



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.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
NINTH
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMISTS

HELD AT
TEEKKARIKYLA, OTANIEMI
FINLAND
19-26 AUGUST 1955

THE IMPLICATIONS OF TECHNICAL
CHANGE IN AGRICULTURE

LONDON
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
NEW YORK TORONTO
1956

THE THEME OF THE CONFERENCE:
THE IMPLICATIONS OF TECHNICAL
CHANGE IN AGRICULTURE
ADDRESSES OF WELCOME

N. WESTERMARCK

University of Helsinki

ON behalf of the organizing committee of the Ninth International Conference of Agricultural Economists I have the honour to welcome the representatives of the Government to the opening ceremony. At the same time I wish to express our gratitude for the financial support which we have received from the Government, without which the arranging of the congress in Finland would not have been possible.

The printed programme of the Conference includes the names of 230 participants, but as a number of late applications have also been received, we can count on 290 agricultural economists from different countries taking part. This number is gratifyingly large. The local organizing committee is very well satisfied that so many have assembled at our Conference. It gives us particular pleasure also to see that so many charming ladies have taken the risk—and gone to the expense—of accompanying their husbands to our country, far off the beaten track. If we except the attendants from the other Nordic countries, most of the other participants of the Conference are visiting our country for the first time. We sincerely hope that your stay here, besides giving you an opportunity to compare notes at the congress, will also in other respects give you pleasant impressions and memories. The fact remains, however, that the possibilities of getting acquainted with our country during the time the actual Conference takes place are very limited because our Chairman, Dr. Elmhirst will, I presume, keep his flock together as usual with his, I will not say strict, but humane discipline. During the trips that are arranged at the time of the actual Conference and during the post-Conference tours you will, however, have a better opportunity to get acquainted with Finland, the farthest northern outpost of Western civilization, a country of vast forests and thousands of lakes, where agriculture still plays an important part and gives work to one-third of the population. I hardly think I disclose a secret by confessing

that Finland is not counted among the four or even five great ones. On the contrary we usually say that we regard ourselves as one of the five small ones, that is to say in cultural and economic respects one of the five northern countries.

A small country is confronted with special difficulties when it is a question of arranging international conferences. It does not only depend on the fact that a small country has limited material resources and scarcity of people, but also the linguistic difficulties are considerable, at any rate in our remote country.

Unfortunately too we have the Conference at East Lansing, Michigan, fresh in our minds. I say unfortunately, because the arrangements were so perfect and the hospitality so magnificent that a comparison will throw us hopelessly into the shade. Despite the fact that we are fully aware of the many shortcomings here, which you, our esteemed guests, have not yet discovered, but will gradually discover, we feel deep gratitude for the confidence which the council of the Conference has shown in daring to entrust the arranging of this Conference to us. Besides, I am broad-minded enough to hope that Messrs. Elmhirst, Thomas, Case, Currie, Dixey, and others have not had as many sleepless nights as I personally have had in thinking about the bold venture which we have embarked upon in undertaking to hold the Conference in Finland.

One can ask what the object of a conference such as this is, what real results and effects it can be counted on to bring about. By the way, this is a question my dear wife has posed to me countless times during the past two years, and you can understand that I personally have got a certain amount of practice in replying to it. I shall not go into detail, however, regarding all the different arguments for and against congresses, obviously mostly for. I shall be content with asserting that the fact that leaders of the same, or closely connected, branches of science from different parts of the world get to know each other personally, and are confronted with each other's problems and points of view, justifies getting together now and again. I am fully convinced that the holding of this Conference here in Finland will stimulate discussion around the agricultural economic problems, not only of our country, but of the whole north, and what is still more important, will give the treatment of the problem a more exact stamp, founded on a more scientific basis. Unfortunately it cannot be denied that agricultural economic questions have far too often been raised in general politically coloured discussions, where they have been treated in a way which from a scientific point of view leaves much to be desired.

There can be different opinions as to whether agricultural economics is of a basic scientific nature, or whether it is a branch of applied science. I shall not treat this problem here, but you may note that in Nordic agricultural economics by far the greatest part of our research work has been carried out on the basis of empirical material, while the purely theoretical works are fewer. Since agricultural economics is strongly anchored in national economic and social conditions, and in the natural conditions underlying agricultural production, agricultural economics has a fairly strong national tinge. This is why in the Nordic countries the majority of agricultural economic research works and investigations are published in the language of the country, and not in one of the world languages. Indeed, this is one of the reasons why knowledge about Nordic agricultural research is fairly limited outside the boundaries of the north. It has therefore been considered appropriate to list, for information, certain papers and treatises which may give some idea of agricultural economic research in the north. For the same purpose, a list has been compiled of institutions at which agricultural economic research work is being carried out.

Agricultural economic research in the Nordic countries has been influenced a great deal by Central European research, and also by that carried out in Great Britain. In recent times a certain orientation towards American agricultural economics has been noted.

It may be somewhat presumptuous to speak of a Nordic School of its own in agricultural economics. Yet it cannot be denied that research workers in the Nordic countries, through intimate co-operation, have steadily been confronted with their mutual problems and trends of thought, and this in turn has contributed to balance diverging interpretations and to bring research methods into closer contact. During the last few years a joint standardized terminology has been worked out, and a joint textbook in farm management has recently been published. This is no doubt an expression of Nordic teamwork, which has already had, and in all probability will have, a fruitful effect on agricultural economic investigation.

Agricultural economic research in Finland has been greatly influenced by the prevailing Continental currents in this field. Scientists such, in particular, as the Swiss Laur and the Germans Aereboe and Brinkmann have influenced us in Finland. Laur's work was essential for the introduction of farm records based on accounts.

Contacts with the United States and England, however, have been intensified since the end of the war, as is illustrated by the fact that teaching on the college level not only includes Finnish and

Scandinavian but also Anglo-Saxon literature. This contact was first made in agricultural marketing—earlier than in farm management—mainly thanks to Professor Jutila who already in the 1920's made himself well acquainted with Anglo-Saxon conditions.

During the 1930's agricultural economists from the Soviet Socialist Republics took part now and again in our Conferences, and it gives us special pleasure to see among us here this evening three prominent representatives of the agricultural economic science of our eastern neighbour. I am convinced that your presence is greeted with real pleasure by all members of the Conference, and that the lectures promised by you will be listened to with keen interest. I also wish to express our hearty welcome to all the members from other continents, America, Asia, and Australia.

The contacts which agricultural economists of Finland and the other Nordic countries have had with our French-speaking colleagues and also with other colleagues in the Latin countries within Europe and South America have, unfortunately, been very scarce up to now. This is due in part to the fact that the problems of agricultural economics seem to be so very different in character, and certainly in part to linguistic difficulties. We have become aware, however, especially during recent years, of ever-increasing attention being paid to agricultural economic questions, not least within O.E.E.C., where the French economists play a great part. I personally was proud, as a scientist, when one of my works was published in France, and we all hope that mutual contacts will grow in the future.

I mentioned just now the impulses and ideas which Central European research in the field of agricultural economics has given our country. Especially the older generation of Finnish agricultural economists have been very closely connected with their Central European colleagues whose influence on our way of thinking and our methods of research in the Nordic countries has been outstanding. The contacts between the younger generation have, unfortunately, not been equally lively, but we sincerely hope that this Conference will contribute towards building up the bridges again.

We today are gathered together at an international congress on Finnish soil. I would like to point out, however, that we do not wish to see our Scandinavian colleagues as international guests, but as fellow organizers—partly because in this way the duties of host will seem less onerous to us, but not least because our Scandinavian colleagues have co-operated with the arrangements in a very laudable manner, especially in planning and organizing pre- and post-Conference excursions. We therefore sincerely hope that our congress,

while it is characterized by its international stamp, reflects the Nordic setting which means so much to us all.

The organizing committee is naturally very pleased to note that the Finnish participation in the congress is so numerous. It gives us special pleasure that political economists are also taking part.

I mentioned the favourable attitude of the Government towards the arranging of our Conference. In addition there are many agricultural and co-operative organizations and firms closely connected with agriculture who have supported us financially. I have the honour and the pleasure to express our deep gratitude for this support, and I also express my gratitude to all the Swedish-speaking organizations and enterprises who have given us their valuable help.

On behalf of the organizing committee it is my pleasant duty to wish you all cordially welcome to the Ninth International Conference of Agricultural Economists. We hope that this congress will have a stimulating effect on agricultural economic research and will deepen our knowledge of the theme around which we have gathered. We sincerely hope that you, our dear guests, will be happy with us and will take back happy memories of our country.

JOHANNES VIROLAINEN

Minister of Foreign Affairs of Finland

AGRICULTURAL economics covers all the various aspects of farming. The agricultural economist must master a great variety of subjects, but the student of agriculture cannot limit his research to a detailed analysis only. His ultimate aim is a synthesis with a view of raising farm income as a whole to a level as profitable as possible. Although in many parts of the world farms are managed by members of the farmer's family, without hired labour, and although commercial profit-making is not always the object of farming, principles of efficiency and gain also begin to play a part of growing importance in farming. In the long run income must cover expenses in farming, and a farmer must win a satisfactory compensation for his work. It is the task of agricultural economists to find out and propose the most effective and appropriate plan for each individual case and to solve the problems of how agricultural production fits in with the pattern of the national economy of the country in question.

As, throughout the world, conditions of agriculture are determined to a great extent by government authorities, a close collaboration between them and the agricultural economists is needed. It is thus in the interest of the authorities both in Finland and elsewhere,

that research in agricultural economics be carried out effectively, so that relevant material can be placed at the disposal of the authorities for their reference. In Finland the co-operation between the authorities and the agricultural economists has always been good, and I avail myself of this opportunity to thank the Finnish agricultural economists for the valuable service they have done to our country.

We in Finland have benefited greatly by international co-operation in this field, and we desire to do our share in furthering this co-operation. On behalf of the Finnish Government I hope that the Ninth International Conference of Agricultural Economists will give new ideas to all the participants, and will promote this important branch of research work. I wish to the present conference all success, and hope that our foreign guests will enjoy their stay in Finland.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

L. K. ELMHIRST

THIS is our Ninth Conference, and we celebrate our 26th anniversary. At our first meeting, at Dartington, we had members from ten countries. Today we have members in forty-two countries, and some thirty-five are represented here.

We cannot achieve such an age without losing some of our older friends. I deeply regret with you the passing of Professor Arthur Ashby, W. Heath, and Dr. Orwin, and I shall ask you to rise for a moment in memory of all three. C. S. Orwin contributed to our first meeting in 1929. 'Ashby, who attended every Conference from the first, made, over the years, a special contribution in papers and by discussion. These are all printed in the *Proceedings*. They compensate in some measure for the fact that he never found time to publish his ideas in book form. He could be vigorous in discussion and our records give a fair summary of his considerable learning, sympathy, and wisdom.

In opening this meeting, and for the benefit of our many new members, I propose to do four things: to make a passing reference to the history, progress, and objects of the Conference itself; to comment upon the general theme of this meeting; to list some of the problems that now face agricultural economists and our fellow social scientists in allied disciplines; and, finally, to suggest some of the ultimate ends for which we work.

In our first Constitution, drafted in 1930, we formulated three principles: the Conference was to be a truly international organization; it was to consist of individual members; it was to develop effective local organizations. How far have we travelled on this road? In certain linguistic areas real progress is being made. Thanks now to the Kellogg Foundation and to Professor Case, whom we are happy to welcome here as our first salaried General Secretary-treasurer, we have the beginnings of a new, substantial, and effective group from the Latin American countries in South and Central America. We cannot, unfortunately, say the same yet for North, for Central, or for South Africa.

If in the whole of Asia we had something comparable to the Annual Conference of the Indian Society of Agricultural Economists, we should be much better represented than we are. Such a body as yet does not exist. In the Middle East, too, in South-East Asia and in the Antipodes, we still lack any regional organization.

We are happy to welcome many members from South America, as well as representatives from China, the Philippines, Japan, Pakistan, Malaya, and Australia. But there is no one this time from New Zealand or Indonesia. We are delighted, too, to see here seven members from South-East Europe: one from Greece, one from Turkey, and five from Yugoslavia. We regret, however, the absence of representatives from Egypt, Israel, Syria, Transjordan, Iraq, Persia, Arabia, Abyssinia, and the Sudan.

In 1930 we had six speakers from the U.S.S.R., and after twenty-five years we are happy to be able once again to draw upon the wealth of Soviet Union experience. It was a Russian speaker in 1930 who said to us: 'Science is international. True scientists are internationalists. In seeking out our own path we must keep up to the scientific level of international science.' At the same Conference, at Cornell University, Max Sering of Berlin and George Warren of Cornell, our first two Vice-Presidents, added a rider to the main objectives of the Conference. It was established, they said, 'to improve economic and social conditions relating to agriculture and rural life'. This aim has been accepted as axiomatic ever since.

In August 1952, at Michigan, the task was laid upon your President and upon Professor Edgar Thomas, your Executive Vice-President, of preparing a programme for this Conference at Helsinki around the broad implications, for us and for different parts of the world, of 'Farming Change' and of 'Technical Advance'. In June 1953 a draft programme was circulated by Professor Thomas to all Conference Correspondents, and by July 1954 criticisms and suggestions for speakers had arrived and were embodied, with little subsequent change, in the present programme.

With regard to our theme for this week, there is small doubt that in the world today technical development is one of the most powerful forces making for change. In many directions the *tempo* of this change is truly bewildering, but peculiarly so in the field of agriculture. The fearful problem of shortage, characteristic of the post-war years, has now, almost overnight, been transformed into one of an apparent unmarketable surplus. So technical change by itself, leading to higher productivity, is not enough. Not only must sound marketing and forward planning be devised, but both must ultimately be harnessed to humane ends. All change should be geared to an integrated process of development, concerned as much with social and cultural as with technical and economic values. As nations finally achieve their political freedom, and attempt to realize to the full their economic potential, they can seriously disturb existing

areas of production and traditional markets, as well as do irreparable harm to their own economies unless they face fairly the international implications and responsibilities of their actions. To study the production and marketing problems associated with such changes so that we may achieve a more balanced advance for the general benefit of humanity will, I hope, always be a special concern of our Conference.

In each of the triennial meetings we have held, I have sensed, in the minds of economists, a growing need for more help from other disciplines, but especially from the sociologists and from the social anthropologists. For an example of what I mean I shall quote to you from Lord Adrian who, as President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1954, pointed out that 'unless we are ready to give up some of our old loyalties we may be forced into a fight which might end the human race'. 'The Scientist', he added, 'must apply his science to learn as much as possible about the mental and physical causes which make us behave as we do, he must study human nature to prevent its failures', and later, 'we must find out what human behaviour is like before we try to explain how it is produced'. How well we know in our practical work the kind of 'bullock proof' resistance the average farmer, even in the more advanced countries, can put up to the offer of skilled technical assistance! How little as yet we really understand about the origins, the why, of his obstinacy!

This Conference should also give us a perspective of the wide variety of forms that technical change on the farm is taking in different parts of the world, and what part environment plays in giving to each form its own special significance. This is why, in Finland, we have kept a special session for a discussion of the economic implications of the combination of forestry and farming which we find so characteristic of the northern regions here. The immense flexibility demanded today on the farm is in part the effect of scientific discovery, but in part of new consumer demand. To achieve an appropriate flexibility, new and considerable resources and supplies of capital and credit will be needed. How can or should they be found? Are new modes of marketing and distribution required? What modifications in exchange relationships between countries are necessary?

But without forethought the rate and kind of technical change we are seeing around us may have quite disastrous effects. The chance suddenly to purchase and use new machines, new sprays and fertilizers, can shake to its foundations an ancient rural culture and

can sometimes intensify the problems of rural under-employment and of population structure. Not only world markets, but political stability may be upset, and the attempt to develop a reasonable balance and relationship between urban and a rural society can be wrecked. Here is, in brief, another challenge that this Conference will need to face, and it is one that concerns all social scientists, but especially the agricultural economist. For rural and urban are inevitably complementary aspects of a single culture, and it is in part our concern if they seem to develop unbalance or that acute antagonism that comes from not understanding each other's peculiar role.

Speaking at Manchester shortly after the close of the First World War, Lord Keynes put the challenge thus. 'The political problem of mankind is to combine three things: Economic Efficiency, Social Justice and Individual Liberty'. Five years later, he reinforced this statement still further: 'The pace at which we can reach our destination of economic bliss will be governed by four things: our power to control population, our determination to avoid wars and civil dissensions, our willingness to entrust to science the direction of those matters which are properly the concern of science, and lastly the rate of accumulation as fixed by the margin between our production and our consumption; of which the last will easily look after itself, given the first three.' 'But, chiefly,' he went on, 'do not let us overestimate the importance of the economic problem, or sacrifice to its supposed necessities other matters of greater and more permanent significance. It should be a matter for specialists—like dentists. If economists could manage to get themselves thought of as humble, competent people, on a level with dentists, that would be splendid!'

'Power to control population.' Notwithstanding an apparent food surplus that exists in some regions today, there is still a vast area of the world where people go hungry and lack any decent means of existence or range of opportunity. At the moment, food resource and population-need are still, in many countries, ill-adjusted. Science and medical care have accelerated the increase of population almost everywhere. How important it is then for us to take conscious steps to bring about some balance between the human and the agricultural potential, not merely that mouths may not increase beyond the regional capacity to fill them, but that mothers may have the means they need, not only to rear children, but to guarantee for themselves some leisure in which to enjoy companionship and the cultural activities of their communities. I know this population question is still a thorny problem, but as an organization of scientists we must face the issue involved.

'To avoid war!' It must be a great satisfaction to us all that, for the first time in our twenty-six years of conference, we can dare to suggest that the world is enjoying an atmosphere of comparative peace. This is no small gain for our Conference. We have, in addition today, international bodies like F.A.O., I.L.O., Point IV, the Colombo Plan, and U.N.E.S.C.O., with W.H.O. These, with other altruistic agencies doing positive work in rural areas all over the world, are becoming increasingly conscious of the need to study in a scientific and objective manner the political and social, as well as the economic factors for improving standards of living in less developed areas.

Our meeting gives us a unique chance to make those intimate, personal contacts which, in the years to come, can bear positive fruit by enabling our members to contact one another informally across national barriers and behind the inevitable rigidities of officialdom and political bargaining. At the base of our Conference lies the idea that the ultimate need of humanity is one, and that this need can be studied and met in a scientific manner by experienced men of goodwill.

'Entrust to science the direction of those matters which are properly the concern of science.' How many the gaps still are in our knowledge we well realize. Yet each day some new gap is filled and some problem, which has hitherto been the battle-ground for emotional, religious, or partisan feeling, emerges into the daylight as one which can and should be, measured, diagnosed, and finally mastered.

The relating of world production to optimum human need is a complex and baffling task, but not insoluble. Ever since the end of the last world war, strides have been made in the management of currency problems, in the freeing of trade, as well as in the increasing of food production. How best to reinvest the world's annual capital gain is still something of a problem in juggling. It is one that India, for instance, is having to face just now, in the drawing up of her second five-year plan. But the fact that her field of choice is widening is in part due to her ceasing to be an importer of rice. The corollary to this achievement, however, is the creation of a problem for other rice-producing areas, such as Burma, Thailand, and Southern California.

The relating of productive potential to human need is likely, therefore, to be an ever-widening field for research in social science for economist and sociologist alike. It is, after all, thanks mainly to science that so much advance is possible in rural areas today. But

sudden change is not always or necessarily progress right away. In some Western countries the pace of mechanization has now become so rapid that the farm horse hardly survives. It already seems like the vestigial trace of an earlier civilization, as the draft bullock itself disappeared in so many countries in face of the greater efficiency of the horse. In the United Kingdom, for example, in 1939 we used 50,000 tractors and about 1,000,000 horses. Today, there are eight times the number of tractors (or 22 to every 1,000 acres of farmland) and only one-third the number of horses. I do not suggest that all these tractors are used to their full advantage, or that, as yet, all the new problems their operation has created are being faced. I use this example merely to illustrate the theme of our meeting and the kind of problem with which we must deal. How difficult it is, after twenty years of depression and nearly fifteen years of war-time and post-war controls and difficulties, boldly to explore the possibilities and implications of an expanding economy.

In the heavily populated corners of the East, two major problems are the shortage of capital with which to equip farms, to engineer roads, water supplies, transport, and power, and the knowledge of how to develop rural areas and communities in the light of present-day conditions. Lack of these two, the means and the skills, still holds thousands in a state of demoralizing under-employment and in unhappy conditions of penury. As yet so many rural folk can earn a decent subsistence neither from the land nor from a wisely distributed network of secondary industry. A similar shortage of the blessings that can flow from the works of science is also apparent over vast areas in those less developed and less populated countries, such as Central Africa and South America. It is to the sciences, including our own, that we must look to give us a higher output and value per hour of man labour, and a balanced growth of rural and industrial society. It is in this world of values that we, as agricultural economists, can no longer afford to look at the farmer just as an economic unit. He, with his family, needs the chance to learn how to develop in an all-round way and how to become fully conscious that life can offer him an ever-widening horizon of opportunity. A discussion on the sociological and cultural problems that arise out of our success in reducing on the farm the need for so much human perspiration or for so many human beings is therefore vital to our meeting.

As increasing leisure should come to rural society, the power and opportunity should grow for the multiplication of all kinds of new aspirations and responsibilities in the worlds of education, of self-government, and of culture. As technical changes take place in all

directions, rural people find themselves face to face with a new world. An infinite flexibility of mind and outlook is needed today, sometimes for quite sudden adjustments. Rural societies require all the help and advice that we, as economists and as sociologists, can give towards the engineering of desirable social change, a task that, in Keynes's phrase, is 'properly the concern of science'.

But it is also true that we and our fellow social scientists face today an ever widening series of professional problems. There is a greater need than ever for a well-trained and experienced profession, with a new flexibility of approach. While appreciating the good work already done and the difficulty of so many situations already faced, we are not always well enough equipped to face some of the problems we are trying to tackle. Some agricultural economists have neither been raised on a farm nor had much contact with or experience of farming. It is still true that those who have had practical farm experience have also a very special advantage when talking either to farmers or to their more theoretical colleagues.

In addition to the special contribution that agricultural economists can and do make today, in helping to devise and apply national and agricultural policies, new demands for their advice from commercial and agricultural organizations are increasing every day. This is as it should be, and I am indeed glad to see so many agricultural economists holding key positions in the diplomatic service, in banks, as directors of charitable trusts, as deans of colleges, and even as cabinet ministers.

The economist, however, must always balance on something of a tight-rope. His objective approach may lead him to a conclusion very different from prevailing national or commercial policies. Here I should like to make a special plea to our profession, that they should always be on guard, and try to avoid being put into a position where they have to decide between objective diagnosis on the one hand and a pandering to the immediate convenience of ministerial or managerial policies on the other. The desire to be approved of by those responsible for one's pay and promotion can operate in very subtle ways to upset the foundations of objective detachment.

Another subtle situation affecting economists can arise where a government, through its control of public funds and in its anxiety to find support for a given policy, may choose only those projects for agricultural research that are likely to strengthen or bolster up ministerial policy. Sometimes university staffs are tempted to accept funds for research with 'strings' tied to them. This is likely to undermine that very detachment and objectivity of view that in the

physical sciences is rightly regarded as the essential prerogative of any university that wishes to retain its title to that name.

I have visited institutions where the professors are all salaried servants of the government, or of colleges and universities directly in receipt of their funds from government sources. Their need to find appropriate expression for results that might reflect direct criticism of or challenge for the government's or the minister's policy should not be minimized. Even farmers' organizations are not always blameless in this respect, encouraging though it is to see the increasing use they make of the economist's services. Sometimes the 'parochialism', shall I call it, of the 'purer' sciences at universities can prevent the appointment of an agricultural economist to the staff or the granting of an appropriate rise in status to senior agricultural economics research workers.

In spite of all the defences that a university can erect, the power of governments or of industries to vote additional funds for research can sometimes exercise too great a brake upon a wider and deeper examination of rural problems. Sometimes an agricultural research council will even deny relevance to rural economic problems altogether. I should not labour this point of objectivity if it were not so fundamental. Nor am I attempting to reflect upon any specific decisions on policy taken today by universities, governments, farmers' organizations, industries, or by agricultural economists themselves. But I am sounding a warning, more especially for countries which have only just begun to find how useful, nay, how essential are the services of our fraternity. The social scientist will always need to keep his feet on a bedrock of measured fact and his eye on those horizons where a broader perspective should not be clouded either by prejudice, by vested interest, or by lack of knowledge.

The sociologist is, I suppose, still the Cinderella in the social science family. As far as the rural scene is concerned, his need to collaborate with the economist is paramount. He is now necessarily occupied in his task of 'finding out what human behaviour is like', and of deciding how far he should participate in, or take responsibility for, the society or culture he is studying, and how, if at all, he can advise, for example, the health visitor or the newly appointed village teacher, or the official at administrative headquarters. How much attachment, how much detachment, at any given time or place, is, for all social scientists, a perennial challenge.

So much for our professional problems; what about those 'matters of greater and more permanent significance'?

Increasing economic and social efficiency, a better balance between food and population, a decrease in war and civil disturbance, less of a gap in social justice between the haves and the have-nots, all these trends will lead us where? Are we reasonably sure of the destination? To what end—more refrigerators, more leisure, more television? You remember the charwoman who, on her knees, had scrubbed floors so hard and for such long hours every day and all her life, and who, designing an epitaph for her own tombstone, wrote:

'Don't mourn for me friends, don't weep for me never,
For I'm going to do nothing for ever and ever.'

I sympathize with her, but before we, and the perspiring rural folk we serve, reach such a heaven of leisure on earth, man has still a long and strenuous climb ahead into ever higher and wider fields of consciousness. If he is to build a culture worth having, he will, I suspect, need to explore new worlds of feeling, of thought, and of communication of which, as yet, he has little or no conception. 'What is culture?' said one of his students to Dr. Whitehead at Harvard. 'Culture', came the answer, 'is activity of thought and sensitiveness to beauty and to humane feeling.' I think we may consider whether such a conception of culture can express for us an ultimate aim. Without the practical contribution, thoughtful and sensitive, that we and our fellow social scientists can render, a culture of such a character is hardly likely to be realized, either by the world at large or for any of the people on it.

In conclusion, may I hope that what I have said will be of use and that mutual respect, good fellowship, and plain speaking may be the crowning reward of our meeting together here.

HENRY C. TAYLOR, *Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*

Dr. Elmhirst, I know that on this occasion I should be silent. But I have a strong urge to say something, and that is that I look upon this organization, as I have seen it grow from the beginning, as one of the most important agricultural organizations in the world. I count it important, not simply because it is significant in the training of agricultural economists, and not simply because it is important to the progress of agriculture throughout the world, but also because I look upon it as a training ground in which we, from various parts of the world, learn to work together; and in this training school we should learn that which must be learned in the way of understanding each other and sympathizing with each other, to the point where the

most arduous tasks, essential to the peace of the world, may be performed.

It is because of these far-reaching influences of this world-wide organization that I want all of us to join in congratulating Dr. Elmhirst who started this grand work in 1929.