A26—Lancaster Farming, Saturday November 8, 1980



Dear Editor:

I read your editorial of October 25 "The Three Percent Solution", as an indirect reply to Jerry Webb's last two Farm Talk columns in which he sings the familiar tune that fewer farmers and bigger farms means better farming.

Without specifying the possible conditions that would bring it about, you say that a time will come when three percent is not enough. I agree, and find Mr. Webb's last two pieces as trite paeans for the Amorican agricultural system that has evolved over the last 35 to 40 years. We have no guarantee that the same trends will continue – and maybe they shouldn't.

The Farm Talk column of October 25 bothered me so much that I urafted a rebuttal. His comments about the greatness of American agriculture raised some questions. I did some research and found some answers – and they in turn led to more questions.

Webb described the "phantom" farming of the

Delmarva peninsula, marvelling at its productivity and efficiency, but prudently declining to pass judgment on its long-run value in our civilization.

Then one week later, in his October 25 column, he reversed himself and came down firmly in support of government paid research into more mechanization, more bigness, more efficiency, and fewer people on the land. Quote: "There's no question that America has developed the best agricultural system in the world."

This view betrays an agribusiness bias, and sees farmers as just another factor or cost of production. The more we can produce, with the least labor, the better, according to Mr. Webb. Several things are wrong, or at best one-sided in that analysis.

First of all, "efficiency" and "productivity" are relative terms We have to ask, against what input is America's farm output efficient? In terms of manhours of labor, our production is indeed marvellous. agreed, only three farmers can feed 100 Americans and have a surplus left over.

To use another measure of productivity – yields per acre – our superiority is unchallenged, but only in corn. Several European countries get double our wheat and barley yields. And still more produc-

And sum more productivity questions crop up: what if we ask about yields per gallon of fuel, or yields per dollar of capital invested? And, while we're asking, can our system that produces so much per acre sustain itself over many generations?

It's only been about 35 years that those three or four farmers have been feeding 100 of the rest of us, a very short span compared to the millenia over which we humans have drawn our sustenance from the soil.

Those questions must be asked, even if the answers might disturb those long accustomed to uncritically accepting whatever the economists and engineers tell them is progress.

Some answers, barely scratching the surface of a whole new way of looking at American farming:

U.S. farm output increased by 90 percent from 1940 to 1975, during the same period that so many people left the farm labor force. Wonderful, maybe. But... during those same years fertilizer use increased 900 percent. New question: are we depleting the fertility of our topsoil and hiding the loss by pouring on more chemical fertilizers?

One study of Indiana farms found an average of \$500,000 invested per worker. (Even General Motors has only \$40,000 invested per worker.) Is this a desirable capital-to-labor ratio? Is it really efficient to farm with money instead of with people?

To say that America has developed the best agricultural system in the world is chauvinistic prattle - something we'd expect from incumbent candidates in an election year, but not from an intelligent observer of global trends in agriculture.

The system, with all its good and bad points, developed as it did because of conditions unique to America fertile (and formerly cheap) land, cheap energy, and an ever-growing industry could absorb surplus rural labor.

These conditions are changing; our farming system never was the best for every time and place, and may not prove the best for the coming times in this place.

Maynard Withesell R8 Johnstown

Dear Editor:

I enjoyed your editorial about the KILE. As mentioned there are many things large and small that must be changed for the show to remain viable.

In your opening comments you mentioned The Standard of Perfection Polled Hereford show scheduled for the 1981 event. This breed event can definitely add gréatly to the entire show but only if show officials are ready to do things properly as should be the case with a major stock show.

The basic purpose of a stock show would have to be considered both educational and promotional. It is safe to assume that those animals that are shown are high value individuals; not only, to an individual breeder, but in many cases to the breed as a whole.

My first acquaintance with KILE was at the time when I was a member of the Ohio State Intercolligate Judging Team. The stock show not only presented an outstanding contest but an excellent display of purebred livestock. Most all the leading herds East of the Mississippi were present.

At recent shows this attendance has not been evident. Some of the same individuals were involved with the show throughout the entire period. But, they are individuals and cannot be expected to buck against a system that seems determined to extinguish the interest of prospective exhibitors. The facilities provided at the present KILE are, at best, substandard, when the beef cattle were housed in the cattle barn; now used to stall horses, and they were shown in the large arena, these surroundings made for a much safer & prestigious exposition.

It seems to be a totally opposite position of KIILE show management to confine the progress of this show when the national attitude of major livestock shows is toward better facilities and improved cooperation between exhibitors and show management. There are a few ' superintendents who really do seem to earnest to do the best job they are allowed to do.

Cliff Orley, owner Keystone Cattle Service Member, Eastern National Livestoc'. Show Board of Directors



