was originally trained, physics, this is comparatively easy. We can achieve a high degree of objectivity, and yet, even in physics, we can't get totally out of the problems of our involvement in our concern with how it works out. In economics, obviously it's more of an existential question than in physics. As for theology, if it

deals with what it should, it's dealing with the things that matter most to man. So that here, the degree of the achievement of objectivity that is desirable (which involves complications I don't want to go into) would be very much more difficult in the nature of the case. Yet even here, I claim that it's possible for a man to teach history of religions with something that very closely approaches the passion appropriate to somebody who belongs to that community of faith, even though the teacher himself does not.

E. W. HOFSTEE:²⁵ Almost no social scientist is only seeking the truth. He wants also to see his side of life, his burdens in society, that he has a certain obligation to society. It is not for the social scientist to set the goals of society. But the social scientist can set certain limits which restrain the imagination of the policymaker.

BURCHINAL: There are two levels to consider in most of the social science disciplines. One, the empirical, analytic research level where we have a clearly defined problem and delimited operation; second, the broader integrative interpretive level where one's own background, selection of data and interpretation of data obviously enter in. The more valuable role for us is the latter, although it is the more difficult.

HACKER: There are two types of knowledge we like to have. There is significant knowledge and there is trivial knowledge. Generally speaking, the social scientists at best accumulate trivial knowledge, small-scale sorts of information on things we probably knew already. Then there is significant knowledge. Unfortunately the scientific method is not very good at the significant social questions; they are too big, too unreal. Take a simple question like "Is the American marriage today a happy marriage?" Now, suppose the team of social scientists went out and interviewed American wives and came in with their findings. Would we accept them? Certainly not. We have our judgments as to whether the American marriage is a happy marriage or not, and the facts social scientists accumulate will not help us here. So I would say that social scientists generally are helpful at filling in the details. When it comes to really big things one man's judgment seems as good as another's.

O'ROURKE: If we should come to a case where a fairly well-established school of data seems to be at variance with a

²⁵E. W. Hofstee, professor of rural sociology, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

sociologist's observation, let us, for love of truth, consider the sociologist's observation. Otherwise, we would be, truly, anti-intellectual. But for the love of truth also, let's have a little stability, a little stickiness about dashing away from a fairly well-tested if not empirically proven conclusion.

How many sociological studies would it take to convince me that rural life has no bearing upon the quality of family living? Well, to be perfectly honest with you, it would take a sizable chunk, but let me assure you it could be done. Let us give it a try.

BURCHINAL: If I held a certain belief, it would take only one study to change my mind. Now I think this is the issue. If I read this study and knew that the man used a certain type of methodology to govern his observations, if he applied the proper statistics and knew the limits of his generalizations, it would take only one study.

GOALS ARE INTERRELATED

PAUL J. JEHLIK:²⁶ I don't think we can talk about the values and goals in agriculture divorced from values and goals in our total society. It must be discussed in terms of relationships. Also, in our societal goals there are goals that are overriding. Our goals in agriculture somehow or other must mesh into the total societal goals, whether they be limited to this continent or whether they be world-wide goals. And within the framework of these large, over-riding goals, we also have sub-goals. We have both long-range goals and short-range goals. We also have long-range values and I might say we have short-range values — values that change with the attainment of certain given ends or objectives. With that statement, I hope we can begin to line up in one, two, three order what our major goals in society are, what our major goals and values in agriculture are and then perhaps some of the sub-goals.

HACKER: I'll disagree with you right now, Mr. Jehlik. I don't like conferences that come out with consensus, because we get a series of platitudes. We want goals — freedom, justice, security, peace, stability, progress. If you want sub-goals, a happy family, all the rest, I think that we'd better face up to — not the goals —

²⁶ Paul J. Jehlik, rural sociologist, Cooperative State Experiment Station Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

but the problems. What we're talking about, for example, are class divisions in the American society. Take agricultural goals in rural America. One of the real problems is the haves and have-nots. I have yet to know of more than a handful of Americans who would give up anything willingly, politically. The chief cry of most Americans is, "I want to keep my money. I don't want to take it in taxes to give it to other people — chiselers, etc. No, I want to keep my money." This is the view of most Americans even though they don't put it that way. If this is the view, then people who want to see a redistribution of good things of life will have to fight for it. That's what they've always done. Fight for it — try to get numbers on their side, and then they vote for redistribution.

In agricultural America we've got some real problems, not the least of them poverty and ignorance. These can only be redressed if somebody pays for them. Somebody has to foot the bill. The income of these rural people is very small. Partly it's because of the number of areas such as the rural South, where they are unwilling to tax themselves, unwilling to raise the level of social services for those who need them, especially children. As a result there is great privation down there. People are not living the good life, white or black, because they're at a very low level.

One of the points which comes through is that there are large groups of Americans who at this point are unorganized to protect themselves. These people, if they're going to get the sort of things they need to live a good life, only get it if they force the rest of us to pay for it. We're not going to do anything. We can say, "Yes, I believe in Christian charity; I believe in helping other people; it's warm in here; I've got a nice cup of coffee." Go down to your local state mental hospital and go through the snake pit there. See how much you've done for the people there. Or go through some of the shacks in rural America and see how much you've done for them.

We're pretty selfish; I agree with the Christian conception of original sin. We want to keep our money. It's an enduring problem. So let's chart out some of the problems we're going to continue to face. I don't think there are any over-arching goals. Various groups have their goals. The Farm Bureau has upper-middle class goals; the Farmers' Union has middle-class goals; the small businessman and large corporations have their own goals; Negroes have their goals. These are the middle-range goals or the interesting ones because these aren't for consensus. We'll say they're for freedom, and all the other things like democracy that we all believe in. But this group is in no position

to go beyond the level of platitudes. We're not philosophers; let's not kid ourselves.

STACY: I would like to come at this as one who thinks in terms of the frame of reference of the Cooperative Extension worker. What I'm trying to come around to is Rural Area Development. I know a lot about problems in many of these fields. I know some of the steps that are being taken toward development. They are solving problems, and we have said repeatedly that we have a new opportunity, a new opportunity to cooperate for developing all that contributes to agriculture and area development — and what are we going to do? Our church spokesmen have said the door is open now for church leaders to cooperate and to assist with rural area development, and we've seen rural area development defined in terms of such things as agricultural economics, agricultural progress, industrial development, rural or recreational resources, recreational development and even better schools. But have we seen it defined as broadly as we'd like?

I am suggesting that rural area progress includes also the question of whether we want to see rural communities in the future have religious life. I know Iowa communities and other communities, where there is tremendous need for adjustment in church situations. We have a lot of little churches that were planned originally in our grandparents' day of the horse and buggy. What I'm saying to unite our thinking is that we do have an opportunity for progress if we join forces. May I suggest that we think not only of problems but that we think of steps toward progress.

THOMPSON: Mr. Jehlik suggested that we might discuss the relationship between national goals and goals for agriculture. The start of the subject was really the topic of one of the papers which we had the longest opportunity to discuss — Dr. Lampman's paper, listing six goals. The first one was full employment and utilization of the nation's productive capacity. We could discuss, as he does very briefly at the end of the paper, how goals for agriculture fit with that goal. We all agree that we cannot let concern for the way in which families have traditionally earned their living wholly override the need for lessening the number of producers. Yet, no one is willing to let the considerations of efficient production override all other considerations, as Dr. Boulding suggested ought to be the case. And so we all will be in agreement that a balance should be reached relative to the matter of efficiency as against stability, if we take it that stability recognizes the human being as not unlimitedly adjustable. Some things

which cushion the need for adjustment had to come into the picture. We should fit these together in such a way as to produce what we need and in as humane way as possible.

O'ROURKE: Dr. Jehlik asked for a summary of goals and values. Professor Hacker questions the value of that because we should be concerned instead with problems. As one of those who attended the original goals and values conference and who had some small part in the planning of this conference, I think the planners of the conference are aware of the problems. In many instances we found we were getting involved in goals and values, and we thought that by tending to them specifically the probability of united action on problems might be increased. Do we have any hope of accomplishment this way? We have theologians, sociologists, economists, political scientists, philosophers, leaders of farm organizations, governmental personnel and extension workers in education — to mention several of the disciplines represented. And we have had a dialogue. Some of us in the so-called "abstract disciplines" have been warned to attend to the data — the facts that can be provided by the various scientific disciplines.

It seems to me that we have touched upon goals at three major levels. One is the material level — for example, the production and growth of agriculture and other products. When I say material, I don't mean bad or inferior but elementary. We need these material accomplishments in order to have the foundation for the family and some of these higher goals that we seek. Then we attended to some of the human goals: the development of the individual, the strength of the family, the promotion of community and the common good. Then we felt that there was behind us even a higher set of goals. Some would speak of it as God's will, salvation or maybe again love or happiness. Or we might almost put on a par that which is true, that which is good, that which is beautiful. Again we may say this is extremely abstract, but I'm just trying to characterize some of the not too abstract discussions. There might be, then, three levels of goals: the material, the human and the more ultimate.

Now again the means: means to make our productivity more effective, as illustrated in Mr. Lampman's paper; means to improve the common good; love — the practice of love in the community, as Dr. Greene suggested; The means to salvation. And again the practice of love and charity, the morally correct conduct and so forth. If there is any value in it, I think that somewhere along these lines we may be able to derive some synthesis of the goals and values we have discussed. Maybe we will be in a position then more effectively and more harmoniously to attack the problems about which Professor Hacker speaks.

TALBOT: My comments are rather an anti-climax following the statement by Father O'Rourke. But what I really had in mind was to speak on one of Mr. Hacker's earlier points. I suspected all along where we differed. He wants to keep his money, and I have never found a way to get it away from him. I think this is really fundamental, in terms of what the problem is. This argument started out facetiously, but it is really very significant. I'm not going to try to spell it out in terms of national and international goals and so forth.

In terms of the rural situation, what we are saying in RAD is, "We want that urban money to do great things." Or it might well be that the best thing we could do with the farmers is to give them all \$5,000, or some such amount, and tell them to go to Peoria or wherever jobs might be. They are not satisfied with that either, because we have not indicated for them to go to Peoria. If we had, I wouldn't be too much concerned about it.

Here again, why spend money talking about RAD in terms of industrial development? Why not just build some decent schools out there, some technical high schools, etc., and get these rural boys trained in terms of what modern technology calls for and then have them go to it. If you stop to think about the conditions in the world in terms of what we could do about it if we would, then I must admit it seems to me that as Christians this demands that we make the attempt. I just can't see any other answer.

I leave you with this noted conflict. In order for me to do this, I have to get a lot of Mr. Hacker's money. By borrowing money I am able to get only so far. But he is rich, and some way or another I have to get money away from him. So this, it seems to me, imposes an entirely different kind of conceptualization from what we have been talking about.

THE NEW RURAL LIFE

LONNIE HASS:²⁷ Rural life in America is passing through a tremendous and massive transition. So is urban life and so is metropolitan life. But I am happy to find someone subscribing to my pet theory that all American life is not going to become urban or metropolitan by any means. I think we are developing a rural subculture which is brought to you and will be as individualistic perhaps in its own way as was the farm one. But rural people are passing en masse from a rather comfortable, well

²⁷Lonnie Hass, national director, Church Development in Town and Country, Disciples of Christ, Indianapolis.

established side of the pioneer day to something rather strange and unpredictable in the future. That it should do so reluctantly is only natural and understandable.

When the dam broke in Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries and people began to move en masse across the ocean, they had a goal, and it was a bright and shining one that hung in the sky night and day for them. Land-hungry Europeans wanted a piece of land with their own fig tree and their own vine. And they swept like a tide across the American continent into every crevice and corner of the United States and Canada and came to beautiful fruition in the traditional American family on the farm. But this was the goal in itself. They weren't producing for the market; they weren't building for the future primarily; they were seeking a way of life which they had dreamed of for two centuries and which they realized.

But in the transition of the past 50 years we have begun to be oriented to another over-all goal for American agriculture, and that is what it should be — the efficient production of foods and fiber for the needs of the nation and our participation in world affairs. Whether we like it or not, it seems to me this is our job in agriculture for the future. The farmer has not had nearly as much trouble accepting this as have some of the rest of us.

But the thing we are concerned about, and I think rightly so, is that this should not mean complete disregard and destruction of several million people in the process.

How to achieve the major new goals without destroying too much in the process in the way of human values — this, I think, must be the concern of the church as well as all the rest. I really see no serious problem, theologically, in accepting this major goal. Certainly the economists do not see any serious problem. In fact, I think people in agriculture should and can achieve a sense of mission in this direction. This is our job; this is our chance. This is why we came into the world. This gives meaning to life. There must be certain values on which we stand to do the job. Certainly, a good family is of prime importance. A healthy community is also. So also are a permissive and dependable government and plenty of capital and credit, and all the other things necessary in the realization of this major role of agriculture — the efficient production of food and fiber.

CHURCHES IN TOWN AND COUNTRY

KNUTSON: I am concerned about the thing that Mr. Stacy brought up, the religious life of the community in rural America. I find

the churches in the position of causing part of the problem we face in rural Iowa. It seems that we as denominations and local churches, created in the horse and buggy age, find ourselves in a changing situation, and we hesitate to discuss the possibility that we are a problem ourselves. What I am getting at is that if we face this problem as it should be faced, for instance in southern Iowa, we would close two-thirds of the churches in the area. People are struggling to keep them open. They are not doing a good job. Facilities are running down. The education in these churches is such that I think it has something to do with the low aspiration level of some of our young people in these areas.

I am wondering whether in rural area development it would be possible to go further than we have gone in the past by having a clergyman on the committee to work with these things. Would it be possible to set up some kind of organization in these counties to discuss this problem so the people themselves could come up with some kind of a solution to the problem of over-churching, which actually leads to under-churching? We find that in counties where we have the most churches we have the smallest proportion of our population in a church. I think there is a possibility of having a committee on the local level working along with Rural Area Development to see if they can work out some solution to the religious problem to enrich the religious life of the rural community.

HACKER: I should like to offer one suggestion to the thought you raised which I think is a very important one. I would like to give you a model: the role of the Southern Negro Baptist Church in helping people they serve to solve their problems. I have talked with Martin Luther King and other people on this, and it's a remarkable phenomenon. As you know, the Southern Negro Baptist Churches are engaging in and recommending sit-ins at lunch counters, movie theaters and elsewhere. They are starting registration drives. In some cities they are even organizing economic boycotts. How is the church able to take leadership here and how is it they are able to be effective? The first answer is that they are Baptists. This helps because, as you know, the Baptist Church here does not have a higher authority than the minister. In other words, the minister is dependent on the parish and isn't dependent on the bishop or any similar authority. If the parish is behind him, he can do what he wants. This has been the case in the South with certainly hundreds of Baptist ministers. Now the second. The parishioners don't have much to lose. Will they go to jail, get beaten up, the churches burned? Why? Because there just isn't much to lose and everything to gain. That makes it easy. The church has taken a very active role.

The problem with white people, white churches, is that very frequently they are mixed congregations. Very frequently the people who want to dominate the congregation are those who do have something to lose — banker, lawyer, or merchant. So let's not do anything controversial. Is it possible to stand up to this dominant social congregation? I don't mean in terms of numbers, but in terms of influence. Is it possible to get the congregations to raise a fuss like picketings, sit-ins, etc.? It's not very easy.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

GREENE: We don't vitally become concerned until the rate of change becomes such that we find our security and our mores and our traditions being threatened. When Ross Talbot spoke of RAD and getting Mr. Hacker's money, I felt he was tending to reflect a public image of the Rural Area Development program which has been proposed, propagandized if I might say, by the Department of Agriculture itself in the sense that here are opportunities to use federal funds to help communities through investment and industry and so on that might come to a rural community. Don't misunderstand me. I'm for the process involved and for what it can do for the people and institutions who might be affected by it. But my concern is about the way we attempt, I think, to dangle the prospect of industry to suggest something that may not necessarily really be true. In our state we've had Rural Area Development since 1956, when it was called Rural Development. We discovered almost immediately that if the people in the community were to be concerned, we had to kick out the word "rural." In other words, Main Street would have no part of it. Now we've come around to the philosophy that it isn't really Rural Area Development; it is community adjustment.

I would like to emphasize what I think are the strong points in this process. I know it's referred to as a program, but really I think it's a process of leadership training for the total citizenry in program development for adjustment to circumstances in their particular community.

In this community-adjustment process you're asking the people in all walks of life, all vocations, all levels of income, all political persuasions and beliefs to sit down together, to take a look at their community, to find out what it really is (not what they think it is, but what it really is), what they would like to see it be, what some of the alternatives are to get where they plan to see it. It is important to sense this as a process that is done through people, because of their own involvement. But we must

be careful not to give them false hope. Maybe they can bring a small business to this community, to that community. But we have got to be more realistic.

I'd like to think that in a goals and values conference we continue to be concerned about people. I agree with Mr. Hacker that generally these are people who are facing problems or some conflict of interest in which they have to resolve in opposition to their own values. I'd like to think that in this conference we have become somewhat disturbed. Mr. Hacker gave a good answer to the question I asked earlier, but I didn't like the answer he gave — not because of what he said to me but what I thought he was saying to all society. Unless we find some new means of invigorating an interest in our political arena and finding things that we can really stand for or be against, we're going to be a very sad society. I think we ought to take this as a challenge. It seems to me this ought to relate to our goals and values and what we do with them. I would like to go back to the first point I made earlier, or tried to make at least: That all of us, irrespective of our disciplines as public servants, regardless of the public we serve, no matter how we receive our income — all of us have a real responsibility as Christian stewards of the talents we've been given. These must be used to help articulate and communicate to those with whom we work, helping them to see the alternatives in the situations facing them and to identify their concern, to endeavor to relate their own values and goals to the solutions of their particular problems in the communities in which they now live and in the communities to which they're going. This is particularly true in the way the churches and educational systems must function to equip the young people who are a mobile group to move without much assistance and to adapt themselves to a new setting.

WHAT IS OUR JOB?

W. G. STUCKY:²⁸ There have been enough things of great value said so that they deserve to be summarized. Foremost there is the accepted recognition of a problem. The problem is that not many of us are doing very much of what we really ought to be doing, as clergymen, social scientists, or educators. What ought we to do about it?

We begin by recognizing man as a part of a civilization, set in an "environment of life" so that he does not exist isolated in

²⁸W. G. Stucky, education leader, Center for Agricultural and Economic Development, Iowa State University.

an ether. Therefore, the first thing incumbent upon us in the search of truth as clergymen, scientists and educators is to help individuals, everybody in the society, to understand what his "reality" is. The first order is to understand the way the world really is. This understanding as a goal is one of those goals Dr. Tyler Thompson characterized as being unattainable. But we ought to still seek it.

Within this real world we can identify certain disquieting problems. We have used, as an example, the poverty sectors in agriculture and the needs of rural youth — not all of whom can find a livelihood in the rural area — to have an adequate education. As we attack these problems, it is not very relevant to argue the comparative virtues of urban life against rural life as we have been doing.

What we're in part trying to do is to look at what must be done that would really make a difference in helping society arrive at some accommodation to the needs and changes of economic progress. It does not achieve greater opportunities for youth for us as educators or clergymen to frighten rural people into thinking that just because some cities have slums, they shouldn't adequately educate their youth. The bulk of these youth must go there whether ready or not.

We are having great difficulty as a society in setting aside some of our old notions about what ought to be done and investing enough of our resources, both in the clergy and otherwise, to analyze this reality.

Once we identify disquieting situations that have to be dealt with, we must then help with solutions that enable society to progress to a new social environment of a possible higher order, within our Christian ideals. But we must also recognize that it too will have emerging out of it new problems to be solved, demanding as much scientific ability as we had in the initial situation. In other words, we will never be without this problem of moving from one stage of development to another. Flowing out of each stage is a set of problems that is a part of the environment of life. We must help society continuously to deal with these in an objective way.

WE NEED A PROPHETIC WORD

LOUIS ALMEN:²⁹ I am a Lutheran minister, and thus a theologian or minister of the Word. As I understand the ministry of

²⁹Louis Almen, dean of chapel, Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.

the Word it has two functions. First of all, it has a critical function and, second, it has a creative function. I think that in this conference the critical function of the Word has been most effectively laid bare, enunciated not by the theologians but by the political scientist, who has expressed his belief in the doctrine of original sin and has prodded all of us to realize how limited we are, how in truth we do express the point of view of our particular group, of our self-interest.

The second function of the Word is creative. I think this is a word that this conference has not yet spoken. We have talked about love, and then we have the typical social gospel, in idealistic fashion attempting to express love in certain ideals and goals. While I think this has its place, the creative gospel can also be radically understood as original sin can be radically understood. I think that, speaking strictly from the point of view of religion and not from the point of view of any of the sciences, one of the goals of religion ought to be true evangelism. This is one of the aims of the church in the rural areas. Let the church be the church. When it is prophetic it is creative. It is not only determined by its environment, it determines its environment — not as a culture religion but as a prophetic religion.

VIZZARD: I wonder if it's possible to test whether or not some clarification has emerged to be helpful as guidelines for specific action. I'm oriented towards the type of action mainly influencing government policy. Taking a current legislative proposal, I'd like to find out whether sufficient consensus of goals and values has emerged to give you or anybody else functioning as I do directions on whether or not I should be for this proposal, or neutral, or against it, or with reservations.

How would I determine what I ought to do or say about, say, the National Service Corps proposal?

HACKER: Of course you ought to be for it. Can you think of any reason why you shouldn't be for it? You're referring to the domestic peace corps, I assume. I think this is a splendid idea. What you have to do first of all is fight inertia. Second of all, you have to fight the people who think it costs too much money. Third, you have to fight the people who think government activity shouldn't be wasted on "riff-raff." Go ahead and fight. Good luck! But don't think harmony of interests and the freedom of values is going to get you any place. It will be a struggle. If you want a Band-aid I'll send you one.

MUELLER: This points up an area we should be going into. I

think there is a real challenge to the church. The statements prepared for President Kennedy indicate that motivation for such a peace corps is going to be in terms of humanistic interest, in terms of needs that are not being met. We'll have people going in to meet these needs with a humanistic motivation where the church with its motivation of the cross was unable to go.

ATTITUDES TOWARD CHANGE

GREENE: The implication behind the name of the Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment³⁰ is that there are adjustments to be made, that there are changes going on. Certainly in this conference we have been confronted by rapid rural economic and social change.

My comment at this point is only that I see four ways in which persons and institutions can respond to change. One is to stubbornly ignore it, and I'm not sure but what we got a hint of that tendency here. Another is to blindly resist it. Another is to unquestionably accept the changes. I do not like any of these three attitudes. The fourth approach, it seems to me, is to try to understand and influence the direction of change from the context of an accepted system of goals and values. My comment about the Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment at Iowa State University is that the concept of agricultural adjustment could be interpreted in my third category: we've got to accept these changes and simply change the people to fit the new order. My impression from what I've heard here is that this is not what it means. Instead the concept of the Center of Agricultural and Economic adjustment falls in my fourth category, which is to say, that in the face of change we think as rational human beings to understand, and as moral human beings to influence, the change in the direction of human values.

At certain points persons will have to change under the impact of social forces, and will inevitably change under the impact of the social forces which are moving us. But also there are ways to human decision making through rational analysis and program development. There are ways in which the trends can be changed. The trends can be adjusted to people as well as the people adjusted to the trends.

I hope that in what we have said and heard here we will find some foundation for values — that we will begin to see some guidelines toward the system of values against which we could

³⁰Former name of Center for Agricultural and Economic Development.

judge the trends going on about us — that we will discover the moral force to bend these trends in the direction which will make the structure of society most conducive to the good end of persons as we define such ends in our goals and values. I hope the Center will seek this, and I hope it will give us further opportunities on an interdisciplinary basis to come together again and again until we have truly found ways to come to grips with this problem of changing trends, of adjusting trends to the human ends, the moral ends and the spiritual ends of persons.

Index

Agricultural policies, programs,
and organizations, 156-66
beliefs and values underlying,
50-63
demand expansion, 58-59
ethical goals for, 112-14
farm resources, new uses for,
59-60
nonfarm employment oppor-
tunities, 60-61
supply management, 61-63
Agriculture
American, Protestant program
for, 112-28
changes in, 188-206
government policy errors in,
91-92
international age of, 114-16
trends in and N. F. O., 104-7
Ahlgren, H., 77-78
Allin, B. W., 71
Almen, L., 243-44
American economy, goals for;
see Economy
Aquinas, Thomas, 44-45

B

"Base-surplus" pricing, 90-91
Benvenuti, B., 195
Boulding, K., 156-66
Brewster, J. M., 51, 80, 214-15,
232

Burchinal, L., 8-14, 150-51, 212-
13, 216, 217-18, 233, 234

C

Campbell, Christiana M., 67-68
Capitalism, 69
Catholic church and rural U. S. A.,
129-34
and cooperatives, 132-33
and family farm, 132
and farm-city relations, 133
national and international
agencies, 131-32
social and economic order, 130-
33
Claar, J. B., 135-44, 154, 175, 176
Cochrane, W. W., 5, 50-63, 151,
180-81
Community
change in, 3-4
as a value, 29-30
Conservation, 113
Constitution of the United States,
68-69
Cooperative extension programs,
141-44
Cooperatives, 132-33
Cronin, J. F., 41

D

Demand expansion, 58-59

E

- Economic aid, sharing, 115
- Economic order, 130-33
- Economic policy, broad types of, 99-100
- Economy, goals for American, 94-102
 - agriculture in, 100-101
 - full employment, 96
 - opportunity and output sharing, 97-98
 - price stability, 98
 - striking a balance, 98-99
 - use of resources, 96-97
 - and world leadership, 98
- Economy, world, and religious organizations, 115-16
- Education of farm migrants, 117-18
- Ekola, G. C., 223
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 37
- Employment
 - full, 96
 - opportunities in, nonfarm, 60-61
- Engbretson, O. E., 215-17
- Equity, concepts of, 53-56
- Ethical goals for agricultural policy, 112-14
 - conservation, 113
 - cooperation among farm people, 113
 - development of persons, 112
 - diets, 113
 - farm family, preservation of, 113
 - human interdependence, 114
 - income, 113
- Ethical implications, 19
- Ethical issues, 114-16
 - and global program, 116
 - role of religious organizations, 114-15
 - sharing food supplies, 114
 - sharing technological knowledge, 115
- Ethics, 145-55
 - theological standpoint of, 146-50
- European perspectives, 188-206

- and effect of urban standards, 196-99
- and higher income, 194-96
- and overproduction, 200-201
- peasant attachment to farm, 193-94
- and reduction of number of farms, 201-4
- Extension programs, 135-44
 - cooperative, 141-44
 - goals, 137-41
 - and Smith-Lever Act, 136-37

F

- Family farm, 77-81, 186-87
 - and Catholic church, 132
 - preservation of, 113
- Family and rural society, 40
- Farm Bureau, 64-76
 - basic philosophy of, 67-70
 - policy, 64-76
- Farm-city relations, 133
- Farm, family
 - and Catholic church, 132
 - change in, 77-81, 186-87
 - preservation of, 113
- Farm labor, foreign migrant, 117
- Farm policy, 4-7
 - application of fundamental principles to, 70-76
 - problems of, 159-61
- Farm resources, new uses for, 59-60
- Farmers Union, 77-86
 - basic goals of, 81-86
 - policy, 81
- Farming as way of life, 2-3
- Farms, reducing number of, 201-4
- Fite, G. C., 79
- Fleming, R., 67
- Food and Agriculture: A Program for the 1960's, 61
- Food supplies, sharing, 114
- Foreign labor and migrant workers, 117
- Free enterprise, 69
- Freedom, 24
 - vs. other goals, 7

G

- Government, state and local, 69
 Grange
 and "base-surplus" pricing,
 90-91
 origin of philosophy of, 88-89
 programs of, 87-93
 Greene, S. E., 3, 15-32, 119-21,
 147-49, 177, 178, 179, 208,
 209, 213-14, 227-28, 232,
 241-42, 245-46

H

- Hacker, A., 3, 184-87, 207, 208,
 214, 219-21, 224-25, 233, 234-
 36, 240-41, 244
 Hadwiger, D. F., 1-7
 Hamilton, W. E., 4-5, 64-76, 151-
 52, 158
 Haroldsen, E. O., 1-7
 Harris, M., 83
 Hass, L., 238-39
 Hathaway, S. R., 218
 Heller, W. W., 99, 100
 Historic beliefs and values, 51-53
 Hofstee, E. W., 188-206, 233

I

- Income
 fair and stable, 113, 127-28
 means to higher, 194-96
 Institutional programs, 167-83
 International age of agriculture,
 114-16

J

- Jehlik, P. V., 234
 Jesness, O. B., 76
 John XXIII, Pope, 35, 41, 43, 44
 Justice, 25-26

K

- Kennedy, J. F., 46, 102
 Key, V. O., Jr., 181
 Knutson, K., 218-19, 239-40

L

- Labor, 38-39
 foreign, 117
 Lampman, R. J., 94-102, 153
 Larson, O. F., 36
 Local government, 69
 Love, law of, 22-30
 and community, 29-30
 and freedom, 24-25
 and justice, 25-29
 and stewardship, 23-24

M

- Magnuson, O., 219, 223
 Man, sinful nature of, 19-21
 McCanna, H. A., 3-4, 112-28,
 153-54, 179, 180, 228-29
 Migrant ministry, 116-19
 Migrant workers
 education of, 117-18
 and foreign labor, 117
 and legal exemptions and
 discriminations, 118
 and living conditions, 118
 reduction of, 117
 and social legislation, 121
 Miller, P. A., 36
 Monachesi, E. D., 218
 Moral law, natural, 34-36
 Morgan, A. E., 20
 Mueller, E. W., 210-11, 244-45

N

- National Council of Churches,
 31-32
 General Board of, 21
 National Council of the Churches
 of Christ, 125-27
 National Farmers Organization,
 103-11
 and trends in agriculture, 104-7
 Natural moral law, 34-36
 Newsom, H. D., 5-6, 87-93, 152
 Nonfarm economy, protection of,
 92-93
 Nonfarm employment oppor-
 tunities, 60-61

O

- Opportunity, fair sharing of, 97-98
- O'Rourke, E., 4, 129-34, 154, 174, 227, 231-32, 233-34, 237
- Output, fair sharing of, 97-98
- Overproduction, trend to, 200-201

P

- Paarlberg, D., 74
- Paulsen, A. A., 226-27
- Piety and reverence for the soil, 37-38
- Pius XI, Pope, 42, 43
- Pius XII, Pope, 2, 36-37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46
- Policy
 - economic, 99-100
 - farm, 4-7, 159-61
 - main types of criteria for, 170-73
- Policy problems, farm, 159-66
- Political science evaluation, 184-87
- Population, urban, 192-93
- Poverty in U. S. A.
 - and church, 122-25
 - R. A. D., 124-25
 - in rural areas, 123-24
- President's Study Group on National Voluntary Services, 180
- Pricing, "base-surplus," 90-91
- Programs, institutional, 167-83
- Property and rural society, 40-45
- Protestant program for American agriculture, 112-28
- Protestant theology of rural life, 15-32

R

- R. A. D., 124-25
- Redemption, 21-22
- Religious organizations, role of in world economy, 115-16
- Resource use, 96-97

- Review of conference papers, 174-82
- Rohde, G. C., 6, 77-86, 149, 152, 176, 177, 209-10
- Rossi-Doria, M., 196
- Rural life, 36-37
 - Catholic theology of, 33-49
 - portrait of, 187
 - Protestant theology of, 15-32
- Rural society
 - family, 40
 - property, 40-45
 - social virtues of, 45-49
 - structure in, 39-49
- "Rural" versus "agricultural," 185-86

S

- Schnittker, J. A., 80
- Schultz, T. W., 71
- Shideler, E. W., 211
- Sinful nature of man, 19-21
- Skovgaard, K., 202
- Smith, M. G., 127-28
- Smith-Lever Act, 136-37
- Social action, model for, 30-31
- Social changes, 8-11
- Social legislation for migrant workers, 121
- Social order, 130-33
- Social virtues, 45-49
- Societal adaptations, 188-206
- Soil, reverence for, 37-38
- Southeast Land Tenure Research Committee, 73
- Speltz, G. H., 2, 3, 33-49, 149-50, 174, 175
- St. Paul
 - Epistle to the Romans, 34, 38
 - Letter to the Galatians, 24
- Stacy, W. H., 211-12, 236
- Staley, O., 6, 103-11, 153, 156
- State government, 69
- Stewardship, 23-24
- Stremke, V. L., 221-22
- Stucky, W. G., 242-43
- Supply management, 61-63

T

- Talbot, R. B., 212, 238
Technological advance, 56-58
Technological knowledge,
 sharing, 115
Theological standpoint, 146-50,
 184-85
Theology
 of rural life, Catholic, 33-49
 of rural life, Protestant, 15-32
Thompson, T., 6-7, 145-55, 158
 207, 229-31, 232-33, 236-37
Trade Barriers, need to reduce, 93
Traditionalism, disappearance
 of, 190-92

U

- Urban population, 192-93

- Urban standards, effect of,
 196-99

V

- Vidich, A. J., 220
Vizzard, J. L., 208-9, 231, 244
Volin, L., 47

W

- Ward, L. R., 222-23
Williams, R. M., Jr., 7, 167-83,
 217, 223-24
Wilson, Woodrow, 69-70
World Council of Churches
 report of for 1954, 25
 Second Assembly of, 21-22
Wriston, H., 78-79
Wu, Yuan-Li, 47