SUPPLEMENT TO
INTERNATIONAL
JOURNAL OF
AGRARIAN AFFAIRS
Vol. V, No. 4. July 1969

The Human Factor in Agricultural Management

**Proceedings of the First I.A.A.E. Intereuropean Seminar
Warsaw, May 1968**

***Seminar sponsored and
Proceedings published jointly by the
International Association of Agricultural Economists
and the Polish Academy of Sciences***

Price 10s. 6d. net from Institute of Agrarian Affairs
3 Magpie Lane, Oxford, England

PWN—POLISH SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHERS

The Human Element in Farm Management

J. PONIATOWSKI

Committee on Agricultural Economics of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland

INTRODUCTION

The man of European culture in the last half-century has experienced an acute crisis in his attitude to the pursuit of farming as an occupation. Not only is he abandoning farming eagerly, as evidenced by the shrinking overall numbers of farmers in most countries of our culture, but he also exhibits a singular uncertainty in deciding on the shape of a farming unit to replace the traditional pattern of husbandry.

In disputing the technical and economic efficiency of family-type farming, we do not usually favour large-scale agricultural enterprises with large numbers of hired farmhands and a hierarchical structure of the work force. Side by side with voices which urge agriculture to follow that pattern of evolutionary change, which led in industry from the artisan's bench to the contemporary factory, we encounter quite contrary opinions, derived from the fact that the farmer's job differs fundamentally from the manufacture of inanimate matter. Those who advocate extreme specialization and a breaking up of the farmer's profession into several specific, mechanical operations, are criticised by economists anxious for a full utilization of resources and a uniform spread of work throughout the year. The aims of mechanization and maximum savings in human labour have their opponents because of the constantly growing cost, in their opinion, of agricultural production in European conditions. They maintain, that the so-called "industrialization" of agriculture leads invariably to a need for state subsidies.

Meanwhile, the case for traditional family-type farming and its merits would have been completely lost in the sphere of sociological changes, together with the dwindling prestige of the farmer's occupation, were it not that it is continually maintained in practice as is clearly shown by the fact that the forms of non-family farming known up to the present, i.e. large farms with hired labour or Soviet-type collectives, have proved to

be even less successful in retaining the farmers. In practice they too hasten the migration into other occupations.

Very clearly then we have entered a period when we must search for new patterns of farming and a new model of agricultural enterprise, a period of controversy, when our ideas about the future drift about in an unconfined space of arbitrary conceptions. As I do not intend to multiply the proposed solutions, I have chosen in this paper merely to narrow the limits of these scattered suggestions. I should like to propose for discussion a framework which, in a very general way would describe the attitudes and aspirations of the man of European culture towards his professional work in the next half-century. The future model of a European farm should be worked out within that framework. It should possess for a fairly long period a distinct attraction for the young who may be willing to choose farming as one of the professions in the group of applied Natural Science.

The object of this paper, as above defined, will also determine its character. It is generally known that for collective deliberations two types of paper are especially useful. First would be a specific exposition of a current question, i.e. a well argued proposal for a solution of a problem, sometimes even offering a detailed prescription. The second would be more in the nature of analytical exploration, for revealing the attributes of a case which while less obvious may yet be necessary if developments are to be formulated. In this case the diagnostic character which is only a preparation for making prognoses, predominates.

Advice of this kind must be distinguished by marked moderation, by all possible objectivity and by deep insight into all local and temporary circumstances. Thus, as a rule, it is useful only within the economy of one particular country, where it will be especially useful if it is based on a profound knowledge of it.

But every attempt to see further ahead, i.e. to define future trends and to forecast development, is usually subjective, or even arbitrary in judging the importance of the individual elements of the case. But when one attempts to ascribe common problems to a whole group of nations, when one sees in them many cultural affinities and assumes the existence of uniformity in further similar social evolution, then one abandons so-called objective description. One carefully selects the arguments appropriate to some general thesis built upon one's own conviction and then submits it to collective judgement.

That type of paper does not attempt to come to any definite conclusion, it tries only to stimulate open discussion and to draw out relevant criticism of its supposed one-sidedness.

This paper belongs entirely to that second category. I think that in this international gathering it would be proper to detach oneself to some

extent from the current affairs of one's own country, and to stress the common European problems, or rather the problems of the farming profession common to all countries of European culture. Across the differences of political systems, across the variations in the level of economic development and existing standards of prosperity, we are tied together by the similarity of human strivings and aspirations, a result of many ages of mutual influence. A continuously growing cultural interchange consolidates and develops common appreciation of moral values, characteristic of our culture, distinguishing it from other cultures. This process plainly forestalls the levelling up of economic standards. Human aspirations and moral values are less earthbound than material wealth.

It is right and proper, therefore, to speak about a common and growing crisis in the farming profession, a crisis more pronounced in the changed attitudes of human individuals than in the economies of the countries concerned. The present conference, having for its subject "the human element in farm management", involves us in the problems of *how the farmer does his job,* in contradistinction to a concern about agriculture as a branch of the national economy.

Thus, special characteristics of work in the farming profession, and especially its division into managing and subordinate duties and functions will form the backbone of my reflections.

THE OCCUPATION OF FARMING, AND ITS DIFFICULTIES

The search for a new structure of farming occupation must start with an agreement, however general, about how we see the present state of affairs and why a change is necessary. This would give a solid foundation for discussion. I am keenly aware that my attempt at such a synthetic description is neither the first, nor is it even rare, and this leads me inevitably to a critical review of currently held opinions.

The most universal disapproval of today's "farmer", which treats him as an anachronistic relic from a by-gone age, denies his job the status of a contemporary profession. It sees his job as a collection of various non-specialized functions, which should be divided into its component parts, given to different persons to perform, and the only would these separate operations assume the character of a proper "occupation".

Such opinions are preached above all by people rather remote from actual farming, who at best are familiar with agricultural problems on a macro-scale, and naively transfer into the world of farming their vague impressions of factory techniques. It is beyond their comprehension that neither the rigid sequence of operations, as in a conveyer belt system, nor strict demarcation of specialized tasks could be synchronized with climatic

changes or with the biological cycle of development of living creatures. Keeping to a strict timetable usually fails. Even the utmost degree of mechanization would not lengthen the time appropriate for sowing or harvesting nor would it alter the fact that effective work and the fullest use of a farmer's time demands frequent changes in the type of cultivation and the use of ever different tools for their work.

Having to enumerate these elementary differences between agricultural and industrial occupations is embarrassing in a paper intended for competent representatives of our profession. Yet I am doing it solely to point out what an ocean of misunderstanding surrounds the farmer's occupation for I will have to return later to these astonishingly superficial judgements, which would make farming one of a number of mechanistic activites which merely manipulate raw material. It remains unnoticed, or is purposely passed over in silence, that the essence of this occupation lies in cultivation and the care of living things, creating for them favourable conditions for development. The thoughtful and purposeful servicing of these "miraculous automata", the plants and animals, which are the real producers of our food, demands considerable knowledge and constant choice of different, changing skills.

These are two of the chief arguments of the apostles of "industrialization" and of breaking up the generalized farmer's job into separate, at last, professional skills. These are: on the one hand, references to the already established "industrialized" production of poultry, veal and pork, on the other, quoting as evidence the peasants' own conviction, that "they have no occupation; they are only farmers". As to the first argument, I agree that production of sick animals goes beyond the farmer's job. This, indeed, could be ceded to industry together with a pious hope that medical science would soon put a stop to this sorry practice. As to the second, i think it is only a misunderstanding of rural vocabulary. For the vast majority of peasants, "to have an occupation" means to hold a post and to execute a job paid for by some outside agency. When one is one's own master on a farm, and does not receive a regular wage, one is "only a farmer".

This peculiarity of village terminology does not permit us to draw any conclusions about the non-existence of farming as an occupation. The exaggerated importance that some sociologists attach to this phenomenon: that farmers' own convictions seem to have brought them to the realization of the truth, is at best an attempt to avoid the difficult analysis of developments.

It must be admitted that the prejudiced supporters of industrialized agriculture judge the big agricultural enterprises far more leniently than the family farms. The very size of production, the uniformity of produce, but above all the number of employees and complicated administrative

machinery bring the large farm closer to the ideal of an industrial undertaking. They like its multilevel administrative structure, they see in it the advantages of specialization, while another positive feature, in their opinion, is the vast increase of groups of subordinate workers, who perform tasks efficiently even when they do not understand the reasons for them; they just act by the decisions of highly qualified managers. This, it is believed, provides greatly extended opportunities for the exercise of leadership and creative thought somehow, I would suggest, in the image of artificial insemination.

It is not my task to record the kind of economic disappointment which only too often accompanies large agricultural enterprises. Their prosperity depends very largely on the unlimited exploitation of farm workers as, for example, in colonies. In the framework of European labour laws, they tend to produce economically largely because of state-guaranteed prices, or they have to have straightforward subsidies from public funds. In general, it may be accepted, for countries of European culture, that farms based on hired agricultural labour produce more expensively and less from each acre than do family-type farms.

Note: The statements of G. L. Johnson and H. Priebe at the International Conference of the Society of Economic Science in 1965 illustrate vividly the views of economists concerning the competitiveness of family farms against those based on hired labour. The first asserts that "the farmers caught in the trap of their family farmsteads" sell their produce at such low prices, that a modern enterprise employing e.g. 30 people, finds it impossible to compete with them. G. L. Johnson quotes as an example the Californian dairy-producers who can exist and obtain high prices only through lack of competition from family-type farms. And Prof. H. Priebe writes: "The changes occurring in Europe haven't in any way proved the theory about the alleged superiority of big agricultural enterprises. The personality of the farmer always plays a decisive role". Let us remember, that both these pronouncements concern countries where the prices for farm produce are state subsidized to a very high degree. In countries which do not subsidize their agriculture the poor results of farms based on hired labour would be even more pronounced.

But what is most important, and what concerns us almost exclusively today, is the fact that large farms show a growing inability to retain their employees. We know that recent decades have been notable for the rapid rate of decrease in the number of hired farm workers, a rate several times higher than in the labour force on family farms. In countries where the standards of pay are low this tendency must be recognized as a natural and just self-defence of these workers. It must be stressed again how necessary and pressing is the need to improve the conditions of work for this most under-privileged group of the rural population. But it is wrong to

think, as the supporters of industrialized agriculture would have it, that the raising of earnings would solve all difficulties. The flight of hired farmhands, precisely those passive performers of someone else's dispositions, happens very conspicuously in countries with the highest standard of living and the highest wages for farm workers, e.g. in Sweden.

There are telling signs that the old-fashioned distinction between mental and physical labour is being challenged in our culture, and nowhere more emphatically than in agriculture, where it is challenged not by verbal protests and phraseology, but by the actual behaviour of the farm workers themselves. The sharpness of the reaction is surely the result of special conditions.

The social establishment: "The master and the farm-hand serf", has taken shape over the ages through differentiation in the character and quality of living, which entirely separated one partner from the other. The wealth as well as the social customs, the class status as well as the standard of education, everything was diametrically different and sanctified by tradition. Thus, in *everyday practice* everything was totally incompatible with contemporary notions about cooperation. Agriculture has not been excluded from the 20th century process of rapid social transformation, which has broken down many old barriers between people, and today steadily erodes educational disparity.

Yesterday's "obedient performer of tasks" now resents more and more the lack of opportunity to use his knowledge. He is inclined to criticize orders from above, and eagerly seeks work which allows him to engage his whole personality. The watchword of present-day youth: "to live to full capacity", extends to all kinds of work. The unity of thought and its penetration linked with full responsibility is set up as an ideal, as the only way to achieve the true effects of one's work and the feeling of satisfaction from one's creative participation in life.

And so we witness a growing phenomenon, that as soon as his material needs have been satisfied, on a level appropriate to each country, the man of our culture does not accept *any* work, even though well paid. He demands satisfaction for his talents, he seeks a job that would ensure a measure of independence, and he is ready to pay for it by accepting responsibility for the result. Passive performance of someone else's instructions wearies and discourages him.

I expect that these remarks could and probably would be challenged so far as the extent and rate of growth of this phenomenon are concerned. But for the purpose of my argument, the mere confirmation of the evolutionary tendency which I have outlined will be sufficient to show that "for tomorrow" better pay for farm-workers, however indispensable, will not in itself provide a solution. Perhaps it will do no more than make the transitional period a little longer, until a new style of *working community*

in farming can be worked out, a style much nearer to friendly cooperation than administrative subordination.

Today's fundamental division into managers and subordinate workers is the chief source of shortcomings in large agricultural enterprises. It is not a question of external forms of human relations, but their very essence when one person gives orders and another performs them. Inevitably that unity of thought and action is rendered impossible, when it ought to be implemented to the greatest possible degree, if the occupation of farming possesses those qualities which I ascribe to it. Lack of this unity repels ambitious and educated aspirants from our profession, and subordinate personnel is recruited by a process of negative selection. Does a similar crisis, difficult to overcome, threaten the family farms as well?

PECULIARITIES OF FAMILY FARMS

The special features of small-scale farming, i.e. of the family farms, today as a rule without hired labour, have been a subject of keen interest and very varied appraisals for a long time. This is due to the dominant role which this type of farming plays to this day in European agriculture, and to its undoubted virtues of great tenacity in adverse conditions and great flexibility in adapting itself to lasting changes.

Note: The numerical preponderance of the farming population working on family farms over hired farm workers could be questioned in those socialist countries where full collectivization of agriculture has been carried out. But the families in the collectives could not be regarded as completely detached from family-type production. The family retains a small parcel of land, a very considerable share of the meat and dairy production. Moreover, in some collectives there is a growing tendency to entrust to every constituent family certain separate tasks on common land, with payment to the family for the products. It is, therefore, a mixed model.

Appraisal of the purely economic value of family farms is not our subject, so perhaps it is enough to make a general statement, that despite all the forecasts about the superiority of amalgamation, the competition of other kinds of farming have not in fact ousted the family farms. After thousands of years they have entered, undoubtedly, into a period of decline, but this is plainly for social reasons such as lack of continuity in inheritance, when none of the children wants to be a farmer, or the dishearteningly late independence for the young when fathers retain the management in their own hands, or the difficulty of obtaining full secondary education for young farmers when their labour is indispensable on the family farm, etc. But their economic performance remains quite

remarkable, and an explanation of what constitutes the true source of strength of this type of farming is indispensable, I think, for mapping out their future. The opinions hitherto published are extremely divergent and they emphasize the faults of peasant farming much more than its virtues. It might seem that it maintains its existence against all logic and to spite economists.

From the most traditional repertoire of arguments listing the peculiarities of peasant farming come statements about its semi-productive character, because of its close interlocking in everyday life with household work and the production of commodities largely for its own needs or, again, about the exceptional role played by the marginal labour of the members of the family, which constitutes a hidden reserve of prductive capacity, mobilized if and when necessary to support the farm as a whole. No one could deny that both these qualities do play a role, but they are not confined to peasant farming.

In every family where earnings are not high, a woman's work in the house, as well as the labour of the old and young, if they bring savings in consumption or if they supplement the family budget, are eagerly exploited. Nowhere in Europe has the question of household management, including the care of children, been successfully solved outside the family whether in town or country. It is not a peculiarity of the peasant household, therefore, that these functions absorb a considerable amount of time and effort, to some extent to the detriment of "professional" farm work. The difference lies rather in that in rural areas the organization of distribution is generally worse and the supply of household gadgets brings less relief.

Similarly, a marked degree of self-sufficiency in the provision of food ought not to be regarded as detracting from the professional character of peasant farming. A teacher who instructs his own children does not cease to be a teacher, nor does a painter who hangs his picture on his own wall stop being a painter. Extreme commendation of farming for the market is understandable in commercial circles, where every "reduction of turnover" is treated as sinful. The ordinary citizen, on the other hand, has no objection to the produce from his garden plot, and peasants, moreover, feel great respect for a batch of their own produce which, by virtue of passing through the shops, has had to carry two profit margins. They can also, thank goodness, calculate the cost of transport and their own wasted time. Thus, everything seems to indicate that an exaggerated pursuit of producing for the market should be treated as a hangover from the years of war shortages and ought not to be used as a weapon against family farming. Let us be content that family farms produce more for human needs from every acre, than do other kinds of farming enterprise.

Of much greater importance is the so-called marginal labour. Flexibility in the extent of actual work which a farming family can achieve when reacting to adverse circumstances, constitutes a fundamental weapon in the struggle for existence of this type of farming. But here too we should see not so much an exceptional feature of smallholdings but rather the normal behaviour of a family exposed to adversity. The same is true of a worker's overtime or of a clerk's additional work at home, or of the full-time or part-time work of a young mother who entrusts the care of her children and the household chores to a grandmother, or of all kinds of "cottage industry", in which old or young play their parts. A more significant difference lies, probably, in the fact that these marginal earnings in a sense force themselves upon a peasant family. The farm creates almost limitless possibilities of extending them and, with low overall incomes of peasant farmers, this wide use of additional labour becomes a daily occurrence rather than a reserve for exceptional times.

Note: It is only in the wealthy agriculture of some Western countries that the income from the work of a peasant family, together with interest from capital, equals or exceeds the income of employees in other branches of the economy. And so in these countries the marginal labour of the family, and especially of women, has been drastically curtailed.

Thus, the description of the family farm as being indissolubly bound up with the exploitation of marginal labour ought to be rejected.

One should mention also the attempts—less today but sometimes revived—to explain the strength and survival of family farms as being due to sentimental attachment to inherited property for the support of which no effort is spared. It is sufficient to point to the well known fact of the flight from farming into industry, as proof that the desire for land ownership was above all an effort to secure the means to earn a living and some support for one's old age in the face of possible and incalculable difficulties of existence. Today, when employment is sure and the benefit of old-age pensions has removed the reason for seeking security in land ownership, and when, on the other hand, the continuity of inheritance is breaking down, young farmers prefer to lease land, thus leaving them more freedom and needing less capital. The reason for confining a farmer to the ownership of land is disappearing; what matters is a good place for doing a job of work.

The above sketchy review of current opinions indicates that they tend to concentrate on the easily grasped material elements of production such as terms of exchange, degree of self-sufficiency, mechanization, labour (in the sense of working hours or of its cost) and do not provide a reply to the question: what constitutes the strength of the family farm? How striking is the neglect of problems relating to the quality of work, both in the sense of management and in the conscientious execution of duties.

THE UNITY OF DECISION-MAKING AND PERFORMANCE

The term "quality of work" is, indeed, quite often referred to as being both necessary and desirable, though it frequently assumes the character of a conventional formula which it just wouldn't do to forget. The true problems of good work in husbandry have been little studied. We know something about the correct course of action which a given task demands, and sometimes we even know the time-span needed for doing a job well or badly in certain conditions; but we know next to nothing of what it is that galvanizes a performer into achieving real rather than specious excellence in his work. We know that if decisions concerning the time and character of farming operations are to be fitting there must be full and prompt information about conditions and the right choice of equipment as well as efficient performance of duties. But how easily we lose sight of the distortion which occurs on a large farm when problems for diagnosis and decision have to be transmitted through a long series of minds. Nor do we know what difference a confident or distrustful appraisal of his instructions makes to the quality of a man's work.

Similarly, to take away the work of accounting from the manager of a farm would probably result in work of poor quality. The advocates of specialization assert that qualified accountants produce balance sheets more efficiently, and claim that by covering whole groups of farms they can get comparative data for different sections of farm economy. Yet we know how important it is in keeping normal control of a business to be in constant touch with the accounts. And figures set out in a form appreciated by the manager, even if they were less detailed, would be far more helpful to him than yearly statistics drawn up in an unfamiliar form.

One could multiply almost endlessly examples of negative results caused by separating the functions of manager and worker, and of positive ones when the two are combined—for individual work—and of course, for work on family farms. The work there is not strictly individualized, but the labour of the family members is fused with the management to a very high degree. The joint income of the family, which demands a common interest in the *whole* outcome of the economic activity, as well as a high degree of mutual trust, both in the disposition and in the good will of the members, mark this kind of enterprise and provide its vigour.

Among the criticisms of peasant farming, the supposed insurmountable difficulty of quiet progress on small farms is particularly stressed, as against the activities of highly qualified managers of large farms. I fully recognize that the time of traditional stagnation has ended, and that the present day evolution of farming follows the developments of science. It is also true, that the schooling of peasants is poorer than that of those engaged in other occupations. This is a result of the need for the young

people to work on the family farm. As I mentioned, it is one of the main reasons for the decline of this type of farming. But experience by no means confirms the notion that the large farms do better in the matter of schooling for their employees; indeed it brings impressive evidence of the farmer's own extramural self-education.

If hired farm workers are recruited mainly through what may be called negative educational selection, and in the course of their work neglect education as being superfluous in their state of constant subordination, the individual farmers, on the contrary, have worked out for themselves, either through their associations or by the help of the state, very effective means of expanding their professional knowledge. Scientific information through radio or special courses, professional literature and especially individual advisory services in the leading countries, have opened up a wide field for the application of scientific advances to the practice of farming. The highest yields per acre and the best breeds of animals are the achievements of independent individual farmers. Neither coercion, nor official instructions, but only fullness of his own aspirations and ambitions would lead a farmer to enrich his understanding of possible future improvements. He gets satisfaction from making a choice when an adviser, or some mass medium of instruction, puts forward proposals. His own individual decision and his responsibility for the outcome would mobilize all his efforts so that his involvement might not prove a mistake.

Thus, in matters of general progress and professional self-education as well as in the cheapness of its produce, the family farm, if it has had access to a well organized advisory service, is superior to the farm with hired labour. It owes both these advantages to the *symbiosis* of decision-making and work processes which is the fundamental element of its strength.

The crisis in agriculture which we are here analysing can be summed up as follows: the family farm which hitherto has been strong is suffering a decline against the background of far-reaching social changes, namely, the breakdown of the family as a united working team. Will it be possible, *with a different model of a working community,* to preserve that fusion of management and labour which is the source of economic strength in the fading model, the value of which continues to grow in the minds of the European farmer?

FROM THE FAMILY TEAM TO THE UNKNOWN

There is nothing at present to warrant the assumption that the breaking down of succession in farming families will be reversed. The right of the farmer's children to choose their occupations freely is being strengthened,

and when at the same time the percentage of the farming population in our countries is rapidly approaching ten per cent of the whole, then naturally the chance of inherting the occupation (as distinct from inheritance of property) is a very modest one. Nor is there any indication that hired agricultural labour is increasing its appeal, so that it might replace family labour instead of shrinking as it is at present. The hierarchical structure of the labour force does not allow for any changes in the direction of combining intellectual and physical activities for which there seems to be a growing demand. Collective farms of the Soviet type differ from farms with hired labour only in the system of remuneration; in the sphere of management and division of labour they are similar. The search for a modified relationship between decision-making and executive functions is barely in the experimental stage as yet.

Similarly, neither partnership nor cooperative neighbourhood teams for securing cheaper services, nor any vertically integrated organizations, even those managed by the producers themselves (however highly we may value them for the time being), would provide a permanent solution. It is easy to see in them a shallow reflection of the family model. The source of ferment among the young would remain, e.g. the difficulty of longer schooling, the complications in the change-over of generations, etc. Moreover, in spite of all the aversion to gigantomania among agriculturists, it is difficult not to concede that tiny productive units with from 1.5 to 3 workers would be too small for rational modern production. The desired conjunction of management and execution need not mean the fragmentation of the working unit into individual "grains". The difficulty lies precisely there: how to achieve a similar internal cohesion in a non-family yet plural community, while disregarding the ties of paternalism *inherent in the old model.*

It may be stated with considerable certainty that in contradistinction to some other occupations, which are evolving the new structure of working teams, we have not yet worked out a new pattern in agriculture. While among the teaching staff of a good school, or a team of doctors in a leading hospital or a research team in a scientific establishment or in a small precision-engineering workshop, new standards of collaboration between educated and ambitious people are being evolved, in agriculture everything is waiting to be worked out. Matters are not helped by the fact that traditional inertia comes up against a volatile mania for project-making which is ready to reform life at once at full scale, without experimental checks, without clear choice of objectives, whether near or distant, and sometimes even without knowing the essential differences of historical evolution and the economic conditions of individual countries.

Therefore, while expressing the need for a diligent search for a new *pattern of working relations* in our agriculture, we must recognize the

need to adopt a *clear-cut framework within which the experimentation* would be appropriate. Such a framework should be founded upon knowledge that it is only if the functions of management and labour are unified that a man of European culture would remain in farming after the present transitional period—a period which would probably be accompanied by a considerable increase in the general standard of living. In searching for such a pattern, not based on the family, the experiment could usefully include farms taken over by small groups of people well known to one another and trusting each other. Another helpful factor would be introduced if the whole group of workers had a similar standard of education and themselves shaped their system of management and division of labour. Perhaps it would also be practical to encourage collaboration by devising a system of material incentives by which the results of the economy of the farm as a whole and not of its sections would be rewarded. All these problems must be solved by teams of the farmers themselves before a pattern to serve as an example could be expected to emerge.

I do not doubt that many practical people would raise their voices and proclaim that such a view of the future is reaching for the impossible. I can only quote the opinion of a scholar, known to futurologists as Clarke's law: "Quand un savant distingué mais viellisant estime que quelque chose est possible, il a presque curement raison. Mais quand il déclare que quelque chose est impossible, il a très probablement tort" (Encyclopédie Planète, "Profil du futur", 1re Loi de Clarke).

SUMMARY

If in the present state of European culture there is an inherent tendency to put increasing value on the psychological aspects of work as a means of self-expression,

if it reveals itself in a tendency to blur the distinction between intellectual and physical labour and to utilize the whole potential of the human individual,

if the character of work in agriculture, more than in other occupations reveals the disruptive effects of separating the process of decision-making from that of execution, and if it gives rise to more dissatisfaction and to flight from farming as an occupation,

if in the organization of the family farm the unity of the functions of management and labour was the fundamental element of its strength,

if today, not for economic reasons, but on account of social evolution, the family farm ought to be replaced by another model,

then the search for a different structural pattern of farming must strive to preserve that valuable feature of family farming which was its

strength. Thus, the fundamental aim for the non-family community should be to evolve such a pattern of work as would remove the distinction between managers and workers. Instead, these functions would be fused and the work arranged jointly by the members of the community, all of whom would be on the same educational level.