Under these conditions poverty is perpetuated. Because of the poverty there is relatively little investment in human resource development and in the development of other resources. Investment in social overhead capital falls behind in the low-income communities thereby perpetuating and magnifying income differences.

As our economy has continued to grow and develop, the pace of technological change has quickened. The nature of this change also has been altered. Today, there is a great deal of specialization in plants and in equipment. Linkages have been developed among plants and agglomerations of industry have developed in favored areas. These developments complicate attempts to induce growth in isolated communities. Consequently, we now find many communities that not only are bypassed by progress but are actually degenerating.

There was a time when the term "ghost town" was reserved largely for gold mining and silver mining villages and more recently for coal mining villages. During the past decade, the term has acquired relevance in agricultural communities. This is particularly true of those rural communities which have served as supply centers for items purchased by farmers or which have depended heavily upon farm product processing. Modern transportation and communication systems which have developed in conjunction with large changes in the structure of modern agriculture have made it possible, and in fact profitable, to bypass rural towns and villages. As a consequence, the current U.S. scene is characterized by many sick rural communities. The problems of poverty, therefore, are to a considerable degree, problems of sick communities. People in these communities find a decreasing demand for their services. Many of them now face a bleak prospect that their services have been made largely obsolete by the rapid and impersonal march of technological and economic progress.

At the same time that skills (i.e., previous investments in human assets) are rendered obsolete, many new jobs are created which require different skills. Consequently, a paradox has emerged in which many people are unemployed as a result of changes in the structure of the economy while there are many unfilled jobs because of a shortage of persons with the requisite training and skills. Clearly, this situation could not have existed if we had anticipated the structural changes which are taking place in our economy and prepared people for the emerging jobs. The situation which exists has developed in part from the failure of our institutions to make people aware of the nature and extent of the changes which have taken place and which will come to pass in our society.

Labor market institutions must share this guilt. The labor market has not and does not disseminate pertinent information to warn people of changes in labor market conditions. As individuals it is difficult, if not impossible, to anticipate effectively changes of the nature which have occurred and which continue to occur in the labor market. Typically, the individual gets the signals for a change only after the changes are an accomplished fact. A better early warning system is needed to help people to anticipate, prepare for, and adjust to change.

Our educational institutions should devote more resources to study of the processes of growth and development. They have become unduly preoccupied with technology and technological change, with relatively little emphasis upon assisting people to adjust to these changes. This is especially true of the land-grant colleges and universities. These institutions were established to generate new knowledge and to work with innovators in the application of this knowledge. It was not surprising, therefore, that the measure of productivity adopted for the institutions was the extent to which they were able to increase the output of their clientele. Consequently, the effectiveness of the agricultural research and educational programs soon came to be measured by the extent of the increase in production of farm commodities. Under such a system, it is only natural to expect those who are employed in it to work with the innovator, the person who is going to make the greatest increases in productivity. But as income of those whose productivity increases rises in comparison with the income of others relative poverty is intensified.

It is difficult for people to emerge from the culture of poverty. The capitalistic system is built upon a profit motive; it assumes that people will innovate. Furthermore, it is profitable to concentrate upon those who can and will innovate. Those who are unable to make the necessary adjustments because of capital restrictions, limited managerial ability and for other reasons are frequently forced into a lower income position. We see numerous examples of this in agriculture. For example, grade A dairymen who could not make the neces-