

concern for what happens to community economic patterns or community organization in the area where they have their investments. Educational facilities may deteriorate, religious institutions may disintegrate, and social organization may evaporate, but it will not affect the investor nor his investment.

One is inclined to say that we are sorry about this fact, but it is the coming thing and who is going to be able to stop progress? I submit that it is not progress to dislocate large numbers of our rural citizens and force them into an urban atmosphere that may rob them of their self-esteem and impose upon them a structure of society that tends to depersonalize life.

It is not progress to encourage a system that treats the land as a mining operation—good for all that can be gotten out of it without much thought of what is happening in the use of soil and water. Conservation forces have made great strides in the past 20 years. Are we to see this simply cast aside by the land miners who are demanding a profit from their investment?

It is not progress to shut off the economic strength of a local community by the bringing in of a corporation that deals in such large quantities of supplies that it is economically cheaper to bypass the local merchants. This short circuiting of the economic generation factor of the local community can hardly be considered a social good.

A former teacher of mine once said that it was the sociologist's job to discover trends in our society. It then became the task of that society to decide whether it wanted to follow those trends or to kick some of them in the teeth and send them back where they came from.

It does not make sense to me to replace the values, strength, and efficiency of the family-type farm for the depersonalized, inefficient, and socially destructive corporation farm, only to discover after 20 years that the economic power centered in the commercial farming enterprise was centralized enough to force the marketplace to pay a reasonable return to the producer for his marketable goods. Why are we not wise enough to see that it would be a far greater good to encourage the continued development of family-type farms with a fair share in the marketplace?

I know that the immediate question that is raised is, "How is this to be done?"

Certainly I do not have all of the answers. This is not my primary field and most of my ideas have come from observation and not from the laboratory. For this reason I hesitate to make recommendations, but I have been bold thus far and so will make a few personal observations.

First, legislation should be developed to make it economically unprofitable to invest in a farming corporation as a tax writeoff. No one will dispute that this is being done. It is unfair to those taxpayers who have no such convenient loss leaders.

Second, Government agencies should be prohibited from encouraging the organization of corporation farms by giving financial help. At the present time at least the FHA is making loans to help in the organization of such farms—under the name of grazing associations.

Third, bargaining power for the family farmer needs to be encouraged. It seems to me that this is the road that would make the most