

we have a right to save the family farm just as we have a right to save the church, the school, and the family. We have certain values in America that we think are important and social scientists try to sometimes ignore them. We have to accept these factors.

If you were to take a poll of my colleagues, and my colleagues from North Dakota indicated this, I think you would find a lot of people want us to have families living on land in America. In fact, Senator Nelson, I think we are spending millions of dollars overseas trying to get the land back into the hands of family, yet here we sit idly by and let "Nero fiddle while Rome burns." It is time we took a hard look. I am in favor of doing something to help the family farm, rather than hinder, by putting roadblocks in the way of corporate farming.

I think it is better to do something about the family farm to prevent this growth that we have been talking about. We need some research, we need it now, not next year, we need it tomorrow. We don't really know what the social impact is of this change that is going on. We can talk all we want today but I am embarrassed, we have very few answers.

I appeared before Senator Harris' committee in Oklahoma on the impact of rural migration and what it meant. I defined two citations, researchwise, that is all I could define. It is very embarrassing. We do not have the answers. I encourage you to see that we get some answers to some of this. It is a contemporary phenomenon which has taken place almost within the last few years here in the Midwest and certainly in Wisconsin.

Well, what can we look forward to, let's do a little conjecturing. Perhaps the most important thing is there would be a partial decentralization of previously urban industry to rural areas. We anticipate, because it is already happening to some extent, because there has been a discussion in Washington about encouraging this growth. Also, public distrust of unsettled conditions in the cities may encourage people to avoid or leave urban areas. This is a point I made earlier.

Besides these factors, it should be remembered that deliberate policy decisions may change many of the links in the chain of events we now expect. In other words, it is a doomsday kind of thing. We can control our own destiny. I can say we are going to have a decline of population in Lake County, it is going to go down 20 percent in 10 years. So people look at my prediction and I am a doomsday prophet, just as I am in this business, and I say, "Well, there aren't going to be any people." Someone in Milwaukee says that is the place to go, Marshall says nobody is going to be there, so let's go to Lake County. It upsets all my predictions.

Social scientists are in a real dilemma. We can set certain conditions, you change those conditions and assumptions and everything goes astray.

What are the chain effects, in other words, of some of these things that might happen? In general, we can assume that economic conditions in the country and perhaps social conditions in the city will determine the distribution of composition of the farm and nonfarm population. Changes in values and behavior of rural residents will be the outcome of this chain of results. And I still think, very frankly, that the rural people are going to have something to say about these changes, and it will be a sorry state of affairs if we don't.