

# 19

## Dialogue

---

TYLER THOMPSON:<sup>1</sup> 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:<sup>2</sup> 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...'"<sup>3</sup> Are you saying anything different than he was saying?

---

<sup>1</sup>Tyler Thompson, Garrett Theological Seminary.

<sup>2</sup>Andrew Hacker, Department of Government, Cornell University.

<sup>3</sup>Matt. 7:21.

HACKER: No.

SHIRLEY E. GREENE:<sup>4</sup> 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:<sup>5</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup>Shirley E. Greene, secretary of Church in Town and Country, Board of Homeland Missions, United Churches of Christ, St. Louis.

<sup>5</sup>J. 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:<sup>6</sup> 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

---

<sup>6</sup>Gilbert 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:<sup>7</sup> 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

---

<sup>7</sup>E. 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:<sup>8</sup> 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:<sup>9</sup> 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

---

<sup>8</sup>Emerson W. Shideler, professor of philosophy, Iowa State University.

<sup>9</sup>W. 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:<sup>10</sup> 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:<sup>11</sup> 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

<sup>10</sup> Ross B. Talbot, professor of government, Iowa State University.

<sup>11</sup> 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:<sup>12</sup> 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

---

<sup>12</sup> 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:<sup>13</sup> 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

---

<sup>13</sup> 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.:<sup>14</sup> 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

---

<sup>14</sup>Robin 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.<sup>15</sup> 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:<sup>16</sup> 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.

---

<sup>15</sup> See Starke R. Hathaway and Elio D. Monachesi, "Rural-Urban Adolescent Personality," in *Rural Sociology*, No. 24 (Dec. 1959), pp. 331-346.

<sup>16</sup> 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:<sup>17</sup> 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

---

<sup>17</sup>Osgood 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,<sup>18</sup> 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

---

<sup>18</sup>See 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:<sup>19</sup> 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

---

<sup>19</sup> 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:<sup>20</sup> 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

---

<sup>20</sup> 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:<sup>21</sup> 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

---

<sup>21</sup>Giles 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:<sup>22</sup> 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 overriding 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

---

<sup>22</sup> 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:**<sup>23</sup> 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.

---

<sup>23</sup>E. 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:<sup>24</sup> 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

---

<sup>24</sup> 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:**<sup>25</sup> 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

---

<sup>25</sup> E. 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:<sup>26</sup> 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 —

---

<sup>26</sup> 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:**<sup>27</sup> 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

---

<sup>27</sup>Lonnie 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:<sup>28</sup> 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

---

<sup>28</sup>W. 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:<sup>29</sup> I am a Lutheran minister, and thus a theologian or minister of the Word. As I understand the ministry of

---

<sup>29</sup>Louis 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 Adjustment<sup>30</sup> 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

---

<sup>30</sup>Former 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.