of food and fiber. It will be necessary to reduce the amount of labor on farms and the amount of land used in the production of food and fiber in order to solve the income problems of agriculture. These changes will not be accomplished easily. They will not be accomplished as long as policies and programs are carried out under the general assumption that all farmers are similar in that they face similar conditions and that they are affected in the same manner by public policies and programs.

Certainly we cannot cope with the problems of rural poverty if we insist on trying to combat these problems with the same policies and programs which we have employed in the past. To date, the low-income problem of American agriculture has been largely subsumed under the umbrella of price and production control programs. These programs have been of little benefit to the low-income people in rural areas. The benefits are shared largely in proportion to the participation of farmers in commercial markets. In spite of this, agriculture has exhausted much of its political strength in the struggle to develop and maintain price and production control programs.[2] The facts are that the best conceived price and production control programs will do little to improve the lot of those who control few resources.

Geographic and occupational mobility of labor are essential elements of resource adjustment in many rural areas. In areas characterized by heavy outmigration, where the economic base for agricultural production is very limited and where the costs of establishing and maintaining good schools and other forms of social capital are excessive, it may be desirable to purchase additional land for forests, recreation, and similar extensive uses.

Area planning and development.—It was implied above that more area planning will be necessary in order to break through the poverty cycle. Multicounty market areas and trade areas constitute a better base for economic development than most counties. Multiple counties also will constitute a more natural base for the planning of social overhead capital than single counties. The county boundaries which exist today are a product of history and have economic significance largely in that context. If the opportunity were provided today to restructure county lines in accordance with the potential for growth and development, it is obvious that many counties would be consolidated.

In this age of specialization there are definite important economies in agglomeration of industrial plants. As centers of finance, research, design, invention, business leadership, and professional and managerial talent, metropolitan areas provide a setting which is especially favorable to future economic growth. The patterns of economic growth and development in metropolitan areas will have an important bearing upon the types of development programs which are likely to be successful in the surrounding areas and, therefore, should be considered in structuring geographic areas for planning purposes.

One of the best ways to get rural adjustments is to stimulate growth and development in nearby urban areas. Multicounty planning commissions, development associations, and other organizations to induce economic growth and development should recognize that all counties do not have the same opportunities for growth and development. The forces of growth and development do not appear in the form of a heavenly mist which falls evenly upon all counties. Rather, it is more typical for economic development to appear in the form of a pool which starts in a particular location and grows and develops and from which forces spill over into other areas. The extent to which surrounding counties participate in the growth and development of a particular county depends upon the organization of the factor and product markets and the willingness of people to take advantage of opportunities created by growth. The necessary changes can be brought about more effectively if planning is done on a multicounty basis.

Human resource development.—A major facet of the problem in low-income areas stems from the fact that education and training of the people in these areas are out of phase with economic opportunities. One of the greatest paradoxes of our day is the scarcity of highly trained efficient manpower while at the same time there is a paucity of jobs for large numbers of unskilled workers. Many of the persons caught in the cycle of poverty in rural areas have a bleak employment future either in agriculture or in industry. To encourage them to stay on farms is to perpetuate poverty. Unless some means is found for training the youth for nonfarm occupations, to encourage them to move to urban areas is to impart hope where there is no hope. Unless the youth are trained for the

---

[2] T. W. Schultz, "Our Welfare State and the Welfare of Farm People," address at the National Farm Institute, Des Moines, Iowa, Feb. 13, 1964.