



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
TWELFTH
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMISTS

HELD AT THE
PALAIS DES CONGRÈS
LYON, FRANCE
24 AUGUST—3 SEPTEMBER 1965

Disparities in the Pace and
Form of Agricultural
and Rural Development

LONDON
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
NEW YORK TORONTO
1966

THE MAIN THEME OF THE CONFERENCE

DISPARITIES IN THE PACE AND FORM OF AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

THE President, Professor Nils Westermarck, opened the Conference by ringing the Cowbell.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME

DENIS R. BERGMANN

Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, Paris, France

ON behalf of the French Organizing Committee of this Twelfth International Conference of Agricultural Economists, I have both the great honour and the great pleasure of welcoming you here in Lyon. We are proud of having been given the responsibility of organizing this Conference because it is a great honour for our country to welcome here a gathering such as yours. French agricultural economists as a professional group are honoured by your presence here today. We feel a great warmth of joy at seeing in front of us all those faces we have had the opportunity to meet at previous Conferences.

If I feel so elated it is also because the latest news we have had from the crop forecasting services of the Minister of Agriculture is rather favourable and optimistic. After all we *are* interested in agriculture, are we not? And this year in France crops have been good.

The crop forecasters were quite right as regards wheat. The forecasting specialists told us there would be a lot of wheat in France this year, and indeed there is. With regard to corn (maize) we are somewhat concerned. The forecasts have been greatly reduced recently as a consequence of the drought and we feel that our exports to Iowa may not take place after all! On the other hand, there are a few sectors where forecasters have made a very poor showing. This is the case with regard to a very special type of crop, namely congress attendance by agricultural economists.

The crop—at least judging by pre-registration—is rather heavier

than we forecast. This may cause a few technical hitches. As you know, specialists in agricultural policy have rather more worries in periods of plenty than in periods of scarcity. We are, of course, highly pleased with this plenty, but we hope that you will excuse us for any organizational shortcomings which, after all, are the ransom of success. We are quite sure that, in the circumstances, you will bear up with your usual spirit of goodwill and co-operation.

After these apologies—and I am quite sure I shall have to apologize to you a few more times during the coming days—I wish to come to expressions of thanks. Of course, it would be out of place for French persons to start thanking each other at length. However, as Chairman of the Organizing Committee I feel it is my duty to express our gratitude to all those who have made our work easier. I should like particularly to pay tribute to the authorities of the University of Lyon, giving special credit to the Services des Œuvres Universitaires which operate the housing and restaurant facilities and, more particularly still, to the Director of the Cité Universitaire St. Irénée. They have greatly helped us by agreeing to accommodate us when we discovered that the number of members intending to come was such that it was absolutely impossible to hold the meeting in Reims. I should also like to request the representative of the Minister of Agriculture to convey to the Minister our thanks for the financial help we have received from him.

Mr. President, may I now ask you to allow me to come to the third and last point of my speech today. This Conference, the twelfth International Conference of Agricultural Economists, is extremely important for the science of agricultural economics in this country. French agricultural economists as a professional group are fairly young. I am not sure, ladies and gentlemen, whether you know that the young people who have helped with your registration, who have perhaps carried your luggage, who have tried to look after you yesterday and this morning, are the young hopes of our profession—and you may have seen that they do not look very old. You may even have thought that they were students rather than research workers. This shows how much we still lag behind, how much is still to be done in this field in France. That is why it is a great honour for us to know that the most eminent agricultural economists from all over the world have come here today. However, I must not be too modest. The low average age of our teams is an indication of the speed at which we are developing. We are a young profession, but we are growing fast. This is why we are so happy that France was selected for the venue of this congress.

There is another reason why the choice of France and of Lyon pleases us. We think our country is a good cross-roads in this shrinking world of ours. And it has been a cross-roads for a long time. Yesterday I had the pleasure of driving our Founder-President from the airport to the Cité Universitaire and, as usual with a man of such great culture, I learned a lot. He explained to me that for centuries English pilgrims on their way to Rome used to stop in Lyon. This historic city is definitely a favourable meeting point, and we think our Conference is also one. It is open to all and we are glad to see that you have come from the four corners of the earth; from the East as well as from the West; from the North as well as from the South. You have come to benefit from this atmosphere of freedom, from this tradition of frankness and friendliness, which characterize our gatherings. We feel that this can be found in France.

I do not intend to make a speech on economics or on agricultural economics; I have come here to welcome you. Nevertheless, I have few opportunities of addressing such a distinguished meeting as yours and that is why I shall venture a few remarks.

We all know that this is a century of great changes. We are living in an epoch when things move very rapidly. One might very well divide thinkers into two groups, those who look towards the past and those who look towards the future. I hope all the persons present have come here to look towards the future.

This century is not only a century of change in general, but, as M. Louis Armand said, it is the century of structural change. At least in Western Europe, we are at present witnessing the passage from small-scale agriculture to industrial agriculture. This involves a change in the tempo, a change in the scale, of agriculture. Mr. President, I believe that we must take note of this change, and of its consequences. We must also recognize that this change in the scale of operations affects our Conference and our Association. To make this transformation really visible the French Committee is happy to present you with this larger cowbell which is of a more befitting size, we think, considering the growth of the Conference.

Mr. Bergmann then presented to the President a much larger cowbell than the one used for inaugurating the Conference.

M. PERRACHON

Representing the Minister of Agriculture

FIRST, may I discharge the mission that has been entrusted to me, telling you how sorry the Minister of Agriculture is at not being able to accept the kind invitation he received from the French Organizing Committee. Monsieur Pisani had accepted it spontaneously and with great pleasure, but he has asked me to apologize on his behalf for not having been able to keep his promise. I can but regret the absence of my Minister who, far better than I, would have 'kicked off' for your meeting. Indeed, having to make decisions every day, he knows your preoccupations, your concerns. Particularly he would have liked to discuss with you matters arising from the main theme of your Conference.

I am fully conscious of the honour you have done me by asking me to address your assembly in which we have distinguished economists who have come to Lyon from over sixty countries in order to exchange ideas on the various topics on your agenda.

On my way to Lyon I perused some of the papers which you will study during the coming week. If I had intended to talk to you on the main problems which French agriculture has to face, this reading might have induced me to be more careful in what I should say because I realize that studies in rural economics are indeed science and that one has to be very careful. Superficial study of these problems would enable me only to quote a list of platitudes. Ladies and gentlemen, like Mr. Bergmann I am pleased that you have chosen France and Lyon as the venue of your Congress and I am convinced that my country and the city where I was born will know how to give you the welcome you deserve. Also, after having looked at your programme, I feel that France, by the variety of the problems which arise here, both through the diversity of its regions and in the territory as a whole, will deserve your attention and I shall be glad if you find value in the solutions we have found to these problems. May I simply note in passing that these solutions that are specific to the French conditions have, nevertheless, been seen from the point of view of the Common Market, which may enhance your interest? I am not going to deal here with the problems of regional planning or with structural problems or with those of contract farming, group agriculture, integration, capital, co-operatives, investments, credit facilities, and so forth. I know that you are going to deal with these in a very concrete way and the leading French specialists will be here to give you the guidance and information you may require.

May I simply note that for the past twenty years French farmers, without having ceased to be farmers, have made a thorough study of their economic problems and have passed them on to experts who could devote more time to them. In these problems of rural economy it is essential for the farmers to apply this knowledge to actual production. It is also essential that the community or country should not be indifferent to the conclusions that may be drawn from such studies. That is why our research workers in the field of agricultural economics can use a research centre where world documentation is collected. So we are going to meet here for a week and we are going to have study tours in a number of typical areas of this country. On behalf of the French Ministry of Agriculture I wish you a pleasant stay. I am convinced that, thanks to the high level of the papers which are submitted to you for consideration, thanks to the objectivity of the discussions which will follow between the greatest world specialists in agricultural economics, knowledge of these problems will make further contributions to the well-being of farmers throughout the world and also to general welfare. From this clash of ideas a better understanding of mankind results. I feel sure that your Conference will thus make its contribution to greater confidence between nations, and this is certainly my wish.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

NILS WESTERMARCK

THE day after tomorrow thirty-five years will have passed since our first conference was held, at Dartington Hall, Totnes, England. It is with great pleasure that I observe that of those who then met there, at least three veterans are present here in our circle today, namely, in addition to our Founder-President Leonard Elmhirst, Dr. H. C. M. Case and Mr. J. R. Currie. When I compare the photographs of these individuals taken for the Proceedings volume of our first congress with their appearance today, it cannot quite be maintained that there is no difference. However, the difference is not of statistical significance!

It is a peculiar feature of the world today that the number of independent nations has increased tremendously during recent years. As a criterion of this increase may be considered the number of member states in the United Nations Organization. Since our congress in Mysore City in 1958 the number of member nations of U.N.O. has risen from 81 to 113. It is symptomatic that at the same time as national liberation takes place in Asia and Africa, the need for and the interest in international activity also increases. I personally belong to a young nation that won her freedom and independence after the First World War. I well understand the exultation of the people in the newly created states in Asia and Africa on being liberated. However, it seems to be the way of things in this bleak world of ours that only after the enjoyment of the first exultation is over, the difficulties actually begin when everyday problems confront the young society as it begins to build materially and culturally.

As our Association is not a governmental body our financial resources are limited. Nevertheless, I want to emphasize strongly the fact that, despite our limited resources, we want to contribute to narrowing the gap which exists in material and cultural welfare between different countries and between different regions within a country. The main theme of this conference, *Disparities in the Pace and Form of Agricultural and Rural Development*, also evinces that we, for our part, want to do our share of analysing the causes and consequences of disparities as well as the measure aimed at solving the problems. The different kinds of development do not concern only the comparison of different regions within the same country. These are the questions upon which we thoroughly wish to throw light at

this our twelfth congress. We wish to clarify problems not as politicians but as scientists.

The object of I.A.A.E. is that of fostering the development of the science of agricultural economics and of furthering the application of the results of economic investigation of agricultural processes and agricultural organization in the improvement of economic and social conditions relating to agriculture and rural life.

It is clear, however, that many new problems arise to hinder our aims because of the fact that the grouping of nations, not only numerically but even geographically, is increasing. The confusion of languages may become a strong obstruction when welding together such an organization as ours. Therefore it is of particular importance to those of us who belong to small nations, as well as new nations, that we should know, at least passably, one of the great languages of the world. For most of us the regrettable fact that we do not know Russian makes it difficult to keep up with the developments which take place within the vast Russian-speaking area. We are therefore most pleased to observe that a large number of Russian textbooks have been published in the German language during recent years.

France and French agriculture have come into the world picture in a way quite different from, say, ten yaers ago. This, as we all know, is connected among other things with the building up of European economic integration around the E.E.C. I feel that, at the moment, hardly any country so far as cultural interests and agricultural economics are concerned would be more suitable to act as host than France. I assure our hosts that all of us gathered here greatly appreciate the opportunity to get to know the French problems on the spot and particularly the agricultural economic aspects of those problems. Our knowledge of French agricultural economics, research, and scientific training and all that belongs to the field, is unfortunately fairly slight for many of us. It is therefore, in a way, a double pleasure for us to be allowed to come here and have the opportunity to meet our French colleagues.

The international co-operation that is effected within the field of agriculture, and in the sphere to which agricultural economists also belong, takes place within the framework of several different organizations and authorities. Everybody knows F.A.O.; the agricultural producers have their own organization, I.F.A.P.; O.E.C.D. and E.C.E. regularly arrange seminars and group discussions concerning agricultural economic topics of the day. There are many other international organs besides ours that gather in the agricultural economists. However, our Association differs from many others in that we

come together here as individuals, as individual scientists, and not as official delegates. I.A.A.E. is not a governmental political organization, and the views and aspects which we present at this forum are our own personal views and not those of our governments or governmental authorities. I should especially want to emphasize the value of the fact that we appreciate this principle.

It is remarkable that despite the fact that international co-operation across borders has become ever increasingly lively and that, among other things, agricultural economists know each other personally in a way which is very different from that of some decades ago, there exists still a certain isolation. Let me explain my point. When studying textbooks of agricultural economics, marketing, farm management, &c., or doctors' dissertations, among others, from the U.S.A., the Soviet Union, the U.K., and Germany, countries which can be regarded as the great countries of agricultural economics, one is surprised to find that very seldom are there any references to other than the purely national literature. In order to obtain a quantitative measure of this nationalistic in-breeding, I made some tests at random. Of a total of 930 references in five American textbooks, there were 890 American, thirty-six British, and only four in some language other than English. Of 350 references in ten German dissertations and textbooks there were only six that were in some language other than German, and in Russian textbooks there were only a few in some other language.

I am the first to admit that these figures should be taken with reservations. Firstly, it can be noted that in national scientific archives there are articles by foreign authors. Although this softens the borders to some extent, one asks oneself—at least I do—whether agricultural economics should be such a nationally adapted science as these figures suggest. I have a definite impression that it should not be so.

One of the reasons for such a situation may be, of course, that within a big country it is possible to build up a science independently of corresponding foreign researches in the field. The fact that the situation in this respect is different in large countries from what it is in small ones is very clearly established when studying the references, for instance, in Dutch, Hungarian, Polish, and Scandinavian works. I do not want to claim that researchers in small countries are more far-sighted than those in large countries, but evidently this internationally wider knowledge of literature is accounted for by the simple fact that their own national bases have been too narrow and they have had to reach outside their own boundaries.

I have a definite conception, however, that it would surely be fruitful if the large countries would devote a little more attention to research and literature outside their national borders. I have a feeling that agricultural economics in many places has now attained such a standard that it no longer has to be confined nationally but has created a general theoretical foundation of its own, which is not bound within national borders. In this connexion it is appropriate to mention that World Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology Abstracts (or W.A.E.R.S.A.), from the beginning of next year, will be taken over by the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux. This arrangement will make it possible for it to spread more widely.

Agriculture is a world business. Like any other industry it can be rationalized, and it is subject to improvement by co-operative action and co-operative understanding. But, being international in character, permanent improvement and real stability can only come through enlarging our field of consciousness internationally, by stepping over our national boundaries, by the constant exchange of facts and figures, and by sharing our difficulties, our failures, and our successes.

It seems to me to be one of the first duties of agricultural economists to see that the farm population is assured of a reasonable standard of living with stability. Only thus can it achieve the end to which we all aspire—a sufficient standard of life, a standard that can be measured in terms of quality and of the rich use of an ample leisure, as well as in terms of labour income or interest on capital. One of my countrymen some time ago emphasized in a speech that in today's world we must think and work internationally but feel nationally. I consider these words extremely wise, and we are all glad to accept them as the motto for our activity with I.A.A.E.

A condition for all material and cultural progress is that the theoretical basis of research should be deepened and widened. It is not egocentric self-pride to maintain that enormous development has taken place in agricultural economic research since the end of the Second World War; it is a fact. One has a completely different quantitative grasp of problems from that of earlier times. Many of us who read the leading periodicals of the world (in our field: the *Journal of Farm Economics*) soon realize that an explosion-like development has taken place. Unfortunately, I must confess, and maybe some others will feel the same, that many of these writings are more or less incomprehensible. However, I usually console myself with the fact that I have read in some American magazine that agricultural economics research in the U.S.A. is fifty years ahead of practical farming.

Here we arrive at a problem which is in no way an internal problem, but one which concerns research, and I would say particularly economic research, and its applicability for the farmer and the spheres in which he works. In so far as research becomes ever increasingly advanced it becomes ever more difficult to present its findings in such a form that the farmer understands them. Research should naturally not become an end in itself but, in order to come into its own, to be utilized, it should bring profit to those to whom it is actually directed. I am assured that linear programming, for example, has been of enormous importance to agricultural economics. On the other hand I cannot refrain from observing that if special measures are not effected, the gulf between the researchers who deal in linear programming and those who utilize the research results will become wider. The significance of research and new production techniques increases with accelerating speed. However, if the adoption process is not expedited, the farmer will remain helplessly behind when other fields in progressive society are developed. When comparing agriculture, with its tens of thousands of entrepreneurs, with other industries in which the number of enterprises is considerably smaller, and considering, in addition, that the farm population is bound to its traditions in productive activity much more than are those engaged in other occupations, very particular attention has to be directed in rapidly industrializing societies to the farmers' adoption and utilization of new results and methods. Similarly it has been observed that the more capital that is invested in the business the greater the level of knowledge required to achieve profitability. This is an important observation, considering that capital input will continuously rise in farm businesses while labour input will decrease.

Another factor which makes co-operation ever more important is the general direction of research in the world. Researchers specialize on ever narrower sectors. This is necessary for depth in research, but it has the obvious defect, and this is true especially in the applied sciences, that the general view of the researcher becomes too narrow. It is as if he would dig himself into his own little shell. This being so, the contact between the researcher and the adopter of the results of his research becomes difficult in a modern specialized society if something is not done to counteract the drawbacks brought on by this *shelling-in*. In earlier times when research was, should I say, more general but also more superficial by today's standards, the persons regarded as general researchers had the strong point in their favour that their view was wider and they were surely also better informed

of what the demands and requirements were in real life. The correction of the present state of affairs would therefore necessarily require the existence of a transforming or information medium of some kind. It cannot be expected of a person who is a skilful researcher in his own specialized field that he would also be able to present the results of his research in a generally understandable and popular form. His contacts are with researchers in the same field in his own country and abroad. It is not reasonable to demand of him the additional requirement that he should present his results to the public at large in a generally understandable way, though demands of this kind are often heard. Of course there may be cases in which the individual researcher has this facility but the exception only proves the rule. The transforming and information activity has to be taken care of by other persons and media.

When one compares the position of agricultural economics with the technical biological branches of science, one does not have to be an agricultural economist to observe that the importance of agricultural economics has increased in modern society. There are many reasons which have contributed to this development. In more highly developed countries it is, above all, the problem of agricultural surplus which has to be tackled by technicians, biologists, and economists together. The surplus problem has made co-operation with the economists real. Whether it is at all possible to solve the problem is another matter; it often appears to be impossible to solve. It is also clear that the measures and interventions of governmental agricultural policy require an ever increasing input of the expert knowledge of agricultural economists.

The developing countries should be on the watch and learn from the mistakes that the more fully developed countries have made. First of all, I think that the technical and economic problems should be tackled simultaneously and not, as has been the case in many countries up to now, that the technical aspects should one-sidedly dominate the initial stage of evolution, the economic points being considered only later. In many cases it seems as if techniques would run ahead of economics instead of making progress hand in hand. Within agriculture, biological-technical development has generally preceded economic penetration, for which reason economic research has often found itself confronted with a technical *fait accompli*. A typical example in this connexion is offered by the mechanization of farming which has often been effected without being preceded by economic clarifications. The technical side has, as it were, released itself from economics.

The continuous improvement of agriculture in our day assumes an ever increasingly complicated nature. At the turn of the century fairly large gains could be procured through relatively simple measures which often the farmers themselves were able to develop through their own observations. In these conditions research did not have to 'go deep' everywhere—the descriptive and systematizing phase could often yield practical adaptations. Where progress has advanced further, more accurate investigations are required if further development is to be achieved. Thus for technical and economic progress research becomes ever more important. At the same time, the analysis of cause and consequence becomes the dominating phase. It is characteristic here that specialization must be driven far, and researchers must plunge ever deeper within their limited areas. The effect which is mentioned most often in connexion with specialization is that of *splitting*. Specialization breaks up different fields into sub-branches. The horizons of the researchers become ever more limited.

My countryman, the professor of philosophy, G. H. von Wright, stressed in a lecture some time ago, and rightly, that specialization has another effect also which seems to be at least equally worthy of mention although it has been less observed. It could be called the integrating effect of specialization in the field of science. Earlier it was fairly easy to divide science into different disciplines and to connect related disciplines to groups and to keep the boundaries clear. A consequence of specialization is that these boundaries are erased. The very specialization process often takes place in just those boundary areas between the different branches, and the traditional sciences grow into each other. When we observe particularly our own discipline, agricultural economics, it is a fact, of course, that before any contribution can be made it is necessary to select a special sector within which one proceeds to dig deep. This requires specialization, but also, and simultaneously, a greater dependence on researchers working either in different fields within agricultural economics, or perhaps in nearby disciplines—psychology, sociology, statistics, mathematics, &c.

In gathering together agricultural economists who represent different sectors, but who are interested in the same research matters, our Association has a specially important task. The significance of mutual contacts has increased irrespective of whether they are kept up only through correspondence or through more solid team work. In this respect we Europeans have much to learn from our American colleagues. Many of us have followed with great respect the work

that many American research teams have executed during recent times. As an example of this may be mentioned the North Central Farm Management Research Committee, an amalgamation of workers from thirteen states in the U.S.A., which has produced very valuable results in my opinion.

Within agriculture, the mutual solidarity between the entrepreneur, his family, and the farm business is completely different from that within industry and commerce. Often a farm, while being the firm, also represents a dwelling-place for the family. Also, the farm creates the *milieu* in which the members of the family live their everyday lives, the children grow and are brought up to be citizens of society. It has been said that modern agriculture has lost many of its earlier traits on account of the alterations which have taken place in the structure of society. It cannot be denied of course that the continuous transition of modes of activity from agriculture to other industries, together with a continuous urbanization, has weakened the significance of rural life and agriculture as factors in creative and educating *milieu*; but I believe it is wrong to deny that the farming way of life has this value, over and above its economic importance.

A little story, which, however, is not very complimentary to us men, gives us in a nutshell the complicated mutuality between the social and economic problems in agriculture. During one of his visits to a distant village in a remote country, an economist, sent by an international organization, observed when he arrived at the village and found the farmer he was to visit, that the wife was industriously toiling in the rice fields, weeding, despite the fact that the sun was scorching. The man, the farmer, was resting in the shade in the yard under a tree. The economist, somewhat surprised, asked the farmer why he was not helping his wife: 'If you would help your wife you would both receive a larger rice crop and more income.' 'What would I do with the money?' answered the farmer. 'For instance, you could get yourself a bicycle to replace that old one over there by the wall, which seems to be pretty well worn out.' 'I do not need a new bicycle, the old one will do well', answered the man. 'Well, in that case you could buy a sewing machine for your wife', continued the economist. 'My wife doesn't know anything about sewing machines; she would only treddle upon it till it broke down, and it would be a waste of money to buy her one.' The visitor began to be somewhat enervated and impatient, but continued nevertheless, 'Well, if you don't need a new bicycle and do not want to buy your wife a sewing machine, you could save the money, put it into a

bank and when you get old you could enjoy life in peace, in the shade of palm trees.' 'Yes', answered the man, 'that's what I'm already doing now.' It is obvious that there is still a certain need for economic enlightenment and education.

The present principal of Uppsala University in Sweden, the well-known sociologist, Torgny Segerstedt, says in one of his essays: 'In the old peasant society, the opportunities of life were determined by the possession of land, forest and livestock; in the earlier industrial society by the possession of the means of production. In tomorrow's society the possession of education and intelligence are the decisive factors.' With regard to the future of agriculture and agricultural economics, it is not only in our own interest, but also in the interest of the whole of society to keep watch over our talents. I have a feeling that we have all too often passed by this point. We have awoken to reflection only when we have lost the talents. One can conscientiously ask: 'What about our intellectual human resources in the future?' One can too easily suppose that progress depends solely on education, research, and advisory work. But what about the human material from the aspect of intelligence?

One of the better-known historians of the nineteenth century, the German Otto Seeck, maintains that the downfall of the ancient Greek culture, as well as the decline of the Roman Empire, was occasioned by something he calls 'the extinction of the fittest'. The thesis has been further developed by the Danish physiologist and philosopher, Möllgaard, in his recently published book. Möllgaard maintains that never before in the history of the human race have so many placed so great requirements on so few. The social liberal welfare state has led to unscrupulous utilization of the fittest talents. It becomes ever increasingly difficult to bring forth an intelligence reserve. Sociologists and geneticists prove that in those families which, according to statistics, have brought forth the most talented children, the generations hardly reproduce themselves on account of birth control. In other words, the number of the highly intelligent does not increase absolutely but rather decreases. Within the other population groups birth control is not so widely practised. In addition, thanks to medicine, more weak children remain alive, of whom proportionately more have low resources of intelligence. The net increase of the population in the modern culture and welfare state will contain proportionately and also absolutely more persons with low intelligence quotients. It is hard for one who is not an expert to take a stand in this indisputably important, but also delicate, question. It can, on the other hand, be maintained that globally

there are hundreds of millions of people who till now have lacked every opportunity of enjoying education. These therefore constitute a significant potential reserve of intelligence. Whatever the truth with regard to talent reserves, there remains the significance of education as one of the foundations for all progress. In all the activity that tends toward better economic education, agricultural economics has an important mission to complete.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are hardly any people who could boast of having created wholly by themselves their spiritual and material culture. No heritage of culture has been created by any one nation or one group of people. It has come into existence through co-operation between different people and societies. Equally important to contacts in the material aspect is the interchanging of ideas within science and inventions. It depends on our own spiritual vitality how rapidly these bear fruit. When our endeavour is to create happier conditions for the farm population of the world, we should particularly keep this in mind.

On behalf of the International Association of Agricultural Economists the President then presented to DR. L. K. ELMHIRST, the Founder-President, a copy of a volume of essays entitled International Explorations in Agricultural Economics, written in his honour by members of the Association.

L. K. ELMHIRST

Founder-President of the International Association of Agricultural Economists

MR. PRESIDENT and fellow members of our Association, the gift from you of this volume of essays is for me a most unexpected pleasure. But let me quickly add that the kind things you have said about my services to the Association from its outset should really be shared by a whole team of fellow conspirators, of friends, and of fellow workers, who shared with me the intimate fellowship formed at the first Conference at Dartington Hall in 1929. How astonished they would have been to see today the outcome of their first experiment, an outcome far beyond anything they could have imagined thirty-five years ago.

In 1929 I was still little more than a raw student in the field of agricultural economics and of sociology, still sitting at the feet of Dr. Warren, of Dr. Ladd, of Dr. Taylor, here with us today, of John Maxton, of Jock Currie, of my old teacher Dr. W. I. Myers of Cornell.

and of a host of others who all helped to lay the foundations of our Association.

I thank you, Mr. President. I thank you, fellow members. Some of you I have already rebuked for not bringing with you your wives. You, Mr. President, have rebuked me for not bringing my own. You are right. I wish she had been here with me today. From my first meeting with her at Cornell in 1920 she has been not only my chief support but an enthusiastic believer in international co-operation on problems of mutual interest as exemplified by this Association.

May I end by thanking Denis Bergmann for his great achievement in making possible this meeting of our Association in France at Lyon and by saying how happy I am at the warm welcome you have given me today?