century, but the great difference is that today, in a full-employment economy, with numerous alternative opportunities for employment in the nonfarm sector, the farmer can go elsewhere. And what is true of manpower is also true of capital. Today's advanced agricultural technology requires massive infusions of capital. If returns are too low in agriculture, capital will find investment elsewhere.

"Both consumers and family farmers should be aware of this threat."

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING

In June of 1966, the National Commission issued a voluminous report on the nation's food industry. This report is still being studied and digested. Apparently the major area of controversy surrounding the report concerned the conclusion drawn from it—not the adequacy or scholarly nature of the study. This report states, "The bulk of agricultural production still comes from family farms (in the sense that they employ no more hired than family labor) but some types of production, especially fruit and vegetable production, have moved, to a large extent, out of the family farm class. *Probably a selective shift will continue, with the types of farming predominating in the Midwest, East, and parts of the South being among the last to make the shift.*"

I interpret this statement as indicative of what some scholars feel is now happening in agriculture relative to corporation farming and, of course, the eventual demise of the family type farm.

Continuing in the examination of the divergence of opinion and viewpoint of the family farm versus the corporate farming threat we might consider statements by representatives of the Educational Estate.

I would preface the conflicting points of scholarly view with John Galbraith's comment, "Economists, on the whole, think well of what they do themselves and much less of what their professional colleagues do. If a scholar probes deeply into a small section of the subject, he is fairly certain to mistrust, as superficial, the man who ranges more widely. The latter, in turn, will think the specialist lacking in vision or what is called reach. By knowing even more about even less, he will seem to risk becoming quite ignorant. Those who are mathematically inclined see others as in retreat from rigor. The others think those who manipulate symbols impractical. . . . It is exceedingly fortunate for the psychic health of the profession that inadequacy lies so uniformly with others."

THE VIEW FROM PURDUE

Economist Paul L. Farris, speaking at Farm Science Days in January of this year, had this to say:

"Farmers today are much concerned about the future organization of agriculture. Their loss of managerial independence is disintegrating the family farm in ways not fully visible from trends in farm numbers and sizes. Farmers see at stake their freedom and economic status relative to other groups.

"Farmers still have some options for retaining and perhaps advancing the entrepreneural independence inherent in family farm agriculture if they desire to do so. In terms of public policy, the most forceful argument for saving the family farm is to support decentralized decisionmaking and diffused economic power in our society.

"How much managerial independence has been lost by farmers varies widely among enterprises and areas of the country. The shift of entrepreneural functions off the farm has been greatest for poultry and some specialty crops. Farmers in the Midwest appear to have retained more decision-making latitude than farmers in other areas, but their traditional types of operations are being strongly challenged by integrated production-marketing systems in other sections."

THE VIEW FROM WISCONSIN

The University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture and Life Sciences issued a report in August of 1967, prepared by a Special Faculty Task Force. It was a comprehensive study concerning the kind of agriculture we are likely to have in 1980. The task force concluded as follows:

"The family farm in animal agriculture will continue as the basic unit in Wisconsin. Farming in this country is not trending toward the large corporate unit either in numbers or in proportion of the market." (Page 19 of report)