AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Staff Paper P00-6 December 2000

STAFF PAPER SERIES

American Agricultural Economics Association Fellows' Retrospective: Reflections on Philip M. Raup's Career

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED ECONOMICS

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL, FOOD, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Staff Paper P00-6 **December 2000**

American Agricultural Economics Association Fellows' Retrospective:

Reflections on Philip M. Raup's Career

The views reported in this paper are those of the authors. They are not necessarily endorsed by the Department of Applied Economics or by the University of Minnesota.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Copies of this publication are available at http://agecon.lib.umn.edu/mn.html. Information on other titles in this series may be obtained from: Waite Library, University of Minnesota, Department of Applied Economics, 232 Classroom Office Building, 1994 Buford Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55108, U.S.A.

Copyright (c) 2000. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Preface

On August 9, 1999, Philip M. Raup was honored in a "Fellows Retrospective" session at the annual meeting of the American Agricultural Economics Association in Nashville, Tennessee. For more than fifty years Phil Raup has been a major contributor to our understanding of land economics, land reform, the grain trade, transportation, agricultural policy, relationships with the Soviet Union and now with the former Soviet Union states, and many other sub-topics in the profession.

This retrospective program was organized by the Professional Activities Committee of the AAEA, under the leadership of Paul Barkley. It began with three colleagues sharing their observations on Raup's accomplishments and concluded with Raup, himself, commenting on how his career might take shape if he were starting today. This publication includes written versions of these presentations and a brief biographical sketch of Philip Raup.

Contents

Retrospective for Philip M. Raup, Professor Emeritus at the University of Minnesota 1
W. Burt Sundquist

On Land and Land Policy: A Phil Raup Retrospective 3
Gene Wunderlich

Comments in Honor of Professor Philip Raup 12
Alex F. McCalla

In Retrospect and Prospect 16
Philip M. Raup

Biographical Sketch of Philip M. Raup 21

Retrospective for Philip M. Raup, Professor Emeritus at the University of Minnesota

W. Burt Sundquist*

Phil is a native of Kansas where he still owns one of the two sections of land which constitute the Raup family farm. So he stays in touch with farm costs, prices and farming conditions. In fact, if you want some perspective on the historical costs of producing wheat going back to early in the century, Phil is your man.

Phil received his A.B. degree in Economics from the University of Kansas in 1939 and his M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Agricultural Economics from the University of Wisconsin in 1941 and 1949, respectively.

Phil served as a Lieutenant in the U.S. Naval Reserve from 1942-45 and as Chief Land Officer and Acting Chief, Food and Agriculture Branch, U.S. Office of Military Government for Germany in Berlin from 1945-49. During this period he worked closely with a long-time friend and colleague, Walter Heller. Feeding the German population in the period immediately following World War II was a challenge and Phil played an important role in successfully meeting that challenge.

After four years as an Assistant Professor at the University of Wisconsin, Phil was appointed a full professor at the University of Minnesota in 1953 and has been a very active "Professor Emeritus" since 1984. Even today, Phil continues to be a regular attendee (and participant) in departmental faculty meetings. Phil remains a model citizen of the Department of Applied Economics and of the several Twin Cities communities of which he is an active participant. In addition, he continues to be active professionally, including his involvement as a Fellow of AAEA.

Phil has served on more committees and as a consultant to more organizations than I can list, but they include two Minnesota tax study commissions, several UN agencies including the FAO, the European Commission on Agriculture, the World Bank, USDA, and the U.S. Information Agency and others.

His expertise on the former Soviet Union and Central and Eastern Europe is extensive and his counsel is still much in demand by a variety of organizations.

In the few remaining minutes I have available, I want to highlight a couple of Phil's unique characteristics.

---

* Professor Emeritus, Department of Applied Economics, University of Minnesota.

1. His great propensity to collect data and turn it into information.

Thirty-five years ago I was in the Netherlands helping Earl Heady run a workshop for OECD. During this conference we took a bus trip to the, then quite new, Northwest Polder. We were given an excellent presentation on the land reclamation process by hydrologists, land use planners and others. I was curious as to what it cost (per hectare) to reclaim this land from the Zeider Sea. When I asked, the Dutch lecturer said, well I don't know, but the person with the best data on this is a professor at the University of Minnesota, Philip Raup. Sure enough, Phil had a more extensive file on this topic than anyone has a right to expect.

If you have a chance, don't pass up the opportunity to see Phil's collection of German postage stamps that vividly depict the Great Inflation in Germany in 1923-24. In a matter of months the cost of mailing a letter skyrocketed to billions of Deutschmarks.

Finally, Phil's collections of data and reports, particularly on European history, are so extensive that for years professors in the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Minnesota sent their students to Phil for information rather than to the University Library. And, Phil served as an active committee member for a large number of graduate students in other departments and colleges of the University of Minnesota. I could go on and on, but I want to comment very briefly on a second characteristic of Phil's.

2. His proclivity to travel.

It has been said of Phil that he hates to see an airplane leave the Twin Cities airport without being on board. And he continues to log a lot of miles by auto both in the U.S. and in Europe.

Let me cite an example of his extensive travel. Back around 1970 the Raups were in Paris on leave from the University of Minnesota. I was working in Washington, D.C. at the time and came to Paris to work on an OECD committee. When I arrived, I called the Raup's telephone number hoping to have dinner with them. Phil's wife, Marian, answered the phone and said she'd be glad to join me for dinner but Phil was traveling in India. This is just one incident in the life of a world traveler.

Because Phil keeps detailed records on where he went, what he did and what he learned, he is an excellent source of which highways, hotels and restaurants to use in Europe and, last but not least, which wines to buy.

I'm sure you agree that Phil has come a long way from his farm youth in Kansas. His contributions to our profession have been great and diverse. I'm pleased that we are able to have this retrospective program for Phil and to charter the Philip M. Raup Appreciation Club at our AAEA Awards Program tomorrow night.

On Land and Land Policy:
A Phil Raup Retrospective

Gene Wunderlich*

As a community of professional model builders, we should first specify what our model is supposed to explain. Phil Raup is our dependent variable. Our a priori construct has two explanatory (questionably independent) variables: the first is Land, the second is Economic Development. I am supposed to talk about land.

First, I will define Land and note some change over time.[1] Second, I will flag some events in the evolution of American land policy (and in the process tell you where Phil Raup is coming from).

Given our limited time, I will address only some beginnings and the current status of the idea of land in economics[2]. The "Main Idea" is this: The economic concept of land narrowed over 2 ½ centuries to accommodate deconstructed perspectives of the economy–ever tighter, smaller, visions of economic processes; ever tighter, more refined, methods of modelling and testing.

Classical economists were concerned with the wealth of a nation, how it was generated, and how it was distributed. From the standpoint of the Land Idea, this era is illustrated with the overpowering opening of Richard Cantillon's *Essai* [3] written in 1730 (published in 1755):

> "The Land is the Source or Matter from whence all Wealth is produced..."

Clearly Cantillon anticipated Quesnay, Mirabeau, and DuPont, the physiocratic economists. Quesnay's *Tableau Economique(1759)* is in many ways similar to the *Essai.*

From the political economy of Cantillon and the Physiocrats (particularly his friend and correspondent DuPont) Jefferson could draw an economic rationale for his political philosophy, including the importance of primary industries and the widespread distribution of wealth through the ownership and control of land.

Cantillon, as an aspect of his general land value theory, anticipated both Thomas R. Malthus and Henry George by describing the geometric progression of population, noting people's reproductive habits, unchecked, were like "mice in a barn."

---

*ERS-USDA, retired.

[1]Machlup F. *Essays on Economic Semantics* (1963) p3: Quoting Malthus on *Definitions in Political Economy* [1827] "one of the principle causes of differences of opinion among political economists may be traced to the different meanings in which the same terms have been used by different writers."

[2]Another more detailed version is being drafted as an essay on land in economics and policy.

[3]Cantillon, R. *Essai sur la Nature du Commerce en General* (1755).

We pass through a couple of centuries, nodding at the important work of David Ricardo and others including Alfred Marshall who said :

> "...the fundamental attribute of land is its extension...The area of the earth is fixed...this property of land is the ultimate cause of the distinction which all writers on economics are compelled to make between land and other things."[4]

As economics became more refined and specialties arose, e.g., the American Economics Association in 1885, the role of land became fractured, being redefined to suit the political economy of the writer. Henry George, Richard Ely, Roland Renne, come to mind.

The emergence of Resource Economics resulted in part from refinements in production and marketing economics. Marketing and finance specialties embraced the idea of "real estate." See, for example, the transition in Raleigh Barlowe's *Land Resource Economics* (1958).

As production economics expanded its domain it incorporated research on conservation, tenure, and land use into the micro-economic/quantitative models of production economics. Often this required defining out many of the unique features of land in classic economic concepts. Earl Heady in his landmark text *Economics of Agricultural Production and Resource Use* defines land:

> "... we will use the term land to have the same meaning as soil. Capital comes in many particular forms such as fertilizer, feed, tractors, barns, and even the most important aspects of land. Differences within the category of capital are likely to be <u>more important</u> than differences between this category of resources and other amalgamations or aggregations of resources."[5]

Heady meant, of course, those categories of capital assets were <u>more important</u> in providing plausible solutions to the micro efficiency models employed. For the farm manager, land is just another priced asset to be mixed efficiently with other resources.

Folke Dovring's *Land Economics*, published as recently as 1987, is a throwback to classic economics and land economics yet provides for the new areas of concern: conservation, environment, and public policy.

Phil Raup has experienced the rise of imperial production economics. He was schooled in the Ely/Wehrwein tradition in Wisconsin–including its strong roots in pragmatism. He has absorbed and responded to the marketing perspective of real estate pricing. And he has, with benefit of wide ranging experience overseas, developed his own eclectic style. It is a style that I am unable to classify. So, I must ask Phil: <u>What is your concept, your definition, of Land</u>?

---

[4]Alfred Marshall. *Principles of Economics* 8th ed.1920 Philadelphia:Porcupine Press. p.120

[5]Earl Heady. *Economics of Agricultural Production and Resource Use*. NY:Prentice-Hall 1952. p.24.

Now let us turn to land policy. I will limit my comments to land reform in America, and simply recognize Phil's connections with, and contributions to, the subject of land reform also in other countries, other regions.

Again, in the interest of time, I am going to compress two centuries of land reform experience in America into a few highlights. The essential point is that the purposes of land reform in America have changed over time, so the mechanics of land policy have changed accordingly. Not surprisingly, the economic rationale supporting land policies has also adapted to new realities.

Our story of the European conquest and settlement of America must begin in 1759 on the Plains of Abraham (Quebec) where the British under Wolfe defeated the French under Montcalm. This was the turning point of the Seven Years War (French and Indian War). This victory led to a legal and political system for the United States inherited from Britain, with guidance of a Constitution created by James Madison and associates. (And it spared the United States a French modeled government and legal system.)

As if to add another star to the year 1759, the Scot, Adam Smith, produced *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, from which was drawn the narrower but better known *Wealth of Nations*, published in 1776, another year of remembrance in American history.

Most of the remainder of the 18th Century was taken up with the United States defining itself politically, first in relation to Britain, and then its own composition, significantly as the whole Nation in relation to its diverse parts, the States. Much of land policy in America's history and its concerns of today has been a struggle with issues articulated in the Federalist Papers–the division of political turf between the nation and the states.

A land history, however abbreviated, requires mention of:

- The Ordinance of 1784 where Jefferson's no slavery proposal lost by one vote.
- The Ordinance of 1785 which gave us the survey system for all the new states (36 sections of 640 acres, with 1 section reserved for schools). Sale of public land for revenue (min of 640 acres for $1 per acre)
- The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 which basically designed the structure and admission of new States in the Union. One notable land policy of the Northwest Ordinance was contained in Article III:
  "The utmost good faith shall always be observed toward the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and in their property, rights, and liberty they never shall be invaded or disturbed..."

In the 19th Century America began to redefine itself territorially. The Century began with the colossal land deal, the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. It was a crazy deal, illegal from the beginning. It was an unauthorized sale, paid for with unauthorized funds; it started with the purchase of a seaport and concluded by doubling the size of the United States.

The purchaser of the Louisiana territory had not the foggiest notion of what he bought. Jefferson called for an expedition and in 1804 and 1805 Lewis and Clark, aided immeasurably by

Sakakawea, explored the new territory from St Louis to the Columbia River. America no longer ended at the Mississippi but reached to the Pacific Ocean.

By mid-century, with additions from Florida, Texas, the Southwest and the Oregon northwest, the United States had expanded to its present boundaries. In 1867, somewhat defensively, the US bought Alaska from Russia. Land policies began to shift from revenue raising to settlement and securing territory.

The population began shifting westward and European immigration and procreation began to put pressure on the Native populations first in the East and later the entire country. In 1830, Congress passed the Removal Act and the Choctaws of Alabama and Mississippi were moved to Arkansas (in 4 years 4,000 of the 13,000 died of starvation, disease, and exposure). In 1838, under President Van Buren's orders, General Winfield Scott forced 18,000 Cherokees on the Trail of Tears that killed 4000 of them. Some of their survivors came to Kansas and Oklahoma.

Meanwhile, many Easterners were being drawn westward, but not all to the frontier. In 1836, James Blaine Mitchell moved his family of eight to Clark county Ohio to operate a sawmill. His eldest son, Ross, worked in a mill in Springfield, Ohio. When James Blaine died, and his wife shortly thereafter, Ross took responsibility for the large family. Hard work, ingenuity, little education eventually brought Ross great success. He married Catharine Ann and produced five daughters, the eldest Fannie.

The Ross Mitchell story is an example of the Horatio Alger successes in the early industrial/ agricultural revolution in the U.S. From virtually nothing Ross came to own 5,000 acres in Ohio, 80 homes in Springfield, and 22,000 acres in Kansas.

Fannie married one Gustavus Raup, a Lutheran pastor, who among other things became manager of the Mitchell farm estates. To make a fascinating and exemplary but long story short, Ross Mitchell died in 1913. Gustavus Raup visited the Kansas land but did not move his home from Springfield, Ohio. He died in Springfield, in 1914, shortly after seeing and baptizing his new grandson, Philip, in Kansas. James, son of Gustavus and Fannie, eventually came to own Sections 15 and 11 in Banner Township, Rush County Kansas. James' children, Phil, Rowland, and Jane, became owners. After Jane's death Phil and Rowland became separate owners, respectively, of Sections 11 and 15. Rowland recently passed away. Both Sections are farmed by Tom, Rowland's son.

Countless variations of the Raup story have been played out with backdrop of policies of property in people and land. The Missouri compromise, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the Potawatomie, Kansas, massacre by John Brown, the Panics of 1837 and 1857, the Civil War were going on while railroads were being built and railroad companies were grabbing land and selling the dream of farming and farmland ownership. The Raup Land, for example, was once owned by the Santa Fe railroad.

While the nation was locked in the furious Civil War, it created a national Department of Agriculture, the Homestead Act, and the Morrill Land Grant College Act. From the Civil War to 1900 the population grew from less than 40 million to more than 76 million. On the downside, in

1890 the 7th Cavalry massacred all the Indians in the Lakota Village at Wounded Knee, more or less completing the ethnic cleansing of Native Americans by Europeans.

With the southern plains slaughter in 1872-73, and the northern plains slaughter a decade later, the American buffalo had been virtually exterminated and replaced for a time with grazing cattle and then by immigrating farmers. From 1870 to 1900 the number of farms exploded from 2.7 to 5.7 million. Virtually all the agricultural land of today was in farms by the beginning of the 20th Century.

Most everybody here is familiar with the remarkable story of American agriculture in the 20th Century. Many of us have lived through much of the drought and depression of the thirties. We have watched the industrialization of agriculture, the concentration of production, and many of the new roles expected of farmers as architects of a landscape protected from erosion, pollution, and the ravages of an urban population.

Nearly half of the land in farms is owned by someone other than the farm operator (most of that by absentee owners like Phil and me). Livestock production is being pulled together in ever growing concentrations. Genetic manipulation is creating a whole new category of property issues.

A tiny percent of the population, by virtue of being farmland owners, hold two-thirds of the private land in the U.S. and even now Congress wants to reduce the opportunities for young families who do not inherit land from starting farming by exempting farmland from capital gains and inheritance taxes.

So the great land reform in America has shifted from the frontiers of Kansas to the urban sprawl regions of our cities, from homesteads and railroads to land use regulations, preferential taxation, TDRs, land trusts and so on...

Phil, in your view, <u>have our land reforms succeeded</u>? <u>How do they compare to the land reforms of other countries</u>? <u>And where is land policy going from here</u>?

Appendix
Phil Raup on Land: Some Fragments

I. The list of publications shown in Phil Raup's curriculum vitae contains items beginning with 1950. However, we have an interesting study in mimeograph entitled *"County-Unit Studies in Land Economics: A Critique of Five Selected Reports"* which is undated but must have been prepared between 1942 and 1948 (probably 1946)[6]. His report is particularly interesting because he refers to his colleague, Leonard Salter, for critical questions that research reports should answer. Phil's paper, as it unfolds, is a critique of critiques, a criticism of detached or distant analysis not directed to the specific (local) problem solution:

> "Someone, someday, must start reciting chapter and verse of the details of proposed changes or corrective measures. Who, conceivably, is in a better position to do this than the researcher, provided he has done good work in his initial investigation?... What is objected to here is the practice which leads researchers to present a hundred pages, more or less, of carefully worked out condemnation of existing or past practices or legislation regarding land use, and then leads them to conclude weakly that 'there ought to be a law–.' Too often the informed layman in the county concerned is able to reach the same conclusion on the basis of only the most cursory examination...."

A reading of this document, as much as any of his other works, reveals the philosophical debt Phil Raup owes to John Dewey and the pragmatists of the University of Wisconsin.

II. Phil Raup was in part responsible for organizing one of the, if not the, first Land Reform conference(s) in the United States at the University of Wisconsin. In his 1951 article in *Land Economics* he announced the conference and outlined essential issues. He clearly placed the land tenure problems and concerns of the United States in the panoply of world tenure issues.:

> "The development of the American land tenure system has been part of a long history of world wide struggle for land tenure reforms–a struggle the roots of which lie deep in antiquity, and one that still plagues the world today...."

The results of that conference appeared as a book *Land Tenure* coedited with Kenneth Parsons and Ray Penn.

III. Among his many interests, Phil Raup was a data enthusiast. He developed and maintained one of the nation's outstanding state-level series on land values and frequently called us in the Economic Research Service for tenure, use, and value data. He supported continuing data series on structural attributes of agriculture such as land tenure and landownership for which there was little special interest support. Consider his remarks in a 1959 article in the *Journal of Farm Economics:*

---

[6]He has citations as late as 1942. He refers to Salter's lectures on method rather than Salter's book published in 1948 and does not mention Salter's death in 1946. Except for a brief tour with Brookings Institution, Raup was in the Naval Reserve most of this time.

> "The collection of data on ownership units is difficult. An ownership census on a periodic base would be prohibitively expensive if not outright impossible in the United States because of the variation in ownership law, practices, and traditions among our states."
>
> "It is not out of reason to propose a systematic effort at the collection of ownership statistics on a sample basis, and at time intervals sufficiently short to permit the reporting of major structural change while it is underway. Without these data we will be unable to determine who are the 'beneficial owners' of agricultural assets, or to appraise the ultimate incidence of agricultural programs."
>
> "It is more difficult to mobilize support for the collection of data that relate to structural change. The types of data called for in this paper are not prominent among those demanded by farm or industrial pressure groups. They represent in a sense the 'public' interest in agricultural data."

In 1978, the Economic Research Service, as part of a larger data project on land characteristics, reported on the long-neglected subject of landownership. Although the 1978 survey contained some basic flaws (one overestimated the number of farmland owners), the survey and report created a basis of interest so that the Census of Agriculture of 1987 implemented a follow-on survey of the owners of land in farms. It was the first Census-related survey of farmland ownership since 1945, and revealed not only great changes since the '45 survey but the important distinction between the operation of farms and the ownership of farmland. The National Agricultural Statistics Service of USDA is planning a similar survey as a follow-on to the 1997 Census of Agriculture.

IV. Phil Raup did much to bridge the gap between tenure issues abroad and those within the United States. He contributed to the notion that land reform was not a term only for the structural changes in agriculture in developing countries, but was a term well suited for the land ownership and control issues in America. In the book, *Modern Land Policy*, edited by Harold Halcrow and others in 1960, Raup wrote a chapter on Land Tenure Adjustments in Industrial-Agricultural Economies:

> "The term 'land reform' has been in use for more than a century to mean the dissolution of feudal or traditional barriers that prohibit the market mechanism from effective operation in the agricultural sector...The term has also referred to the changes needed in economies in which the control of land has been held by a small number of people...I shall examine the opportunities for adjustments in land tenure that are appropriate to an industrial-agricultural economy involved in the process of tailoring its stock of land and the rates and nature of its uses to the needs of an urban society."

Then he goes on to review the changes occurring in agriculture and the economy and predicts the changes we could look forward to from 1960. He anticipated many of the widely held concerns of today about urbanization:

> "Although human ingenuity has succeeded in developing substitutes for land as a food base, we have been much less successful in developing substitutes for land as space. The impact of urban growth has been dramatized by sprawling cities that have mushroomed in the past quarter-century with astonishing rapidity."

In a book, *Land Use Policy and Problems in the United States* (1963) edited by Howard Ottoson, Raup wrote about lessons to be learned from "...Developments in European Land Policy. " He drew heavily on the experiences of Sweden and Germany and anticipated many of the land use issues confronted in the US then and now. He addressed the problems of adapting agriculture to an industrial world, adapting rural areas to an urban world, and adapting agriculture ruled by technology rather than the forces of nature. He begins noting:

> "We have celebrated the centenary of the Homestead Act, an act that dramatized for the world a solution to the agricultural problem represented by free men on free soil with opportunity for the full and free exercise of the productive and managerial talents. This wheel of history has come full circle. We have passed through an era in which the inadequacies of land policy alone became increasingly apparent. We have passed through its antithesis in the past thirty years, in which the cure-all for the ills of agriculture was sought in the field of market and price policy. There is increasing recognition on both sides of the Atlantic that neither of these major directions of policy is adequate, taken by itself.
>
> "In America we find this change in emphasis reflected in the growing awareness of the problem of land use and rural area development. In Europe we can note similar trends reflected in the increasing concern with regional planning that extends beyond the narrow boundaries of confined states, and in a sharply renewed interest in the structural problems that inhibit agriculture's participation in a market-oriented industrial economy." (p381)

V. Finally, in what may be argued is Phil Raup's most complete statement of views on research on land value and prices, and data related thereto, he summarizes his arguments on "Land Values Research Approaches and Data Needs" in a Lincoln Institute monograph, *Land–Something of Value: Part 1, Price and Market Issues*. It also serves to reflect Professor Raup's perspective on the meaning of land in economics:

> "In the sense that will be used here, land is perceived as an economic variable, responsive to the major forces that guide the combination of resources in the production of goods, services and intangible values that satisfy human wants. It is produced, in this economic sense, in the laboratory, through the techniques by which it is used, by the institutions that are established to regulate its use, and by the perceptions of its users. Its supply can be augmented, diminished, and destroyed....In this view, economic land is a social creation. Its supply is a function of the total structure of markets, tools, techniques and the laws, conventions and regulations that govern their use..."
>
> "Whether desired as a factor of production or a storehouse of value, land is priced through market processes that have several unique features. Befitting land's immobility and durability, annual transactions in the rural land market are a small fraction of the total number of farms

> and an even smaller fraction of the number of ownership units...The land market is a thin market...At a 2 percent rate of annual sales, farmland in the major grain belts would on average enter the land market only twice in a century...[the land market] is highly location-specific. To speak of 'a land market' in this context is misleading. There is no national land market, nor are there state or region-wide markets. There are only local markets..."

And he wrote further on the complications of empirical representation of land values and the need for additional research:

> "...comparative land value data cannot be assembled at any level below that of a state. The most important point to make about data on farmland values in the United States is that they defy disaggregation...In only a few states is it possible to disaggregate statewide data to determine on a county or sub-state level the characteristics of buyers and sellers, variations in financing methods, reasons for sales, intended use by buyer, quality of land and buildings, and similar data that are essential for any useful interpretation of land market trends...A major contemporary trend that calls for renewed interest in the quality and quantity of research into rural land values is the declining volume and proportion of voluntary sales of farmland...An expanded effort in land value data collection is also needed due to the rapid expansion of rural residences, part-time farms and decentralized commercial land uses into areas formerly classified as agricultural...A more intractable problem concerns the creation of partial rights through easements, the separate sale of mineral or water rights, the use of covenants running with the land to implement land use plans, the creation of agricultural preservation districts...One final problem for the future grows out of the need for land valuation techniques that can be used in valuing public lands."

Raup called for a renewed, reexamined, emphasis on research in the area of land values. At the time of his article there was indeed a greatly expanded program in USDA and in several regions. That program was quelled by redirection of funds and attention to other lines of inquiry resulting in a continued decline in research on land values. Its low level of priority in USDA remains today.

Comments in Honor of Professor Philip Raup

Alex F. McCalla*

I was asked by the organizers of this session to address the papers in Dr. Raup's portfolio dealing with national and world agricultural policies with emphasis on development themes and the world grain trade. It's to that assignment that I now turn.

We are here today to honor Philip Raup: Kansas prairie farm boy (and still a farmer); student of farmers and rural communities; social critic driven by overwhelming concerns about equity and those left behind; erudite debater; and social science scholar. But despite all of these attributes he is still at heart a prairie populist. But may I say immediately, that for a prairie farm boy like myself, that is the highest accolade that one could give to a colleague.

When I was asked to do this task. I asked, " why me?" I wasn't a student of Professor Raup, I even missed the opportunity to take a class from him. But when I thought further, I concluded that I must be a generic student of his and further I am a long time friend. He after all gave me the best advice of my life. Let me explain. The Agricultural Development Council in the 1960s sponsored "by invitation only" seminars on new development topics. Willard Cochrane had hosted one of these events on John C.H. Fei and Gus Ranis' new book on *Dualistic Development Models*. After pestering Willard to let me attend, he relented and said I could attend if I sat in the back now and said nothing. One evening during that seminar, Phil Raup invited the participants to his house for cocktails and hors d-oeuvres. I tagged along. It is a lovely house in St. Anthony Park. At one point during the evening, Phil stood in front of his fireplace, one foot on the hearth, pipe in hand imparting wisdom, then turned to me and said, "You know, young man, there is no better job in the world than a tenured full professor at a good university." How well I remembered that and for 28 years I lived by his good advice.

Now to his work:

Over the past week, I read 15 pieces of Phil Raup's writing on topics ranging from: the role of agriculture in rural development; the structural consequences of the EEC-CAP; the changing structure of US agriculture, the impact of policies–tax, monetary trade and agriculture–on family farmers, and so on. And as I read these, I struggled with the question of what kind of economist is Phil Raup. How would I define him?

---

* Director, Rural Development, The World Bank and Professor of Agricultural Economics, Emeritus, University of California, Davis.

– he was trained in the Wisconsin tradition of institutional economics, with a focus on land economics;
– he is a classic land economist driven more by the impacts of institutions on people's behavior than he is guided by economic theory, though he knows a bit of that as well;
– his works are clearly characterized by looking for historical lessons and antecedents but he is more than a historian;
– he is an institutionalist through and through but he believes in markets;
– he is a behavioralist;
– his works are liberally sprinkled with references to sociology, anthropology and political science so I suppose he could be labeled as a social science generalist;
– but he is also an empiricist, not in the sense of using models that crunch data, but in the sense of being a keen observer of the social setting and trying to weave a plausible scenario to explain the facts he observes.

So I concluded it was difficult to label him, and more important, to do so would demean the breadth of his interests. Therefore, I concluded he is all of the above: a land economist; an institutional economist; a social scientist; a historian and an empiricist. He is truly a broad scholar, not a narrow technician. He is an acute and persistent observer of the world around him, a voracious reader and an inveterate collector of papers, books, articles and any other forms of written materials. Less kind people might even call Phil an intellectual "pack rat."

This trait reminds me of another story. When I was a graduate student and was looking for an obscure but important paper, the drill first was to go to the Waite Library in Haecker Hall, if not there, then the St. Paul Campus library, if not there as a last resort to the Main Library on the Minneapolis Campus. But when all that failed my roommates John English and Dean Chen would tell me–"go ask Professor Raup," he probably has it. Finding Phil was a challenge. He had a cherished corner office in Haecker Hall. To get to him, you have to go through a large outer room which was a rabbit warren of bookcases–floor to ceiling, filled with books and hundreds of filing boxes in seemingly random disarray. And when you found the door to the inner sanctum, you also found Phil sitting at his desk, always piled high with papers, reading and smoking his ever present pipe. That office was also lined with bookcases filled with books of every description.

I asked him one day if he had the Brownlee paper from the Iowa Margarine incident. He said, "Yes, I have both of them. Which one did you want?" He got up, went to the outer room, mused momentarily, got the necessary stool and the hook, and went to the top shelf and pulled out an unlabeled box. It had a copy of the original Brownlee paper, which had been withdrawn and two copies of the revised version rewritten after the flap. He gave me the second copy of the revised version, a treasured document I retain to this day. Presto, another characteristic of Phil Raup–he always wanted to share knowledge.

Now let's talk about the papers I read spanning the period 1963 to 1992. While I read them in chronological order, I would like to begin with a quote from paper No. 9, written in 1984. The paper titled "Our Nation and Its Agriculture: The World Scene in 2005." It began with the following sentence, which I quote: "I have come this far in my professional career by not making

forecasts." After 28 years as a professor, I had a reflex reaction. I grabbed my pen and wrote "BS" in the margin. Sorry, Phil. Why did I do that? I had been reading Raup's papers for hours, all of which were full of projections, or perhaps after Sunday night's lecture, they should be called scenarios.

Two, in 1968 and 1970, were on the emerging European Common Market and its Common Agricultural Policy, the CAP. The 1968 one was entitled "An American View of the European Common Market." It is an incredibly perceptive evaluation of the likely impact of the CAP on European agriculture, on world trade and on the plight of the European consumers. It is richly laced with historical perspective and is loaded with "forecasts, future tendencies and possible outcomes (scenarios)." That was 30 years ago and the CAP was just beginning to be implemented.

Yet he saw clearly what the CAP could do. As he said in his paper, seen from the outside it is a "walled-fortress." Technology, structural transformation and high prices would, he argued, cause production to expand but consumers would not benefit as in the US. He predicted rapid increases in grain production. But the biggest impact, not fully recognized in the CAP, would be on the structure of agriculture, on farm sizes and farm numbers. Writing again in 1970, he analyzed all of the forces influencing agricultural development in Europe:

1. Rapid increases in farm productivity, both from biological and other kinds of technologies;
2. The transportation revolution and the integrating forces of the automobile;
3. The revolution in processing and storage of agricultural products;
4. The inhibiting effects of traditional beliefs and so on and so forth.

But the bottom line in Professor Raup's analysis was that Europe was well on its way to being the major producer of agricultural surpluses while its policy was being driven by a food shortage/food insecurity mentality. The result, said Professor Raup, will be big problems and how right he was. These papers were focusing on structural change and institutions, and weaving in broad trends about what might happen. But I guess for Phil, if I can repeat it again, these were not forecasts.

A second set of papers focused on the changing structure of US agriculture and rural America. Again, rich discussions as in "Economics, Economies, and Diseconomies of Large Scale Agriculture" written in 1969. In it, Raup argues that the focus of empirical work on technical efficiencies of farm size has ignored broader pecuniary, information and social economies. Another paper entitled "Societal Goals on Farm Size," a lead chapter in a book edited by Ball and Heady on *Size, Structure and the Future of Farms*. In it, Raup argues that we are going to lose our Jeffersonian commitment to the family farm if we continue on the path we are now on. Another paper entitled "Corporate Farms in the US" in the *Journal of Economic History* (1973) argues that the typical USDA approach of looking at farm size grossly underestimates the magnitude of corporate activity in the agricultural sector. And that it is tax laws that are driving corporate farming, not the economies of scale in agriculture.

Then there was a broad structural paper in October 1977 entitled "The Economic, Social and Political Forces that Will Bear Upon US Agriculture and the Welfare of Farmers in the Years Ahead." Sure sounds pretty futuristic to me. Here, his thoughts are clearly driven by the OPEC oil price increases of 1972-73 and their potential impact on an energy based agriculture. His predictions are dire. He raises the question, given rising energy costs, "how durable, in other words, is our present comparative advantage in export markets for farm products." On this one, his prediction did not come true because falling oil prices later invalidated the kind of issues that he was raising. But as he discusses the various forces, he says "it is at least plausible to suggest that we are witnessing the development of a dual structure in American agriculture." One sector made up of numerous small, part time-farmers with declining economic/voting power and a second sector made up of numerically small, but economically powerful, large farmers who are capable of influencing the power structure of American politics. Here, Phil is engaging in the then new science of political economy.

Well, I've gone on long enough. There are many more interesting papers on land policy, on a comparison of US and Soviet agriculture, on trade and international instability, but surely I've given you enough to illustrate the range of Phil's interests and scholarship. And in this only a sub-set of his writing outside his mainstream of interests in land economics and land reform.

Phil has made a lasting contribution to the profession in the last 50 years (his first publication was in the *Journal of Farm Economics* in 1950) and he has impacted many students including those like me who weren't his formal students.

Let me close with one more recollection of Phil. At Minnesota, morning and afternoon coffees were held in the Waite Library, in Haecker Hall. The first one-and-a-half years that I was there (1963-64) these were generally devoid of intellectual content except on occasions when Phil would note a particular current event, place it in its historical context and deduce its obvious implications. We graduate students listened in awe at his wisdom and erudition. Then Will Cochrane came back from Washington in the fall of 1964 and we then had regular and intense debates. Phil would pronounce and Will would disagree, sometimes even in profane terms, and the debate would rage. Phil was always calm and reasoned but unyielding. Willard bombastic, sharp and equally unyielding. What a learning experience for us as we stood and watched two intellectual giants from our profession duke it out over coffee.

Phil, thanks for always being my teacher. For sharing your ability to draw on history. For being able to look at seemingly disparate current trends and develop plausible scenarios about the future. These characteristics, among many others, are your lasting contributions to all of us. Thanks.

In Retrospect and Prospect

Philip M. Raup*

I. Orientation

My career has been Depression-based and its roots are pre-Pearl Harbor. I expect that there are very few economists still active today whose first course in economics used as a text Alfred Marshall's *Principles of Economics*, 1920 Ed., as reprinted in 1930. I bring you greetings from a bygone world.

I am asked by the arrangers of this session to reflect on what I would do differently if I could recycle myself. Almost by definition, this involves a forecast of the future in which a replay would occur. I must review not only the things I would do differently in a re-run, but I must also speculate on the probable environment in which this would occur.

One constant that I would hope could continue would be the companionship of my wife of 58 years, Marian G. Raup, and our family, Philip Jr., Martha and Gordon. Their tolerance, patience, and support have been invaluable in pursuing a professional career, in ways that they know about, and in ways that only I can acknowledge. This has been a family enterprise, from which I have drawn much of my strength.

What would I do differently a second time around the track? Reverting to my opening reference to Alfred Marshall, the first and most obvious step would be to expand my exposure to mathematics. Economics majors at the University of Kansas in the mid-1930's were advised to do this, but the recommended sequence was largely limited to the calculus. Math was for engineers, and its application to economics was largely left up to the student.

It is worth recalling that much of the math that is used today in economic analysis was accessible in only rudimentary form in the 1930's. The Econometric Society had had its first meeting in September 1931 and the first issue of *Econometrica* appeared in January 1933. A prominent and pioneering effort to tailor mathematics to the needs of economists was R.G.D. Allen, *Mathematical Analysis for Economists*, first published in 1938. One of the earliest U.S. textbooks that attempted to synthesize the fields of quantitative analysis in economics (Harold T. Davis, *The Theory of Econometrics*) was first published in 1941.

It can be said that the field of mathematical economics came of age in the 1930's. Incorporation of these new analytical techniques into classroom instruction was in its infancy at the outbreak of the second World War in 1939. In a reincarnation, I would certainly try to strengthen this area of my professional preparation.

---

*Professor Emeritus, Department of Applied Economics, University of Minnesota.

Having said this, a goal on the next traverse would be to avoid using mathematics proficiency as a crutch, or as a substitute for economic analysis.

Related to this would be a goal to restore a focus on economic history to the minimum set of tools needed by an economist. We have a rapidly expanding and accessible storehouse of historical economic data, associated with a decline in the formal training of economists in its interpretation and use.

I find it difficult to avoid a conclusion that the mathematization of economics has crowded out an emphasis on the historical and institutional structure within which economic activity takes place. I would certainly strive to recover a better balance between the mathematical and the institutional approaches to the study of economics.

II. What Have I Learned?

A. One major lesson: People will do strange things when land is involved!

Land (housing, property, real estate, natural resources) belongs to a special class of hot-button or trigger-issues that includes: Taxes; Sex; Parking; the Draft. Reasoned judgement, and the ability to mobilize hard-nosed cost and benefit analysis, seem to be short-circuited when these issues arise.

I would certainly not diminish my focus on land in economic research and teaching. Our growing awareness of the globalization of the world's economies compels a continuing reexamination of the role that control over land is playing in the economic and political crises that introduce the third millennium.

Consider: The break-up of the USSR; the Arab-Israeli conflict; the tension between China and Taiwan; the stand-off between India and Pakistan in Kashmir; the struggles for land reform in Brazil, and most of Latin America. The listing could go on, to include Northern Ireland, the Balkan States, the Falkland Islands, East Timor in Indonesia, Mindanao in the Philippines, and many more.

While the tenure of land is not the only issue in these conflicts, it is a central issue. We are in a position in our universities in the United States to contribute to the studies of these issues, and especially in the fields encompassed in agricultural economies. This is one area in which we have long had an opportunity to exercise international leadership. This opportunity is not diminishing, and seizing it should be one of our priorities. I would redouble my commitment to the study of international land economics, in any reincarnation.

This would parallel a companion focus on domestic dimensions of land economics in the United States. Prominent among these issues would be the conservation and preservation of farmland and open space, the guidance of urban sprawl, the continuance of policies to insure open access to equity in land, a recognition of the long-run implications of the divergence between size of ownership and operating units in farming, and the expansion of market processes in providing services to land.

It is rare, for example, to find any current recognition of the fact that we are generating problems of land parcelization in America. The acre size of farm operating units has expanded rapidly, accompanied by a steady decline in the size of ownership parcels combined into operating farms. It is not uncommon to find farm operators who negotiate land leases or use rights with ten or more farmland owners. Land ownership is being divorced from farm operation, and transaction costs in farming are rising sharply. This promises to produce land tenure problems of challenging proportions in the twenty-first century.

B. I foresee a need for a shift in future focus by a land economist, from a concentration on property rights in land and natural resources to a concentration on property rights over a wider range. It now seems probable that the rent-receivers of the future who will attract the attention of economists will be those who can control access to intellectual capital, and especially the products of biotechnology and genetic engineering.

Access to capital in land has been one of the key rights driving the social and political revolutions of the past, and it is still a powerful force. But the potential for creating contrived shortages, and for the collection of a rent over and above a competitive price, has been enormously increased in our generation. In the most highly developed countries, there are few examples of a landed aristocracy at the peak of the contemporary power structure (although the exceptions are still potent). We do face the prospect of a functional aristocracy in control of access to intangible rights in intellectual property. How can we tame this beast?

The key to this achievement will be the creation of a structure of definable, defensible, transferable, and inheritable rights in intellectual property. We are well on the way to this goal, but we have not yet arrived. Problems of valuation will be the defining characteristics of this pursuit. Confronting this prospect with the analytical tools developed in the study of property rights in land would seem to be a logical evolution of a recycled land economist.

C. I believe we are also learning to fear for the future of agricultural economics due to data deterioration Our great strength as a professional body has been our data base, and the incentive structure that has led us to expand it and to use it critically. This has been rooted in the fact that our farm and non-farm data have come from a vast number of firms, few of which have been large enough to influence the outcomes of analysis by falsifying self-reported data. This has generated a relatively high degree of public trust in governmental and “official” data. I fear that it is eroding.

One dimension of this potential erosion is geographic. Many firms and farms are now so large and so specialized that anti-disclosure rules preclude publication of data by counties, or minor civil divisions of government. The geographic unit of analysis in many branches of economic activity has been pushed up the scale, to regional or state levels.

Although decisions on land use rules and regulations in most states in the U. S. are still the responsibility of municipal and country units of government, they find it increasingly difficult to assemble the data needed for wise decision-making. Our data-base is becoming more opaque, and the locus of decision-making more centralized.

This threatens to drive the focus of research in agricultural economics to higher and higher levels of aggregation and abstraction. It is in danger of losing its local roots. The legendary Tip O'Neal famously said that "all politics is local." This can be rephrased to argue that agricultural economics in the past has derived its strength from its local roots. If these are lost, it will lose its distinctive character as an economic discipline.

What would I do differently if I could replay my career? I would devote even more of my time and efforts to make my teaching and research relevant to problems at the local level. In the spectrum of specializations within our discipline, I feel that this is the area currently most in need of regeneration.

D. What else have I learned?

I hope I have learned to beware of long-range forecasts. My life span has coincided with the petroleum age in America. I was about 10 years old when the Kilgore field emerged in East Texas. John Ise, my major professor as an undergraduate at the University of Kansas, had authored one of the first efforts by an economist to understand the significance of oil in the nation's energy balance. Using the best scientific data then available (1926), he provided estimates of oil supply in America that clustered around a horizon of about 30 years. We would not run out, but it would become expensive. Known supplies and rates of use would put a cap on the role of oil in the American energy economy. We should conserve.

This 30-year horizon for U. S. dependence on natural resources has been remarkably durable, and not only for oil. The longest time-period of forward pricing now in general use is the 30-year U. S. Treasury bond. Amortization periods for conventional home and farm mortgages tend to peak at 30 years. Forecasting horizons for the Social Security system are moving targets, but in many governmental studies they tend to cluster around 30 years.

It seems clear that, in the hands of economists, the future is 30 years away. In fact, this makes actuarial sense. Until quite recently, the average length of a generation in the U. S. has been about 30-plus years. As a general statement, if you have inherited any property from your parents you can expect to hold it for $\pm$ 30 years before the next pass-through.

To pick a currently fashionable illustration, if we attempt to quantify the concept of "land stewardship" as a basis for investment decision-making or cost-benefit analysis, the most defensible time period we could select would be 30 years.

I conclude that any attempt to calculate resource availability, pension-fund solvency, or consumption needs beyond about 30 years is largely an exercise of faith and belief, rather than analysis. Longer range forecasts seem guaranteed to self-destruct.

III. Concluding Thoughts

Reverting to my roots in the 1930s, let me paraphrase FDR:

The only thing to fear today is the current lack of fear about the stock market! We seem incapable of remembering one simple truth: Markets are manic-depressive. Economic laws of gravity still hold.

The forward-looking U.S. land economist in 1999 must surely be aware of the inflation in asset values reflected in current stock-market valuations. This cannot last. Those trained in the valuation of income streams extending over long time periods should now be constructing scenarios for the forthcoming crash. What damage-control mechanisms, what institutional bomb-shelters, should we be devising? This strikes me as the major current challenge to a reformed but not remorseful land economist in 1999.

A train of the Dakota, Minnesota and Eastern RR "recently derailed while standing still, when the track it was sitting on suddenly buckled."
–*Wall St. Journal*, May 13,1999, p. B-1

The goal of my future career re-development should be to avoid derailment while standing still! To this I pledge my best remaining effort.

Biographical Sketch of Philip M. Raup
Professor Emeritus, Department of Applied Economics

University of Minnesota
St. Paul, MN 55108
Telephone (612) 625-8241 Fax (612) 625-2729
February 10, 1999

Education, Training

A.B. (Economics), University of Kansas, 1939; M.S. University of Wisconsin, 1941
Ph.D. (Agricultural Economics), University of Wisconsin, 1949
Research Fellow, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1941-42
Lieutenant, U.S. Naval Reserve, 1942-45
Chief Land Officer and Acting Chief, Food and Agriculture Branch, Office of Military Government for Germany (U.S.), Berlin, Germany, 1945-49

Teaching, Research

Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin, 1949-53
Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota, 1953-1984, Professor Emeritus, 1984 to date

Teaching focus: Land Economics, Land Tenure, World Agricultural Development
Research focus: Land prices, valuation, credit, taxation; inheritance, transfer, farm incorporation; water rights, structural change, land planning, land tenure reform; agricultural development, world food problems

Professional Activities

Secretary, World Land Tenure Conference, University of Wisconsin, 1951
Consultant and Alternate Member, Governor's Minnesota Tax Study Committee, 1955-57
Consultant, St. Paul Planning Board, 1958-59
Consultant, Land and Water Development Division, Food and Agriculture Organization, UN, Rome, Italy, 1960-61
Technical Secretary, Land and Water Use Subcommission, European Commission on Agriculture, Rome, 1960-61
Consultant, Economic Development Institute, World Bank, Washington, D.C., 1959-66
Guest Professor, Institute of Foreign Agriculture, Technical University of Berlin, 1963, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1985
Member, Panel of Experts on Land Tenure and Settlement, Food and Agriculture Organization, UN, Rome, 1966-72
Member, Research Advisory Committee, Minnesota Tax Study Commission, 1973-74

Consultant, Legislative Commission on Minnesota's Future, 1976-77
Member, UNDP-FAO Mission to Evaluate Philippine Land Reform, 1983
Member, U.S. Department of Agriculture Mission to the USSR on Agricultural Finance and Land Tenure, 1990
U.S. Information Agency Lecturer on Land Tenure, USSR, 1991
Consultant, World Bank Mission to Belarus, 1994
Study Tours: Turkey, 1996; Morocco, 1998

Fellow, American Agricultural Economics Association
Member, American Economics Association, Agricultural History Society, International Association of Agricultural Economists, Royal Economics Society (England), Phi Beta Kappa, Gamma Sigma Delta, Pi Sigma Alpha.

Publication Related to Burt Sundquist's Presentation

"A Profile of the University of Minnesota–What It Is and What It Is Not," in *University of Minnesota Class of '39 Symposium: How Can We Help Our University? What's the Problem?*, Minneapolis, November 12, 1988; Proceedings. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, 1989, pp. 17-21. (CURA 89-2)

Publications on Land Economics Related to Gene Wunderlich's Presentation

"Agricultural Taxation and Land Tenure Reform in Underdeveloped Countries," *Papers and Proceedings of the Conference on Agricultural Taxation and Economic Development*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1954, pp. 245-269.

Land Tenure, (with K.H. Parsons and R.J. Penn, co-editors), Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1956, pp. 739.

Bibliography on Land Tenure (with K. Giocarinis, N.M. Tscherkinsky, et al), Rome, FAO-UN, 1955, pp. 386.

"Land Reform and Agricultural Development," Chapter 8, pp. 267-314 in *Agricultural Development and Economic Growth*, edited by Herman M. Southworth and Bruce F. Johnston, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1967.

"Land Reform," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York, The Macmillan Company and The Free Press, 1968, Vol. 8, pp. 570-575.

"Competition for Land and the Future of American Agriculture," in *The Future of American Agriculture as a Strategic Resource*, Sandra S. Batie and Robert G. Healy, editors, Washington, The Conservation Foundation, 1980, pp. 41-77.

"Economic Development and Competition for Land Use in the United States," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 5, December 1957, pp. 1514-26.

"The Contribution of Land Reforms to Agricultural Development: An Analytical Framework," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, October 1963. Also (in German) in *Zeitschrift fur Auslandische Landwirtschaft*, Berlin, November 1963, pp. 1-24.

"Urban Threats to Rural Lands: Background and Beginnings," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, November 1975, pp. 371-78.

The Federal Dynamic in Land Use, National Planning Association, NPA Report No. 180, Washington, D.C., July 1980, pp. 32.

"An Agricultural Critique of the National Agricultural Lands Study," *Land Economics*, Vol. 58, No. 2, May 1982, pp. 260-274.

"A Choices Panel on Farmland Prices to 2000: They'll Stabilize," *Choices*, Vol. 7, No. 1, First Quarter 1992, pp. 24, 26.

"Four Decades of the Minnesota Rural Real Estate Market," *Minnesota Agricultural Economist*, Winter 1994, pp. 1-4. (No. 675)

"Some Lessons from Land Price Booms and Busts," *Agricultural Policy and Environment Conference*, 1st Annual, Motta di Livenza, Italy; June 19-23, 1989; *Proceedings*. St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, v. 2, March 1990, 20 pages. (Staff Paper P90-19)

The Minnesota Rural Real Estate Market in 1982, (with Matthew G. Smith), Economic Report ER83-6, St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, 1983.

Publications on Agricultural Policy Related to Alex McCalla's Presentation

"An American View of the European Common Market," *Agrarpolitik in der EWG*, Munich, Bayerischer Landwirtschaftsverlag, 1968, pp. 247-256.

"Agricultural Constraints and Potentials," Chapter 5 in Robert Beck, Harold Deutsch, P.M. Raup, Arnold Rose, and John Turnbull, *The Changing Structure of Europe*, University of Minnesota Press, 1970, pp. 126-170.

"Societal Goals in Farm Size," Chapter 1, pp. 3-18 in *Size, Structure and Future of Farms*, A. Gordon Ball and Earl O. Heady, eds., Iowa State University Press, 1972.

"Economies and Diseconomies of Large-Scale Agriculture," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 51, No. 5, December 1969, pp. 1274-83.

"Corporate Farming in the United States," *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 1, March 1973, pp. 274-290.

Review, *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*, by Alexander Gerschenkron, Harvard University Press 1962, in *Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. XLV, No. 4, Nov. 1963, pp. 901-903.

"The Economic, Social, and Political Forces That Will Bear Upon U.S. Agriculture and the Welfare of Farmers in Years Ahead," Staff Paper P73-30, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Minnesota, October 1973.

"An Agricultural Critique of the National Agricultural Lands Study," *Land Economics*, Vol. 58, No. 2, May 1982, pp. 260-274.

"Structural Contrasts and Convergence in Socialist and Capitalist Agriculture," Chapter 6, *Communist Agriculture*, Karl-Eugen Waedekin, ed., London, Routledge, 1990, pp. 90-104. (Also, Staff Paper P87-35, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Minnesota)

"Structural Change in Agriculture in the United States," in *Industrial Policies and Structural Change*, edited by Christopher T. Saunders, New York: Macmillan Press, 1987, pp. 267-285.

"An Overview of Some Sources and Consequences of Variability in World Trade in Grains," St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, December 1990, 24 pages. (Staff Paper P90-73)

"Evolutionary Trends in Land Use Control in the United States," St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, August 1992, 10 pages. (Staff Paper P92-17)

"The Significance for World Trade of Variability in Grain Imports by the USSR and China," St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, December 1989, 13 pages. (Staff Paper P89-53)

"The Crisis in Agriculture," St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, 1985. (Staff Paper P85-34)

"Our Nation and Its Agriculture: The World Scene in the Year 2005," St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, 1985. (Staff Paper P85-4)