time the family producer will gradually disappear from the scene and his place eventually taken over by highly merchandized, and perhaps highly subsidized, corporate units.

This campaign has been carried on simultaneously with another campaign that would lead people to believe that the need for food would outrun the ability of the country to produce it; so that if farmers would just grin and bear low prices long enough that the golden age would finally come when the very scarcity of food would drive farm prices sky-high. As I remember it, by 1970 the U.S., so the story went, would be approaching a near-famine situation with the farmers enjoying a position of a man on the top of the economic heap.

I might mention here, one whose book, "Road to Survival," was a best seller, William Vogt. In 1950 Vogt declared that, "the lower standard of living is here—and it is certain to go lower". Basing themselves on Vogt's theories and other such works on population and land, those with large amounts of money to invest for future gains, took the grim warning seriously. And so a great deal of what one might call "big money" was invested in crop-producing land in the form of loans, as well as outright purchases. From what I learn, foundations and insurance companies, much of it hidden, hold large land loans which can be liquidated when the mortgage holders think the time has come to turn their holdings into great profits. Mr. Vogt, who incidently is still with us, and who spoke out recently against having a president in the White House with a large family because it set a bad example, was wrong, because among other things he didn't consider the almost universal birth control methods. But those who accepted the Vogt theories helped boost land prices to their high levels, thus forcing farmers and ranchers into cut-throat competition for land, which in turn increased land taxes all over the country and increased all agricultural operating costs and put them greatly out of proportion to the values of the crops and livestock produced on the land.

I think the committee should look into the question of who hold the mortgages on the crop bearing land in this country and the connections the mortgage holders have with big corporations. If the problem of prices can be solved perhaps those holding large tracts of land could be induced to sell some of the tracts to family operators. But family operators could never pay for the land unless they receive enough for their products to make payments possible.

I wish to point out that the contradiction between the prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities and the price for which all agricultural land now sells, compounded the so-called farm problem and speeded up the days when large-scale agriculture would rule the rural areas both economically and politically.

In the process by which corporate agriculture grows and becomes dominant I think it is necessary to point out that the process is not gradual, nor the rate of speed constant. It is somewhat like a military campaign in which the strategists probe for commanding positions where they can plant big guns or bottle up sea traffic. The range lands where life begins in the beef, wool and lamb industry are such a key position. When corporate agriculture gets control of a certain percent of the range lands the rest of the range lands will fall into the corporate camp easily. And also the rest of agriculture will come under corporate control or direct ownership.

Since about 1962 the livestock people have been suffering a downward spiral in net income and have, like agriculture in other places, borrowed on inflated land values to keep in the game. This downward spiral has occurred when there was an upward spiral in the economic power of the food chain stores who handle about 85% of the dressed meat, which incidently is bought through less than half-a-dozen purchasing agencies; while the rest of the chain stores follow the leader in "lock-step" paying prices quoted on the "yellow sheet", the trade publication. Evidence of this chain store monopoly was brought out in 1965 through the hearings of the National Commission on Food Marketing.

It is my contention that the chain store monopoly is the key factor today in the rapid rate in which ranchers are sliding toward bankruptcy while the areas are being taken over by corporate interests. This should be a case for the Department of Justice. A small group of ranchers have filed a civil action against three of the nation's largest food chains charging conspiracy to violate the anti-monopoly laws. The evidence produced by the ranchers in this suit should be examined by a congressional committee such as this and placed in the hands of the proper authorities so that the Department of Justice can prosecute, and