

Pollution Solutions Take Time

The environment and ecology movement is going to bring extensive changes in the next 10 to 20 years.

Exactly what the changes will be is still far from certain. But the potential exists for very broad and basic changes that will have a big impact on everyone.

Because the farmer works with and is responsible for a large share of the environment in the form of farmland, he is necessarily in the forefront of the environment movement.

This is necessarily leading to increased interest in proper control of erosion and animal waste and in proper use and control of pesticides.

Intensive Farming

As farming becomes more intensive, as farmers respond to rising costs by attempting to increase output per acre, the environmental problems grow.

More intensive farming involves greater use of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers, as the farmer moves toward maximum control of the environment which determines output of his land.

More intensive farming also means more poultry, more cattle, more swine per farm and per acre. The increased numbers of poultry and livestock mean more animal waste.

The environmental problems which result from more intensive farming cannot be ignored by the farmer. To ignore the problems now and in the next few years is to invite serious and perhaps even insurmountable problems in the future.

The evidence of the past few years and the present and foreseeable trends indicate, we believe, that the environmental movement is serious and ongoing. To ignore it is to invite future disaster.

More Corn

The farmer who moves away from strip cropping in order to get more acres of corn and continuous corn may be moving in the direction of getting the maximum possible return from his land. But the increased erosion of his land from all-corn may be seriously depleting the long-term value of his land at the same time it is placing the farmer on a collision course with the environment.

To save his land and at the same time continue an all-corn program is possible on most farms. Conservation measures such as terraces and sod waterways can reduce erosion to a minimum. According to recent statements by Extension personnel, the greatest boon of no-till corn may prove to be its ability to cut erosion. Or the farmer may want to consider planting some of his land in another crop, such as alfalfa.

Through these and other measures, the farmer can practice intensive farming and still do his share to protect the environment.

Animal Waste

One of the most serious environmental problems resulting from the move to more intensive farming involves the whole area of animal waste. The odor problem plagues some farmers who have urban neighbors, but the most serious problem may be that of water run-off.

Rain water through feedlots or inadequate storage of poultry and animal waste can result in pollution of streams. While pollution from a few small farms may not be serious, pollution from hundreds of

farms which are continually moving toward larger numbers of poultry and livestock can result in very serious pollution — unless farmers practice pollution control.

Solutions Lag

Recognizing the problem, however, is not the same thing as solving it.

In recent years, particularly in the last couple of years, big strides have been made toward finding new and better ways of maintaining high farm yields while preserving the environment.

But the need for environmental control still far outpaces the know-how and the hardware with which to achieve it. This will remain true for some time, possibly for several years.

While some practices, such as terraces and sod waterways, have been proven, local officials report difficulty in getting manpower and equipment to install present inadequate levels of these measures.

No-till as a farm practice and a conservation measure is still in its infancy and should be considered experimental at this point.

Environmentalists talk knowingly about replacing chemicals with natural means of pest control. But there are cost problems, not enough is known, and in most instances this technique simply can't compete in terms of cost and efficiency.

Recycling

Recycling is attracting much greater attention recently than ever before. Potentially the best and most efficient means of eliminating the animal waste — and urban and industrial waste, as well — is simply to use the material over and over, it is becoming recognized.

But the know-how to recycle is still not developed. When the know-how is available, it will take large sums of money and much time to put it into use.

This does not include possible problems with public acceptance. It may be technically and financially possible to solve the waste problem through recycling long before it is socially acceptable.

When the farmer recognizes his pollution problems, it is only the beginning. It will take time and money to solve these problems.

In the rapidly changing farm scene, farmers have gotten used to the necessity of making financial investments in order to remain competitive. They can be counted on to make the necessary financial commitment to environmental control.

The multi-billion dollar farm program has become increasingly unpopular largely because of its high cost. But the cost of unsound environmental policies in terms of higher food costs could become many times greater.

No Fast Solutions

But there are those who do not want to give the farmer the time he needs to make the adjustments.

There are those who forget that their bread and milk and meat come from the farm. They ignore the possible impact of hasty and unwise environmental controls in reducing the quantity and quality of their food, while increasing its cost.

Haste makes waste. The potential for waste through hasty and emotional solutions to our environmental problems is great.

While recognizing that we do have problems and while moving toward immediate reductions of these problems, we must all recognize that the environment and ecology movement springs from long-standing abuses.

For the movement to be really successful, we must give our vast technical and educational system time to work. We must view a clean environment as a goal of the next 10 to 20 years.

This may seem like a long time for the new generation. But, as youths will find and as their elders already know, a decade or two is all too short for those who are busy meeting the challenges of their day.



NOW IS THE TIME . . .

By Max Smith
Lancaster County Agent

To Put Leases In Writing

Many tenant farmers will be moving to new farms about April 1. We hope that the majority of the agreements have been put in writing and all parties concerned got a copy. We realize that a written lease may not make an honest man out of one who wants to deal unfairly; however, with the agreement in writing there is less chance of misunderstanding and failure to perform as agreed. Put it down in writing for best results.

To Topdress Winter Wheat

Wheat growers who are interested in maximum yields of wheat and straw may want to topdress with nitrogen this spring as soon as vegetative growth starts. The rate will vary from 25 to 60 pounds of actual nitrogen per acre depending upon the fertility of the soil and whether or not the area is seeded down to alfalfa or

clover. Soils that leach rapidly such as sand, shale, or gravel will need the heavier applications; broadcast the minimum amount on fields to be seeded down to a legume.

To Fertilize Pastures

Livestock producers that have some permanent pasture will increase the grazing capacity by applying fertilizer early in the spring. On permanent bluegrass — white clover mixtures a complete fertilizer such as 10-10-10 would be suggested. On straight grass pastures such as orchardgrass, or other grass mixtures, only nitrogen may be used to give quick growth. Some producers will treat only a part of the area with nitrogen during late March or early April so that area will grow more rapidly and then the herd or flock can be turned out earlier in the spring. A complete soil test will reveal the real needs of the pasture area.

THE BIBLE SPEAKS

Internet and Uniform
Sunday School Lessons

BY LAWRENCE W. ALTHOUSE

HAVE YOU 'HAD IT'?

Lesson for March 14, 1971

Background Scripture: Matthew 6:9-15; 18:21-35.
Devotional Reading: Matthew 6:5-15.

"Karl," said his mother softly, "Alec is downstairs—he wants to see you."

In the same low voice Karl replied: "Just tell him I don't want to see him, Mother."

"Oh, Karl, you can't send him away like that."

His mother's voice was both sympathetic and persuasive. "I know he made you angry—and I can understand how you felt: it was a careless thing to do—but he's here to

Rev. Althouse apologize; he wants to tell you he's sorry."

"Sorry!" Karl exploded. "he's always sorry afterwards. He was sorry after he lost my homework paper before Christmas and I got an 'F' on that project. He was sorry last week after he passed me a note in history class and I got detention. But today he borrows my transistor radio and leaves it on the bus and now he's sorry again." Karl's voice now was loud but he didn't care. "I'm sorry, Mother, but I've 'had it' with his being sorry!"

How many times?

There was silence for a few moments until his mother said evenly: "Karl, how many times have you said 'I'm sorry' to your father or to me? How many times have you asked us to accept your apologies? What did you say on Saturday night when you got home an hour late for supper? And what words did you use two weeks ago when you put that long scratch in the fender? Are we supposed to count your apologies and call a halt when we reach a certain number?"

He stared at her and she stared back. There was no need for him to make the obvious answer. Nodding his head slightly, Karl got up and started downstairs.

How many times are we supposed to forgive someone? Once again, Jesus was being questioned about the limits of love. How far are we asked to go? The rabbis seemed agreed that three was enough to meet God's requirement. Turning back to Amos, they had noted that the prophet seemed to use a certain recurrent formula:

Thus says the Lord: "For three transgressions of Damascus, and for four, I will not revoke the punishment; . . ." (Amos 1:3, 6, 9, ff.)

The rabbis thus reasoned that this meant God would forgive three transgressions, but not four. Thus they devised their rule: A man shall be forgiven three times. So when Peter offered to forgive his brother seven times (better than twice what the rabbis required), he evidently thought he was making a most generous offer.

Seventy times seven . . . and beyond!

How surprised he must have been then when Jesus answered, "I do not say to you seven times, but seventy times seven" (Matt. 18:22). Even if Peter was not able to quickly multiply these two numbers in his head, he realized the magnitude of the answer.

Earlier in Matthew Jesus had said: "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy" (5:7). In the giving of the Lord's Prayer he had said: "Forgive us our debts as we also have forgiven our debtors" (6:14). In the parable he is saying the same thing: God will forgive our sins, but his forgiveness is dependent upon our own willingness to forgive the relatively smaller transgressions against us by others. A Christian ought never to have "had it" when it comes to forgiveness!

(Based on outlines copyrighted by the Division of Christian Education, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Released by Community Press Service.)

ATTEND THE CHURCH OF YOUR CHOICE SUNDAY

LANCASTER FARMING

Lancaster County's Own Farm Weekly

P. O. Box 266 - Lititz, Pa. 17543
Office: 22 E. Main St., Lititz, Pa. 17543
Phone: Lancaster 394-3047 or Lititz 626-2191

Robert G. Campbell, Advertising Director
Zane Wilson, Managing Editor

Subscription price: \$2 per year in Lancaster County; \$3 elsewhere

Established November 4, 1955
Published every Saturday by Lancaster Farming, Lititz, Pa.
Second Class Postage paid at Lititz, Pa. 17543.

Member of Newspaper Farm Editors Assn
Pa. Newspaper Publishers Association, and
National Newspaper Association