dant reasonably priced food, full employment of labor, and economic growth seldom are resolved easily. Not only do economic goals conflict with each other, but they frequently conflict among industries and with presently accepted social values.

Under present conditions, transition in agriculture is relatively free of obstructions. In the future, holders of capital for financing agriculture may share more in management. Management itself may require substantial expertise in resource coordination and production supervision. Future farm managers will need to assume these responsibilities, be adequately trained, and financially able.

What, then, is to become of the family farm?[9] Regardless of individual feeling, family farm survival is likely to be determined by how well the farm unit can adapt to changing economic forces. Two contentions seem appropriate. First, the argument that family farms can best achieve optimal organization and production efficiency has much support. Economic studies have shown that many economies of size can be achieved on 1-man or 2-man farms, and the ability of agriculture—still predominantly family-farm oriented—to feed an increasing number of people with fewer land and labor resources is well known. The second argument for preservation of family farms has been eloquently stated as support for decentralized decisionmaking and diffused economic power in the organization of our society.[10] On the basis of these arguments, public policy alternatives have been advanced to help strengthen the competitive position of family farms.

These policy alternatives do not fall into clearly defined compartments, yet there is a need for some cataloging to facilitate interpretation. One policy approach is to encourage free or open markets. Under certain conditions, the elimination of price and income programs could benefit family farms by permitting competitive forces to direct production and establish market prices. Under these conditions, excess productive capacity in agriculture almost certainly would result in further adjustment of resources. In anticipation that the adjustment process would cause further productive realignment, most advocates of this policy have recommended a gradual elimination of Federal agricultural support programs. It also should be pointed out that, under a free market policy, the uncoordinated production of surplus commodities could depress prices and influence family farm income adversely.

A second policy approach can be classified as the establishment of more effective farm bargaining. Farm organizations and the United States Department of Agriculture have shown considerable interest in farm bargaining power. It is contended that farmers need countervailing power to offset the strength of farm suppliers and marketing agencies. Many approaches such as cooperative marketing, marketing orders, and commodity withholding have been advocated and attempted.

Continuation of present agricultural programs is a third policy alternative. Under this mixture of production quota and price support for selected commodities, the experience of recent years is likely to continue. Support programs would tend to establish a price floor and quotas would attempt to coordinate supplies, reducing price and income fluctuations. Such programs may arrest, but are not likely to prevent, resource adjustment in agriculture.

In summary, without direct legislative restriction, much of which is likely to be undesirable, further growth in corporate farming seems likely. Commercial agriculture—farms

[9] A family farm is defined as a farm business with sufficient resources and productivity to yield an income sufficient for: (a) family living; (b) farm expenses, including depreciation; and (c) capital growth to support new farm investment to maintain efficiency and to meet rising levels of living.

[10] Paul L. Farris, "Alternatives for Maintaining the Family Farm," *Economic and Marketing Information* (Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, March 29, 1968).