The purpose of this paper is to look forward to the roles and functions of the farm organizations in 1980. When we reach that year, we shall have completed nearly 200 years in which American agricultural societies have existed. By far the greatest number and variety have been organized since World War I, however.

The bewildering profusion of private associations in this nation has been as significant a characteristic of its political life as the federal system and the two-party system. As one observer commented:

The political associations that exist in the United States are only a single feature in the midst of the immense assemblage of associations in that country. Americans of all ages, all conditions, all dispositions, constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds kinds, in which religious, moral, serious, futile, general or restricted, enormous, or diminutive... If it is proposed to inculcate some truth or to foster some feeling...they form a society.  

That observer was Alexis de Tocqueville and the time was 130 years ago. Unless George Orwell's gloomy pictures of the atomization of group loyalties in his book 1984 come to pass, American agriculturalists will still have an opportunity to belong to several types of farm organizations 15 years hence.

There are two major sources upon which the predictions as to the character of farm organizations and the services which they may provide in 1980 are based. The first is the series of background papers. To build on this and to make a more detailed projection, a four-page questionnaire was sent to 30 associations in the farm organization field. With only four exceptions, all organizations responded. This activity was followed by personal interviews with representatives of nine organizations in Washington, D.C.
The answers to the questionnaire and the interviews demonstrated that most officials and staff members of farm organizations have done little thinking or planning about their organizations' role a decade or more in the future. This well illustrates what March and Simon refer to as the "Gresham's Law" of planning: that daily routine drives out planning.\(^2\) This conference may help to remedy the situation.

Before looking forward to 1980, we might look back 15 years at the changes which have occurred in American agriculture over a comparable time period. This has been a period of new techniques, fantastic output, declining farm population, steady increases in farm size, rising farm costs, and unprofitable enterprises for many producers. It was during this time that vertical integration revolutionized the poultry industry. It has been 15 years of new demands on the education and skill of farmers. It has been a time of a changing rural environment, with suburban fingers probing into agricultural areas and a time of depopulation of some rural communities. It has also been a time of widening markets and of focused interest in the development of international markets. During this time the industrial nations denied earlier predictions that they would abandon agriculture and rely on developing nations for their food.

This has been a period of controversies over the Brannan Plan, flexible versus rigid price supports, the Soil Bank, the 1961 Omnibus bill, the commodity approach, and mandatory versus voluntary programs. The one governmental program which has drawn widest support has been Public Law 480 and its combined concern for human welfare and emphasis upon private enterprise.

These technological, social, economic, and political changes have had profound and far reaching effects on the organizations which have represented agricultural producers.

Debates over policy issues during this period involved most farm organizations and provided each with some victories and some defeats. Differences between them on such issues as the level of price supports and voluntary versus mandatory production control programs hardened, leaving some little room for maneuver. Probably the Farm Bureau's greatest satisfaction came during the Eisenhower-Benson Administration in 1953 to 1961 and the defeat of the Kennedy Administration wheat program in the referendum of May 1963. The Grange and Farmers Union have undoubtedly found greater satisfaction in the programs which have been adopted by the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations. That none of these organizations found favor in the eyes of some farmers was evidenced in the creation of the National Farmers' Organization in 1955. Its emphasis on collective bargaining as a means of determining prices of farm commodities, while rejecting the cooperative approach, has evidently been less

\(^2\)James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (1959), 185.
than successful; yet this organization can still outdraw the others at meetings in several states of the Midwest.

Other dissatisfaction with existing farm organizations led to the development of new commodity associations in wheat in 1950, corn in 1956, and tobacco in 1962.\(^3\) The commodity organizations were brought into the Department of Agriculture policy development process to a greater extent after 1961.

Certainly the declining farm population did not induce a parallel reduction in the number of farm organizations. Neither did the reduction in number of farmers reflect itself uniformly in the membership rolls of these organizations. The Farm Bureau increased by 1.36 percent between 1950 and 1965. The Farmers Union declined slightly, and the Grange's addition of suburban and small town members partially offset its loss of farm members in New England.\(^4\) Although NFO figures are not published, membership in 1962 was said to be one-third less than its 180,000 peak of 1958.\(^5\) In some states there is considerable overlapping membership among farm organizations.

The decline in farm population and the increase in the size of farm units has had significant effects upon cooperatives during the past decade and a half. Most have lost members but have increased the volume of their business.\(^6\) At least three trends have been apparent in the farm supply and farm marketing field. The first has been that of using the slack resources of management to diversify. Thus marketing cooperatives have gone into related supply services for their members, and supply cooperatives have moved into the marketing field. The second has been the greater modernization and sophistication of cooperatives, which have become more competitive. The third has been the merger of cooperatives to get the size necessary to make them competitive. This development has occurred primarily because of a widening of markets, a trend which has made local cooperatives ineffective and has forced

---

\(^3\) The National Association of Wheat Growers has some 75,000 members while the National Corn Growers Association has but a few thousand. Older active commodity associations are the American National Cattlemen's Association (1897), American Soybean Association (1925), American Sugar Cane League (1922), and the National Wool Growers Association (1865).

\(^4\) The Farm Bureau membership total of 1,647,455 for 1954 represents that many families. Both the Farm Bureau and the Grange accept non-farm members. Only farmers may join the Farmers Union.

\(^5\) George Brandsberg, _The Two Sides in NFO's Battle_, Iowa State University Press, (1964) pp. 70, 72, 75, 222.

consolidation. A new element in the cooperative marketing picture is Farm Bureau's affiliate, the American Agricultural Marketing Association. Operating primarily through state Farm Bureau cooperatives, this has enabled the general farm organization to tie in with producers of some 15 different specialty commodities.

Population shifts have not been wholly unfavorable to cooperatives. Suburban growth into rural cooperative territories has enhanced the position of these groups and has widened and strengthened their markets. On the other side this growth and consequent service has brought the rural electric cooperatives into a new conflict with the private power companies. Rural electric cooperatives have stabilized in number in the past 15 years and have lost individual members, but have sold more electricity to their remaining customers. The federal government system under which rural electric cooperatives live has threatened them on two fronts. The first is in Congress and the Administration, where there are constant challenges to the loan program; the other is in the states, where the location of boundaries and regulation of service is determined by public service commissions or state legislatures.

Increased production which outran population growth in the United States forced producers and processors to give attention to foreign markets. This interest spurred the passage of Public Law 480 in 1954 and focused further attention on foreign market development. Further, the Foreign Agriculture Service's administrative decision to develop overseas markets through private trade associations brought about the creation of additional vertically integrated commodity trade associations with farm organization members. These associations -- which tied together seedsmen, producers, processors, and exporters -- may be one of the most portentous structures in the farm organization field. They increase the incentive to create and continue commodity organizations and have provided new channels of communications between producers and exporters. As vertically integrated trade associations in a commodity which is not vertically integrated economically, they may be hastening the day in which vertical integration becomes a fact.

7In the 12 years ending in 1962, the 7,409 supply cooperatives declined by 417, or 5 percent. Ibid., p. 75.
8Among the post-PL 480 market development associations are: Soybean Council of America (farmers, farm organizations, country elevators, cooperatives, processors, grain handlers, exporters, trade associations, and servicing industries), 1956; U.S. Feed Grains Council (two producer organizations, cooperatives, grain and grain processing firms, exporters, and shipping lines), 1960; and the Rice Council for Market Development (producers and rice processing firms), 1957. Perhaps they were patterned after the National Cotton Council, organized in 1939. It is made up of six segments of the industry.
Factors Which May Affect Farm Organization

As we move into the future toward 1980, we find that the background papers are in substantial agreement as to the picture which they project of the farm firm of the future. There will be between 800,000 and 1,500,000 farmers, with some two-thirds of this number producing the vast majority of the output. The farm population will be less than 4 percent of the nation's total. The decrease in the number of farms will be accompanied by an increase in the average size of farms and a substantial increase in the number of largest farms. The production units will be more specialized, more mechanized, and more dependent upon a high level of management skill. Most of our background papers suggested that the family farm would persist, although it would be quite different from the family farm of history and sentiment. As to a hint on the role of farm organizations, Dr. Breimyer suggests the further growth of super farms and of vertical integration. He has suggested that when the latter is complete, sovereignty in agriculture may be retained only through cooperatives.

Other factors than the farm firm structure will affect farm organizations and the services that they provide. The decrease in the size of farm population might be noted next. The increased urbanization of the nation will mean that the vast majority of the population will have no direct interest in agriculture and that relatively few will have ties of background and kinship to agriculture. Agriculture's problems of political representation will stem partially from its minority position in the total voting population. This will be accentuated, however, by the fact that it will probably not be able to exercise the disproportionate political power that it has enjoyed while its population has been steadily declining in recent decades.

The decrease in agriculture's excessive representation began with the federal court decision of 1962, which declared that failure to reapportion a state legislature according to the state constitution was a judicial question. This was followed by the 1964 Supreme Court decision that the equal protection of the laws clause of the Fourteenth Amendment required that both houses of a state legislature be apportioned according to population. We know the immediate results. Failing to initiate a constitutional amendment in Congress, rural interests and their allies have attempted to rush through state legislatures a resolution requesting Congress to call a constitutional convention to permit apportionment of one house of a state legislature on bases other than population. Although 25 states have passed such a resolution, the prospect that nine more will do so is uncertain and the further probability that Congress might comply with the request is not at all sure. Even if Congress responds by proposing such an amendment itself and if such an amendment is adopted by three-fourths of the states, agricultural interests have made a new concession. Seldom in recent years have they conceded that even one house or legislature shall be on the basis on population.
Agricultural interests are paying the penalty for decades in which many state legislatures refused to reapportion themselves as required by their own constitutions. The time is late, and the reconstitution of state legislatures according to the one man-one vote principle and the growing urbanization of the nation make it seem likely that agriculture's representation in state legislatures would not be greatly disproportionate to the number of people engaged in agriculture. It would be more in accordance with the situation in which manufacturing, commercial, and financial interests found themselves in the past. The upshot is that, lacking direct political representation of their interests, agricultural producers would be much more dependent upon functional or organizational representation.

The nature and structure of other groups in the economy by 1980 will also have an effect upon the needs for farm associations. Lacking the restraint of governmental action, it seems likely that manufacturing, financial, and retail enterprises will continue their large scale organization. Those who deal with them, particularly as sellers of raw materials, may be in a very weak bargaining position as individuals. The prediction that the middleman will disappear in the export grain trade, leaving the producer to bargain with the exporter, accentuates the disparity in bargaining ability of the participants. Today's firm emphasis upon bargaining power by such diverse organizations as the NFO and the Farm Bureau indicate a developing situation.

The development and control of markets in an international sense will have a major impact upon producers of raw materials. The overseas demands for food products seem to be due for an inevitable boost by the exploding populations of Latin America, Asia, and Africa, and by rising living standards in other parts of the world. This may result in two kinds of markets, the latter being one in which the United States exports commodities in exchange for dollars and the former one which would provide food stuffs for barter, counterpart funds, or simply for the maintenance of a stable society. If our export sales are to be only for dollars, the role of our government is primarily that of encouraging access of our products into markets of other nations and of minimizing barriers against them. In the other situation, the role of the United States government would be quite different.

The international scene will, of course, affect farm organizations in 1980 by the fact that the world may be characterized by either global or limited wars or by comparative peace. A major war would affect the kind of domestic and international society which survives and in which private associations would endeavor to continue. Widespread disruption of public government might make the local farm organization a viable institution upon which to build a socio-economic and political relationship between interdependent individuals. On the other hand, private associations might be such disruptive and parochial threats to the rebuilding of a unified political society that they might be outlawed.
Most likely (and optimistically) military warfare will be limited but economic warfare carried on between regional or ideological blocs. In such a situation, and considering population predictions, food would be a potent weapon. However, its use as an arm of foreign policy would be inevitably intertwined with domestic policy. The compromise of foreign with domestic demands would inevitably affect the organizations which represent producers.

The kind of elected and appointed leadership which each organization will have may affect its future considerably. Those who view the world objectively and perceive the need for changes and try to move the organization toward it may help the association to survive. Those who are inclined to let the organization float with the current may assist it to drift to relative ineffectiveness. The organization may not disappear, but its existence would hardly matter.

Last, science and technology will have much to do with the kind of agriculture which we will have and the role of farm organizations. The creation in the laboratory of synthetics which can be produced commercially has had considerable impact on cotton and wool. Other research may change the chemical composition of a particular commodity so as to widen its use. Ultimately, agriculture as we know it may face the pressure of synthetic foodstuffs. While we would not expect this to affect immediately the production of all food and fiber, it is likely to move in competition to particular products at one time and to have a significant impact in this way. The oleomargarine-butter controversy of the 1940's and 1950's was an early example of the impact of science and technology upon the competitive position of different agricultural products.

As we look at farm organizations today and consider their future it is well to apply what organization theory has to say about the creation and survival of human organizations. The Barnard-Simon theory states the conditions under which an organization can induce its members to continue their membership, thus helping to assure its survival. These observers have stated that an organization will continue to exist as long as contributions from members are sufficient to support and supply the organization with inducements large enough to get members to continue to contribute. They have suggested two variables affecting a member's likelihood of withdrawing from an organization. The first is the desirability of movement as the member sees it and the second is the ease of movement as he sees it.

For example, if a member is dissatisfied with a farm organization, he does have several alternatives open to him: (1) he may attempt to change the policy or practice with which he disagrees; (2) he may with-

\[9\] James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, *op.cit.*, p. 84f.
draw his membership; (3) after withdrawing, he may join another organization which he expects to satisfy his aspirations; or (4) he may retain his membership in the organization with which he is dissatisfied because of other benefits which he derives from it and join another organization which promises greater satisfaction in the area of discontent. An organization, the survival of which is threatened, may adapt to a new situation. It is difficult for the membership to force this action directly, but they may be able to pressure the management and elected leaders to do so over a period of time. We can keep these factors in mind as we look ahead at the kind of services that may be needed in 1980.

Assuming the gradual decline in number of farmers which has been predicted and the highly capitalized, specialized production unit which will characterize American agriculture, what services will farmers need that farm organizations can provide in 1980? Related to this is the kind of farm organization which can provide this service.

**Services Needed in 1980**

We may expect the following services to be needed by farmers in 1980, all of which may be provided by farm organizations: Policy development, representation, education and information, supply, marketing, market development, management training and aids, public relations, and social institution.

**Policy Development**

Just as now, there will be need for a structure through which ideas for trade and governmental policies may originate or be studied, challenged, and forged into a viewpoint which can be supported by an organized group. No policies or programs in a society as complex as ours can be termed simple, but the development of policy is less complicated in an organization based on a single commodity than in a general farm organization. When a problem presents itself, a commodity group can proceed to consider it and bring forth alternative solutions on a relatively narrow basis. Once the organization as a formal group has expressed its opinion by resolution it can focus its attention more intensely than a group with wider interests. The predicted continued increase in specialized farm production would mean more producers concentrating on only one or two commodities. Their interest in policy development would thus coincide more nearly with the commodity organization. Marketing cooperatives would be in a similar position to commodity groups except in those matters which affect cooperatives along. This would be a unifying factor. In 1980, as now, the chief internal problem of some commodity organizations may be that of regional competition.
On the other hand, the general farm organization, representing several or many commodities, is able to consider their problems and alternatives and coordinate them with each other before presentation to government. Thus the general farm organization may help to compromise conflicting interests before they enter the public arena. The American Farm Bureau Federation, the most widely organized of the three general farm organizations, should continue to be effective in this way. Both the Grange and the Farmers Union are more regionally based organizations and thus would have fewer commodities represented within their structure.\textsuperscript{10} The overhead cooperative organizations will be able to speak for those whose products are marketed cooperatively,\textsuperscript{11} but here too is an inherent problem. The unifying factor in this organization is the method of marketing, not the interrelationships of the commodities.

The vertically integrated commodity organization probably will be the most unsatisfactory machine for policy development. Structurally, the involvement of all elements from producer to processor may place too much strain on attainment of a consensus on goals. If unanimity is required, the experience of the National Cotton Council in 1963 may be instructive. Its effort to support the Administration cotton subsidy bill foundered when Farm Bureau officials, dominating the production sector, vetoed the policy proposal. The restriction of policy development and support by the U.S. Feed Grains Council to export policies only is an attempt to narrow areas upon which agreement must be reached.

Of all the functions of farm organizations, that of policy development is most likely to provide the basis for threatening the organization itself. When a dissenting minority believes that it cannot accept the organization position, the individual members can choose the alternatives suggested by Simon.

Here the multifunctional organization has an advantage in terms of survival. Members may disagree with the Farm Bureau's policy stands, but wish to continue buying fertilizer or insurance from the Farm Bureau co-op, or the Farmers Union member who disagrees doesn't want to cut himself off from the grain marketing co-op. Dissenters may join another organization for its policy stand, but retain membership in the general organization.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10} The American Farm Bureau has state units chartered in 49 states (Alaska excepted) and Puerto Rico. The Farmers Union has state units in 22 states. It has no units in the South and Southeast except for Virginia, Arkansas, and Texas. The Grange is organized in 38 states.

\textsuperscript{11} Specifically, the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, the National Livestock Producers Association, and the National Milk Producers Federation.

\textsuperscript{12} Seven years ago, President Jim Patton of the National Farmers Union told the writer, "No farm organization can build membership on policy alone; it must provide other services."
Thus the commodity organization which is primarily concerned with policy development and support seems most vulnerable in the years ahead.

**Representation**

Representation is perhaps the most fundamental reason for organization. It was deemed essential for men to band together for similar objectives at the time of de Tocqueville's visit in the first decade of Jacksonian democracy. How much more necessary it has become in the heavily populated, specialized and complex world of the Twentieth Century to have spokesmen for particular interests.

Direct democracy has been used considerably in agriculture, but the needs of producers to express opinions go far beyond choices. We can hold a referendum to give producers a choice between one of two wheat programs or of rejecting or accepting a 19.5 percent cut in tobacco allotments. These are one-time, alternative choices which can be decided by a mass vote. The details which go into the preparation of such choices cannot be presented to all producers over and over again.

The private association has proved itself effective and useful in the United States as a representative device. It has facilitated communications between economic groups, and by 1980 the need for this may increase. Currently, the Farm Bureau's continuing contacts with buying and processing groups and NFO's negotiations with livestock buying firms illustrate the functioning of the representative role in the private sector.

The pervasiveness of public government in the agricultural economy is well known. By 1980, government may not be called upon to decide on the use or degree of production controls or of price supports. It may be requested to determine shipping rates and services, the propriety of economic pricing and competitive practices, and labor relations. The interrelationship of technology and government would expand government's role as regulator in the public interest. Issues such as the cranberry scare of 1959, the *Silent Spring* controversy of 1963-64, and the recent smoking and health issue may develop. Thus affected agricultural interests would need to see them through with the least harm.

Representatives of agricultural interests will, of course, need to appear before legislative bodies, administrative agencies, regulatory agencies, and occasionally the courts. As now, state legislatures and county governing bodies will be making decisions affecting agriculture. Locally, farmers will need representation to present their viewpoints on matters of taxation, local government boundaries, schools, subdivision regulations, zoning, and extension of governmental services.
The need for effective representation will, as mentioned before, be greater as the farm population's overrepresentation in legislative bodies diminishes. Functional representation through private association can to some extent offset numerical losses.

Representation poses some problems which are worthy of consideration. First, by 1980, the spokesman for a farm organization would need some back-up specialists. The general and commodity organizations today rely principally on their elected officials and a legislative specialist. The agricultural world of 15 years hence may severely strain such resources.

Second is the problem of communicating with legislators who will have no background in agriculture. Unless Congress improves its staffing, most of its members in 1980 will have to depend almost entirely on what the Administration and lobbyists tell them about agricultural problems.

Third, as organizations become larger, the distance between members and their delegated representatives becomes greater and more difficult to bridge. This is controlled somewhat by Farm Bureau and Farmers Union by retaining their national headquarters in Chicago and Denver, respectively, but is by itself no guarantee.

Fourth is the question of bureaucratic control. Some organizations permit their executive secretary to testify on matters of public policy; others prohibit it. The executive secretary may be better informed as the complexity of issues at the top, but he does not always live with the problem on the farm.

Fifth is the problem of formal representation of interests. By 1980, the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts may be heavily involved in programs affecting urban and suburban residents. Will these people have a formal share in the selection of representatives? The answer involves a change in the nature of the organization.

Sixth is the basic question propounded by Sir Edmund Burke almost 200 years ago: Should the representative carry out the wishes of his constituents or should he represent them on the basis of his own best judgment and information? Some men of integrity have chosen one; some have selected the other. Undoubtedly the level of knowledge and interest of the members should be a factor.

Last is the question, Who is represented? It is customary for farm organization leaders to insist that they speak for all members. We know that this can be so only in the smallest and most cohesive groups. In any farm organization there are members who are interested and in favor of a particular policy, and members who are disinterested, and members who are interested but oppose that policy. Unless that last group makes its opposition known, we can assume that the organization does speak for all.

Ideally, effective and accurate representation of all farmer viewpoints in 1980 would call for several farm organizations similar to those existing today. Predictions that farmers will be represented by "one big organization" seems unlikely -- their interest will be too diverse.
Education and Information

That the farmer of 1980 would need to be well educated in technology, economics, and management is clear. In some type of agricultural production, knowledge and understanding of administration would be essential. In many cases, continuing education of this kind could be provided best by public agencies such as the extension service and community colleges. Specific information could be provided by commercial organizations and by cooperatives.

"Now and in the future nothing is more important than to educate the farmer as the operator of a business enterprise about the national and international economic, social, and political forces that affect his market."13 If we accept this idea, and it seems reasonable, since markets have moved from local to regional to national to international, the educational task is considerable. Much of it can be performed by public agencies, but objectivity is not their possession alone. The education of adults is necessarily voluntary education. Hence the clientele must be sought where it can be contacted and interested and taught. From the point of motivation alone, since it will be concerned with policy development and representation, the farm organization, whether general, commodity, or cooperative can perform this function if it has the specialized staff to select material and train discussion leaders. If it does so, it will be doing what some large industrial firms have done for years.

The weakness in farm organization sponsorship of educational programs is a possible lack of objectivity. Once a policy position has been hammered out, leaders do not like to put it in the position of being questioned. Farm organizations, like most private associations, generally do not advertise their internal disagreements in their member publications. Nevertheless, some of the state Farm Bureaus have done commendable educational work on international trade, for example. Education will be needed in 1980, and farm organizations should have some share in it.

Supply Services

During the past two decades cash production expenses have increased relative to gross cash receipts until they now are 75 percent of gross cash receipts. This trend has been predicted to continue. If predictions that agriculture prices will decline are borne out, economies in production will be essential. Cooperatives which are larger and competitive with other businesses may provide many production items at savings or act to keep private prices' in line. To provide this service cooperatives must have efficient management and a fairly large scale of operations, and must receive overhead services

from their national cooperative associations.\textsuperscript{14}

In some communities, supply cooperatives and electric cooperatives must continue to widen their clientele to include suburban and city residents.\textsuperscript{15} However, the cooperatives' success stimulate private utilities to try to restrict them. The cooperative defense then may be to sell not only to suburban residents but to make them members. The distinction between a farm supply cooperative and a consumer cooperative may become blurred, but it will fit the kind of society in which it operates more closely.

**Marketing**

Even as agricultural producers become fewer but larger, they are merely paralleling the pattern followed by those who buy their products. Concern about the bargaining power of farmers is now expressed by leaders of practically all farm organizations. Probably no changes in agriculture will be greater than those in market structure.

The cooperatives, as farm organizations, may have a major role to play in attempting to give individual producers bargaining strength. If they do this, they must be fewer in number and larger and must have able management. If vertical integration moves rapidly into other commodities, the marketing cooperative seems the final hope in retaining sovereignty with the production unit. Of all functions suggested, this seems to be the one which most defies prediction.

**Market Development**

Domestic market development and promotion has been carried out through demonstration and advertising campaigns for several years. It has centered around a single commodity and has been financed by assessments.

Public Law 480 made available substantial amounts of public funds to private groups for overseas market development. It was thus a major stimulus, although a few commodities had been the objects of foreign promotion by producer or trade groups before passage of P.L. 480. Currently some 45 trade associations are operating foreign market development programs, using foreign currencies under FAS supervision. Some are producer dominated, such as Great Plains Wheat, Incorporated and Western Wheat Associates, Incorporated, both supported from fees levied by state wheat commissions.

\textsuperscript{14}The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the National Milk Producers Federation, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the American Institute of Cooperation.

\textsuperscript{15}REA has estimated a three-fold increase in demand for power requirements from cooperative systems between 1962 and 1980.
on each bushel of what sold. In others, such as the Rice Development Council, U.S. Feed Grains Council, and Tobacco Associates, producers are outnumbered by processing and marketing interests.

Market promotion is based upon the effort of one commodity or product to obtain a competitive advantage over others. Therefore, there is little incentive to integrate several promotional efforts, either domestic or foreign, within one organization. Barring economic studies which would show the relative lack of effectiveness of a market development program, we can expect domestic programs to continue at least until 1980. They would still focus on a single commodity but might operate at different levels in the economy.

Several factors may contribute to the continuance of abandonment of foreign market development programs. Increased demands for American foodstuffs should come from the 2 to 3 percent increase in population of many nations and rising standards of living in Europe and Japan. Factors which may dampen demands are the increased agricultural output of the more industrialized nations and the rising tide of agricultural protectionism. Despite increasing demands on the one hand and trade barriers on the other, foreign market development programs can be expected to continue for 15 more years. The major reason for most of them being discontinued would be the withdrawal of government counterpart funds. If such a policy change were made within the next five years, few would continue on producer and industry assessments alone. (Tobacco Associates has had a year of drastically restricted operation because of USDA's temporary withdrawal of counterpart funds related to the "Smoking and Health" issue.) Given five more years of operation, some of these associations can develop enough momentum to carry on with their own funds. Thus in 1980 it is probably that the two types of trade development associations, the producer oriented and the vertically integrated trade oriented, will still be operative, although their clientele and techniques may be quite different from today's.

Management Training and Aids

The great need for improved management by the 1980 farmer has been pointed out in Dr. Nielson's paper. Education in management will be a continuous process which may be performed best by the extension service and adult education centers. The farm organization could serve only where there are relatively few producers organized in a commodity association, where the more detailed aspects of management can be tailored to the students.

The farm organization can provide management aids, such as record-keeping services, as part of its regular contact with members. Some legal services may also be provided.
Other farmer organizations, such as cooperatives, will need increasingly higher level management education and training, and related services. This will be crucial particularly if cooperatives move into vertically integrated operations which will require the highest types of specialist and management skills. Such services, from education to data processing systems, must be provided by the overhead cooperatives, such as the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the National Milk Producers Federation, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the American Institute of Cooperation.

**Public Relations**

A great deal has been said and written the past few years about the deplorable state of agriculture's public relations. There seems to be general agreement only that too much has been said about some aspects of agriculture (by someone else who has emphasized the wrong things) and that many citizens are woefully misinformed about agriculture's contributions to the economy. By 1980 much of the present disagreement among farmers and farm organizations may have disappeared, but the vast majority of American citizens will not have a farm background or even know a farmer. As a minority which produces a vital necessity, farmers must communicate something of their role and their problems to opinion leaders. The responsibility is too great to be delegated beyond the farm organization. If, as today, different organizations communicate different views, that is the penalty their members will pay for living in a pluralistic society.

**Social Institutions**

Practically all private organizations provide some personal and social satisfaction to active members and greater rewards to their officers and leaders. The sense of accomplishment and success which individuals gain in voluntary programs is a major triumph of American life. Membership in an organization which can socialize its members into the community through participation in a variety of activities may be extremely useful in the more mobile society of 15 years hence. Farm organizations have played useful roles as social and community organizations, particularly in the decades before World War II, when rural residents were tied to their immediate rural environment. Farm or farm-related organizations have done little to alleviate the disappointments and frustrations of rural residents on the lower end of the economic scale. Their commercial orientation has precluded such interests.

By 1980, farm organizations should continue to provide personal and social satisfaction to their reduced membership. Few would appeal to the suburban resident or the non-farm rural resident whose homes will line the country roads. Perhaps two, the Grange and the Farmers Union, will attract such members. The Grange would do so because it has always been as much a social order as a commercial farm organization. The Farmers Union, if it does, will continue its traditional friendliness toward organized labor and the consumer
by providing a new type of membership for non-farmers. The Farm Bureau has a considerable number of associate members who are small town and city business and professional men who agree with its policies. In general, this group needs no social satisfaction from a farm organization.

The cooperatives may, as they become more urban and consumer oriented, act as community social organizations as well as business institutions.

Summary

Just as evolutionary change in the farm firm was predicted in the background papers, so it seems that gradual change will characterize most farm organizations in the next 15 years. Of today's farm organizations, most will continue to operate in 1980. An exception could be the cooperatives, many of which may merge or dissolve, so that cooperatives might be fewer but larger. Membership would decline in general farm organizations and most commodity organizations, but the inclusion of non-farm members may swell the rolls in some. The commodity-industry export promotion organization, which at most is only farm-related, would in all likelihood be around in considerable numbers, but the international situation in all aspects may determine this.

Professional staffs may be larger and more specialized. They would be the key to wider and better service and to continued survival of the organization. A capable bureaucracy could observe those services which become obsolete and replace them with services which would win and tie members to the organization.

The services which we have been discussing may or may not be provided by farm organizations. They are services which would be needed, but we can expect producers to seek them where they can be most satisfactorily performed. The challenge to farm organizations in 1980 will be to do the kind of job that will assure continued and loyal membership.

Although there will be fewer producers, a greater proportion than today will be members of one or more farm organizations. The farmer of 1980 will be an "Organization Man."