### Economic Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit or base period</th>
<th>'57-'59 Average</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices received by farmers</td>
<td>1910-14=100</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>1910-14=100</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and products</td>
<td>1910-14=100</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices, paid, interest, taxes and wage rates</td>
<td>1910-14=100</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family living items</td>
<td>1910-14=100</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production items</td>
<td>1910-14=100</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale prices, all commodities</td>
<td>1957-59=100</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities other than farm and food</td>
<td>1957-59=100</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm products</td>
<td>1957-59=100</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, processed</td>
<td>1957-59=100</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer price index, all items</td>
<td>1957-59=100</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>1957-59=100</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farm Food Market Basket:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm value</td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm-retail spread</td>
<td></td>
<td>627</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers' share of retail cost</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farm Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of farm marketings</td>
<td>1947-49=100</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash receipts from farm marketings</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>32,247</td>
<td>35,921</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>13,786</td>
<td>15,385</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and products</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>18,481</td>
<td>19,986</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gross income *</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm production expenses *</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized net income *</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Trade:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural exports</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>5,031</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural imports</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Values:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average value per acre</td>
<td>1957-59=100</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value of farm real estate</td>
<td>Billion dollars</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>148.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross National Product</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption *</td>
<td>Billion dollars</td>
<td>456.7</td>
<td>554.9</td>
<td>552.4</td>
<td>579.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment *</td>
<td>Billion dollars</td>
<td>297.3</td>
<td>355.4</td>
<td>352.9</td>
<td>370.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government expenditures *</td>
<td>Billion dollars</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net exports *</td>
<td>Billion dollars</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>123.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income and Spending:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income</td>
<td>Billion dollars</td>
<td>442.1</td>
<td>444.6</td>
<td>462.6</td>
<td>464.6</td>
<td>464.9</td>
<td>464.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total retail sales</td>
<td>Billion dollars</td>
<td>19,613</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>20,486</td>
<td>20,759</td>
<td>20,767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales of food group *</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>4,848</td>
<td>4,923</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment and Wages:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total civilian employment</td>
<td>Millions</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Millions</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of unemployment</td>
<td>Millions</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workweek in manufacturing</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly earnings in manufacturing, unadjusted</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial Production</strong></td>
<td>1957-59=100</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers' Sales and Inventories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sales, monthly rate *</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>33,260</td>
<td>33,290</td>
<td>35,150</td>
<td>35,910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total inventories</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>57,210</td>
<td>56,970</td>
<td>58,770</td>
<td>58,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total new orders, monthly rate</td>
<td>Million dollars</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>32,830</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Average annual quantities of farm food products based on purchases per wage-earner or clerical-worker family in 1952—estimated monthly, 2 Annual rates seasonally adjusted second quarter. 3 As of March 1. 4 As of July 1. 5 Seasonally adjusted. Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture (Farm Income Situation, Market-ing and Transportation Situation, Agricultural Prices, Foreign Agriculture Trade and Farm Real Estate Market Developments); U.S. Department of Commerce (Industry Survey, Business News Reports, Advance Retail Sales Report and Survey of Current Business); U.S. Department of Labor (The Labor Force and Wholesale Price Index).
Prices received by farmers so far this year are little changed from 1962—slightly higher for crops but a little lower for livestock and products.

Farmers are producing more livestock than in 1962. Increases in beef, pork and poultry are more than offsetting decreases in milk and eggs. Livestock and product prices dipped earlier this year, then recovered somewhat in June and July. But prices for the year probably will be under the 1962 level.

Crop prices received by farmers are running slightly higher this year because of a relatively favorable supply and demand situation. Indicated crop output for the year is about the same as in the last 3 years; domestic and foreign demand continue to increase. For the rest of 1963, prices likely will average a little below the first 3 quarters, but for the year will average above 1962.

Output, employment, income and sales continue to increase in the U.S. economy though the pace slackened slightly during the third quarter. In August, personal income rose slightly from July to a record-high $465 billion (seasonally adjusted annual rate) and new construction expenditures edged up to $65 billion. Retail sales in August were about the same as the $20.8 billion sales a month earlier. Employment and output each dipped a little in August ... the declines largely reflected temporary changes in August by more than the small reduction in employment leading to the lowest monthly rate of unemployment recorded so far this year.

In the past few months, the general level of business activity has been around 5 per cent above 1962 levels. In June-August, personal income totaled 5 per cent higher than a year earlier, with increased compensation of employees accounting for most of the rise. Industrial output and retail sales were each up nearly 6 per cent from June-August 1962 and new construction increased more than 3 per cent. Employment expanded about in proportion to the increase in population.

Further advances in the level of business activity are in prospect ... inventories continue well in line with sales and, according to a July survey by the Bureau of the Census, consumers planned to buy more new cars, refrigerators, television sets and other durable goods in the next 12 months than they had planned in July 1962.

COMMODITY HIGHLIGHTS

Hog slaughter in the final quarter of 1963 probably will be slightly above a year earlier, reflecting the additional 1 per cent of pigs saved in December 1962-May 1963. Barrow and gilt prices likely will be slightly below a year earlier ($16.51 at 8 major markets in October-December 1962).

Fat cattle marketings during the fourth quarter likely will be above last year. Prices are expected to stay near the July-August level—$24.66 for Choice steers at Chicago.

Fourth quarter cow slaughter likely will be only a little above a year earlier ... was about the same as 1962 during the first 7 months this year.

Slaughter of sheep and lambs in the fourth quarter is expected to average somewhat below a year ago. Lamb prices may be off somewhat from October-December 1962 when Choice slaughter lambs at Denver brought $20.09.
Milk production in 1963 likely will be slightly below 125.9 billion pounds in 1962. Lower production and more commercial demand the first 8 months this year cut CCC purchases (delivery basis) about 25 per cent from a year earlier. August butter output dropped 10 per cent from 1962, while American cheese production increased about 9 per cent.

Turkey supplies in the September-December marketing season are expected to go a little below a year earlier. On September 1 there were 153 million pounds in cold storage, compared with 160 million a year earlier. Prizes to producers likely will average slightly above the 22 cents per pound last year.

Egg production during the summer went above 1962, is likely to continue above in the fourth quarter. And early 1964 output may also be up—a large increase in the out-of-season hatch of replacement chicks is expected. Producer prices in August averaged 32.8 cents per dozen compared with 31 cents in July and 32.7 cents in August 1962.

A recent reduction in broiler hatchery activity suggests that fourth quarter broiler supplies will not differ greatly from a year ago. However, production may increase in early 1964 if the usual seasonal rise in broiler chick output develops over the next few months. Producers received 14.4 cents for broilers in August compared with 14.7 cents in July and 15.5 cents last August.

Feed grain production in 1963 is up an estimated 5 per cent from last year. Per acre corn yields may be the highest ever and production may surpass the record-high 3.91 billion bushels in 1960. Estimated grain sorghum output is 2 per cent above last year.

The total feed grain supply in 1963-64 is estimated at 211 million tons, 4 million less than in 1962-63 and slightly below the 1957-61 average. Carryover has been trimmed about 24 million tons during the last 2 years, reversing a 10-year up-trend. A further but more moderate decline is expected in 1963-64. Feed grain prices advanced more than seasonally during 1962-63...the index of prices received by farmers in August was 11 per cent above a year earlier. A price decline is expected during the next 2 months, with corn and grain sorghum harvest underway. And prices this fall and winter may decrease to last winter's level.

The 1963 cotton crop was estimated September 1 at 14.3 million bales, about 4 per cent below a year earlier, but 9 per cent above the 1957-61 average. Acreage for harvest is down from 1962. But per acre yields are up sharply—estimated at a record-high 482 pounds—from 457 pounds last year.

Cotton disappearance in the 1963-64 crop year is put at 13.8 million bales, up about 2 million from a year earlier. Mill consumption and exports are expected to increase. But carryover in 1964 probably will increase also as production continues ahead of demand.

Soybean production for 1963 is forecast at 728 million bushels—record-high and 8 per cent over last year. Prices farmers receive for soybeans this fall probably will be above the 1963 support rate of $2.25 per bushel. Prices later in the 1963-64 marketing year may advance more than seasonally because of the close balance expected between supply and demand.

Soybean crushings and exports during 1963-64, despite the increasingly strong domestic and export demand for meal, probably will go only slightly above 1962-63 when production was supplemented by a larger carryover. Carryover of 1962-crop beans has dwindled to a minimum level; the same condition may prevail next October.

Heavy disappearance of wheat in 1963-64 is expected; the year-end carryover probably will be reduced for the third straight year. Prices likely will average near the $1.82 per bushel loan rate, but may drop late in the marketing year in anticipation of a much lower support rate on the 1964 crop.

Tree nut production in 1963 is the largest on record at an estimated 306,000 tons. This is 14 per cent above the previous high in 1961 and 37 per cent above the average. Pecans lead the increase with the largest crop on record.

Cigarette consumption in 1963 is estimated at about 523 billion—nearly 3 per cent above 1962 and a record high. Consumption of cigars and cigarillos is expected to total about 7,170 million—a gain of about 1.5 per cent over 1962 and the highest in 40 years. Exports of unmanufactured tobacco—the outlet for about a fourth of the crop—may be up about 8 per cent from the relatively low level of 1962.
The 1962 report indicates farmers made even higher score on output of crops and livestock, yield per acre and productivity than were recorded in 1961.

It’s the same old record breaking story. In 1962, agriculture reached new peaks in total volume of output, production of livestock and products, crop output per acre and agricultural productivity. Once again, the new marks were set with fewer hours of labor and fewer acres. As the result of their efforts, each farm-worker was able to feed and clothe one more person than was possible a year earlier.

**Farm output and production.** The volume of total farm output in the U.S. hit a new peak during 1962, 1 per cent greater than in 1961 and 8 per cent higher than the 1957-59 average.

Production of livestock and products also reached a new mark, 1 per cent above the previous high in 1961 and 7 per cent over the 1957-59 average. Farm output of meat animals totaled 52.2 billion pounds liveweight. Milk production was nearly 126 billion pounds. However, total production of poultry and eggs declined as the reduced output of farm chickens and turkeys more than offset the record supply of broilers and a slight increase in eggs.

Crop production during 1962 equaled the previous high in 1960. Output was 1 per cent greater than in 1961 and 8 per cent higher than the average for 1957-59. Record production of hay and forage, sugar crops and oil crops was obtained while output of food grains, vegetables, fruits and nuts declined from a year earlier.

**Crop acreage harvested.** Crops were harvested from a total of 295 million acres in 1962. Crop-land harvested was 8 million acres less than in 1961 and 54 million under the total a decade ago.

An estimated 63 million acres was used for producing exports in 1962 compared with the record of 67 million in 1961. Most of the cut was due to declines in shipments of wheat and cotton which more than offset the larger exports of soybeans and soybean oil.

Food grains accounted for 39 per cent of acreage grown for export during 1962, feed grains made up 27 per cent, soybeans 21 per cent and cotton 7 per cent.

**Crop production per acre.** Output of crops per acre reached a new high in 1962, 4 per cent over the previous year and 17 per cent greater than the 1957-59 average. New yield records were set for all the feed grains.

Assisting the improvement in yields was a 7 per cent increase in use of fertilizer on farms. As in recent years, the gain in use of nitrogen was substantial—an increase of about 11 per cent over 1961. Little change was noted in applications of liming materials.

**Livestock production per breeding unit.** Animal units of breeding livestock increased during 1962 for the second year in a row. The number on farms as of January 1, 1962, was 1 per cent over the same date in 1961. Production per unit continued at the record level of 1961.
Feeding of all classes of livestock continued to be liberal through 1961-62. Feed efficiency dropped slightly for all classes except milk cows.

**Man-hours of farmwork.** Labor used on farms reached a new low of 9.1 billion man-hours in 1962, a decrease of 4 per cent from the previous year and a continuation of the long-term trend.

Growing and harvesting of crops took about 4.2 billion man-hours last year and work with livestock required 3.7 billion. The remaining time was spent on farm maintenance and other overhead work.

Farm output per man-hour of labor in 1962 was almost 6 per cent higher than in 1961.

**Persons supplied farm products by one farmworker.** The average farmworker produced enough food, fiber and tobacco during 1962 to supply himself and almost 28 other people. Close to four of these consumers were citizens of foreign countries. Since 1950, each farmworker has managed to supply more than one additional consumer each year.

**Farm inputs.** The total value of agricultural inputs continued at the same level in 1962 as in 1961 and 1960. However, farmers are increasingly dependent on the nonfarm sector of the economy for production goods and services. This trend reflects the increased specialization and use of improved practices in farming. During 1962, the volume of purchased inputs was 7 per cent higher than that of 1957-59. The purchased items accounted for over two-thirds of all measured inputs.

Although the use of agricultural inputs remained stable during 1962, they were the most productive on record. Farm output per unit of input was 7 per cent greater than the 1957-59 level.

**MAN-HOURS OF LABOR USED FOR FARMWORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total man-hours</th>
<th>Index 1957-59 = 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>22,547</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>23,995</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>22,921</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>20,472</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>15,137</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>9,825</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9,473</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962*</td>
<td>9,085</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preliminary
Farmers Put Up More New Barns, More Storage Buildings Than Homes

As might be expected, operators of large farms build considerably more new structures than do farmers with smaller operations. In 1958-60, farmers with annual marketings of $40,000 or more constructed 71 new buildings per 100 farms. At the other end of the size scale, farmers with less than $2,500 in annual sales built only eight new structures per 100 farms during the same period.

The new structures on the small farms were more apt to be dwellings—these averaged about a fourth of all new buildings. For all other farms—those with more than $2,500 worth of marketings annually—dwellings were only a tenth of the buildings added from 1958 to 1960.

Of all farm buildings built within the three-year period, nearly a fourth were barns of different types. Next in importance were grain storages—they were one-fifth of all farm buildings erected during 1958-60. Dwellings came in third place, followed by machine sheds.

Lumber continued to be the most important material for exterior walls and framing. Masonry was used for at least part of the exterior walls on nearly half the dairy barns and close to a third of the dwellings. Metal and composition together were the materials used for 90 per cent of the new roofs. Metal was by far the most popular roofing for service buildings while composition materials were used for most of the houses. (3)

Models Show Price Change Effect For Cotton and Alternative Crops

There's one obvious way to get farmers to grow more of a commodity—raise the price. It's almost as effective, though not quite, to lower the price of alternative commodities.

To get an idea of the effect of such price changes on farm production, economists analyzed the theoretical responses that would be most profitable on model farms in the limestone valleys of northern Alabama. The use of improved production practices as followed by the upper 10 per cent of the farmers in the area was assumed for the models. The study was conducted by the Alabama Experiment Station in cooperation with the Economic Research Service.

When all other commodities are at the assumed base price, and cotton is at 20.8 cents a pound, a considerable amount of cotton is grown on the larger farms of the area. Little or no cotton is grown on the smaller farms. Push the price of cotton to 26 cents, and cotton acreage for the region more than doubles. Finally, when cotton goes to 31.2 cents a pound, acreage is increased another 25 per cent and just about all the suitable land is planted to cotton.

Cutting the price of competing commodities also helps to push land into cotton, even when the price of cotton is lowered. When prices for competing commodities are 30 per cent below base, and cotton is 15.6 cents a pound, the land use ratio is about the same as it is when cotton is at 20.8 cents and prices for all other commodities are at base.

And when the prices of competing commodities are cut, but the price of cotton is held at 20.8 cents, once again just about all the suitable land in the area goes into cotton.

Cotton loses its appeal quickly, however, when prices for competing commodities are raised 30 per cent above base. Not until the price of cotton reaches 26 cents a pound is there any noticeable production. Even at 36.4 cents a pound, not all the suitable acreage will be planted to cotton.

The commodities included in the analysis were cotton, oats for grain, wheat, grain sorghum, soybeans, lespedeza and alfalfa hay, beef cows, feeder steers, hogs, and manufacturing grade milk. (5)

Asbestos Dollars

The volume of fire insurance carried by some 1,600 farmers' mutual fire insurance companies totaled $36.4 billion on December 31, 1962. The total on the same date in 1961 was $35.3 billion.

Farmer members of these companies paid about $104 million for their fire insurance protection during 1962—premiums totaled about $99 million the previous year. The increased cost was due primarily to larger amounts of coverage rather than a hike in assessment rates although the average assessment did rise from 23.6 cents per $100 of insurance to 29 cents last year.

Losses paid by farmers' mutual fire insurance companies were $87.8 million during 1962. During 1961, the companies paid out $81.4 million. (4)

Hot and Heavy

Farm fire losses reached an all-time high of $175 million during 1962—7 per cent above the $163 million in 1961. The estimate is based on reports from 226 farmers' mutual fire insurance companies.

Buildings and their contents accounted for about 85 per cent of the losses covered by mutual fire insurance. The buildings include dwellings, barns and outbuildings, rural churches and schools. The remaining 15 per cent of rural fire claims were for personal property—chiefly livestock and machinery and equipment. Lightning was responsible for about 80 to 90 per cent of the livestock losses.

Farm fires strike about two out of every 100 farms each year. The proportion of the property value destroyed in a farm fire averages about six times that of urban fires. (6)
Buying Land Is Often Only Chance
For Michigan Farmer To Get Ahead

Future financial progress on many Michigan farms will depend importantly on the ability of farmers to buy or rent more land. Some farmers will be able to rent additional acreages but buying will be the only alternative in many cases.

Look at the land purchases of a group of Michigan farmers between 1930 and 1960.

When these men started out, only half bought land. Forty-three per cent rented their farms and 7 per cent began farming on acreage they had inherited or received as a gift.

Regardless of their original source of farmland, 87 per cent of the Michigan producers ultimately bought land.

FARM MORTGAGE LENDING UP

Twenty major life insurance companies, the federal land banks and the Farmers Home Administration together closed $451 million in new and additional loans during the first quarter of 1963. This sharp increase was 19 per cent over January-March 1962.

The amount of mortgages closed by life insurance companies during the first quarter of 1963 was 41 per cent higher than the volume made in January-March 1962. The average size of new loans reached $27,000, up $2,000 from a year earlier.

About half the life insurance loan commitments in early 1963 were to refinance existing debt. An additional one-third were to buy farm real estate and the remaining mortgages were for repairs, improvements and miscellaneous purposes.

Interest on life insurance loan commitments during the first three months of 1963 averaged 5.75 per cent, down slightly from 5.78 per cent in October-

December.

The federal land banks reported a 7 per cent rise in closings during the first quarter of this year compared with the first quarter of 1962. However, the increase was largely due to a 6 per cent gain in the size of loans which averaged $15,320 for the three-month period. The number of loans made by the land banks during January-March was up less than 1 per cent from early 1962.

Federal land bank interest rates did not change during the first three months of 1963. Two banks were charging 5.75 and 6 per cent respectively, and the remaining 10 made loans at 5.5 per cent or less.

Mortgage loans made directly by the Farmers Home Administration (including additions to existing loans) in early 1963 dropped to $28 million from $80 million in fourth-quarter 1962. FHA closed $35 million in loans during January-March 1962. (7)

Wisconsin Farmers With FHA Loans
Earn More Money Than Their Peers

How can you tell a farmer with a loan from the Farmers Home Administration (FHA)? Not an easy task if you look at the clothes he wears or the car he drives. But taking comparative farm statistics for FHA borrowers in Wisconsin we can see significant variations from state averages.

A below average group in terms of income per crop acre ($73.77 in 1961 for FHA loan recipients as against $97.50 for the overall state average), FHA borrowers were above average in total farm income. How? By farming more acres (206 compared with a state average of 162).

In 1961, more than 2,100 Wisconsin farmers received loans from the FHA. Fully living up to the reputation of the dairy state, FHA borrowers were dairy farmers to the tune of 96 per cent, although hog production was frequently listed as a secondary source of income. And compared with other Wisconsin dairy producers FHA borrowers achieved about average milk income per cow whether they were grade A or grade B producers.

Since there is a close correlation between the different prices received for A or B grade milk and the variations in farm income, switching to grade A production would be an effective means for raising income per acre. The switch should bring in an additional $400 annually to the average FHA borrower.

Raising the size of herds could also contribute to increased income. The average FHA borrower now has only one cow for each 4.9 acres compared to one cow to 3.7 acres for grade A milk producers. To equal the size of herd averaged by grade A producers, the FHA borrowers would need to increase the size of their cow herds from the present 27 to 35 or 36. (9)
A good part of the increase in farm assets for the high-increase producers was due to ownership of more land. Large and small farmers who showed a high increase purchased an average of more than 70 acres of land between 1953 and 1958—low-increase men made no major additions to their farms.

During the same period, the high-increase farmers borrowed around $30,000 each—much more than was borrowed by the small-increase group. Nearly half of the credit was used to finance land purchases with the remainder going into additional livestock and machinery.

Despite a high rate of repayment, the high-increase producers reported $17,000 more debt per farm in 1958 than was the case in 1953. Little change occurred in the net debt of the low-increase group.

Although the high-increase farmers borrowed heavily to increase their ownership of assets, the gain value—from price increases as well as physical increases—more than offset their larger debts. The result was considerable progress in building net worth. Net farm incomes also increased substantially.

The opposite was true for the low-increase men: Little change in debt, little change in assets and income because they didn’t use credit as a managerial tool; little change in net worth except for the increase in the value of the land they started with.

A revealing difference between the high- and low-increase farmers, whether small or large, was age. The high-increase men averaged five years younger. They very likely had more managerial drive.

URBAN NEEDS CUT WIDE SWATH THROUGH THE COUNTRYSIDE

Here are some examples of the acres new urban facilities can cover.

Airport construction requires not only the land necessary for proper operation of the aircraft and access to the terminal—additional buffer space may be necessary because of the noise from jets. At the new Dulles International Airport which serves metropolitan Washington, D. C., the airfield and service area occupy 10,000 acres. In addition, the access road to the airport took another 915 acres in covering 17 miles. As is usual in the vicinity of a new airfield, plans for housing and commercial development have earmarked more acres nearby.

Even recreational use of farmland, whether alone or in combination with tourist enterprises, has effects that reach farther into land use and values than planners may expect. Construction of new lakes or reservoirs for power, water and recreation often encourages the building of fishing preserves, hunting grounds, private homes and cottages on the shores. And, as vacationing families visit these places, many often decide the area is just the place to buy an acre or two or even a farm as a permanent site for rest and relaxation.

Next come the roads to get to and from the new facilities. Each mile of new right-of-way for an interstate highway reduces the supply of farmland by about 40 acres.

Along with the new roads come the travel services necessary along the route. These include filling stations, motels and restaurants. Such facilities place even more pressure on the farmland fringe at the edge of the highway.

Although scattered throughout the country, military and other government installations affect the land values in the areas in which they are located. Particularly important are the vast acreages for space testing.
Fewer Pear Trees Dot Landscape; Bigger Orchards Producing Crop

Times have changed even for pears. Back in the thirties, farms all over the country had a pear tree or two. In season, pears were a familiar treat for eating out of hand. Nowadays, pears are mostly produced in large commercial orchards and the bulk of the crop is canned.

According to the Census of Agriculture, the number of farms reporting pear trees or production dropped drastically between 1940 and 1959. The number of trees bearing also decreased sharply. However, thanks to higher yields on the remaining trees, total production of pears has been relatively stable except for fluctuations caused mainly by weather. According to USDA estimates, output was 29.3 million bushels in 1962 while the high point since 1935 was the 34 million bushels produced in 1947.

Eleven states now account for the commercial pear crop. Of these states, California, Oregon and Washington supply the bulk of annual output with California easily the No. 1 producer.

To illustrate the concentration of production, output of pears in the three Pacific coast states climbed 25 per cent from 1935-38 to 1959-62—from an average of 19.8 million bushels to 24.8 million. In 1959-62, this region produced 89 per cent of total U.S. pear output.

Production in the remaining eight commercial states—Utah, Colorado, Idaho, Texas, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York and Connecticut—dropped 65 per cent from 1935-38 to 1959-62. Average output in the two comparison periods was 8.8 million bushels and 3.1 million bushels respectively.

Along with the decline in farms reporting pear trees or production, fewer pears are eaten on farms where produced. This reflects the change from small pear producing enterprises to large commercial orchards. Fruit used on farms totaled less than 400,000 bushels in 1962 compared to 3 million in 1935.

More and more of the pears going off farms went to processing plants over the years as sales for fresh use (including exports) declined 35 per cent. The volume sold for processing averaged 7.9 million bushels in 1935-38 and 16.5 million in 1959-62. Most of the pears sold for processing were canned—an average of over 97 per cent during 1959-62. Most of the remaining processed pears were dried.

From 1935 to 1962, total consumption of pears in the U.S. increased about 5 per cent. But with the growth in population, per capita use of pears declined about 25 per cent.

The Bartlett is the leading variety of pear grown in commercial orchards on the Pacific coast. During 1959-62, Bartlett pears accounted for 77 per cent of total output. Nearly 74 per cent of this variety was processed during the period.

Of the remaining Pacific coast commercial varieties—Hardy, D’Anjou, Bosc, Comice, Nelis and Easter—84 per cent was sold through the fresh market. Hardy, a California pear, is also a popular variety for canning in fruit cocktails. (12)

Trend in Price of an Acre of Land Parallels Per Capita Nonfarm Income

Fewer farmers, the increasing dependence of many farm people on nonfarm sources of income and higher per capita income for the nonfarm population have combined to put the trend in land prices on a parallel with the general economy.

Since 1945, the price of an acre of land has been more closely keyed to the rise in per capita income of the nonfarm population than it has to the incomes of farm people. Land values near the end of World War II averaged $47 per acre. By March 1, 1962, the average value had reached $121. At the same time, income per nonfarmer went from $1,384 to $2,445. Income per capita (all sources) of the farm population was $700 in 1945 and $1,436 in 1962. (13)

Soybean Crushings Hit New Record; Large Carryover of Meal on Hand

Strong demand and good prices for soybean meal pushed crushings to a record 403 million bushels during October-July 1962-63. That’s 29 million more bushels than were processed in the same months the previous year. (See Marketing section for oil situation.)

Crushings for the entire marketing year (ended September 30) reached a new high of about 475 million bushels—45 million more than in 1961-62.

But we can crush even more, according to USDA economists. They say the total U.S. soybean crushing capacity is at least 575 million bushels a year. In other words, the soybean industry has operated at about four-fifths of its full capacity. Processors have been expanding their facilities to keep ahead of the growth in the soybean crop. Crushings jumped from 283 million bushels in 1955 to 475 million bushels in 1962.

In the foreign market, U. S. exports of soybeans continued at a record level and reached some 180 million bushels in 1962-63, compared with 153 million last year.

The strong demand for soybean meal resulted in a larger crush than would have been justified by the oil situation alone. As a result, carryover stocks of crude and refined soybean oil will total a record 925 million pounds by this month, compared with 620 million pounds on the same date last year. (14)
SYPHON TUBE IRRIGATION OF DELTA COTTON SAVES MONEY ON PUMPING AND REPAIR COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating costs</th>
<th>Annual cost per irrigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sprinkler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumping</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent conveyance maintenance</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary ditches and flumes</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and misc. costs</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ($)</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The once-over equivalent use for these systems was sprinkler, 372 acres; gated pipe, 447 acres; and syphon tube, 507 acres. 2 Forty-two cents per acre-inch pumping cost at well; 66¢ per acre-inch relift pumping cost for gated pipe; 75¢ per acre-inch relift pumping cost for sprinkler. 3 Four acre-inches of water applied with gated pipe and syphon tubes and three acre-inches with sprinklers.

SYPHONS GET BEST COST RATINGS IN DELTA COMPARISONS

For irrigation of cotton to be profitable in the Mississippi Delta, it has to be inexpensive not only to develop but to operate.

A new study by the Economic Research Service shows that the syphon tube system meets the test better than sprinkler or gated pipe systems.

Costs of temporary ditches and flumes as well as maintenance of permanent conveyances run somewhat higher with the syphon tube than with the other two systems. But these costs are more than offset by lower operating costs, including pumping, labor and repairs.

Since operating costs are lower, it takes a much smaller increase in yields to pay a farmer for irrigating an acre of cotton with the syphon tube system than it does with the sprinkler system.

The use of sprinkler and gated pipe systems is profitable only in a limited number of situations because the per acre cost is so high. Piping is more expensive than the ditch or flume used in the syphon system. And the necessity of relifting the water in both systems more than doubles the pumping cost of the water used. Better planning and engineering could eliminate much of this cost.

Labor costs for the syphon tube system are much less because no pipe has to be moved. Also, more acreage can be irrigated with one setup of the system.

The report is based on information obtained from 100 farmers in 1957 and 90 farmers in 1960, all of whom irrigated some of their cotton acreage. (15)

Cotton Carryover

On August 1, the carryover of all kinds of cotton was estimated at 11.2 million bales—3.3 million more than were on hand on August 1, 1962. The increase was due both to a larger crop and a sharp decline in disappearance during 1962-63.

The 1963 crop was estimated September 1 at 14.3 million bales, down from 14.9 million last year. Although harvested acreage was lower this year, yields per acre reached a new high of 482 pounds, 16 pounds over the previous record in 1958. Domestic mill consumption during 1963-64 is estimated at 8.8 million bales, up 400,000 bales from 1962-63. (16)

Insect Hordes Face Little Opposition On Many Cotton Farms in Alabama

Overcome all the other problems in getting a good stand of cotton and overnight a lush growth can be destroyed by an army of hungry insects. The only way to fight back is with a good insect control program. Yet many farmers don’t make use of such practices.

To determine the extent to which insect control is used on cotton, the cost of a typical program, the effect on yields and the use of related production practices, the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, in cooperation with the Economic Research Service, conducted a survey of cotton farms in the limestone valley area of Alabama during 1962.

Farmers in the 11-county survey area were questioned about insect control used on their 1961 crops. Cotton production in the limestone valley accounted for 44 per cent of the state total during 1961.

The farms selected were classed in three size groups on the basis of 1961 cotton acreage. There were 48 small farms with an average of 47 acres of cropland. These farmers planted 9.6 acres of cotton during 1961 and 1962 and had average lint yields of 372 pounds per acre.

In the medium-size group, 47 farms averaged 124 acres of cropland. Yields averaged 404 pounds of lint per acre on 32.8 acres during the crop year surveyed. The large farms were 55 in number and had 506 acres of cropland on the average. These operators planted 140.6 acres of cotton in 1961 and harvested 506 pounds of lint an acre.

Of the total acreage planted in the limestone valley area, 65 per cent was treated one or more times for control of insects during 1961.

Replies to the survey questions indicated that 44 per cent of the small farmers used insect control,
70 per cent of the medium-size producers and 73 per cent of the large growers. The average number of times treated was 6.4 on small farms, 5.2 on medium-size farms and 6.3 times on large farms.

The total cost of insect control per acre treated also varied with the size of farm. Small farmers spent $13.06 per acre for materials and application, medium-size operators, $9.53, and large producers, $14.18. The cost of the spray or dusting material alone was $8.90, $6.32 and $9.64 for the small, medium and large farms.

On the basis of total cotton acreage treated, dusts were used on 59 per cent of the crop and sprays on the remaining 41 per cent. On most farms, the cotton crop was dusted or sprayed as often as the Agricultural Extension Service recommended.

More small farmers used dusts than sprays. Ninety-six per cent of the cotton was treated with insecticides in dust form. On the medium-size farms, 79 per cent of the treated acres were dusted while the large farmers used dusts on 54 per cent of their cotton.

However, the large farmers were more likely to use airplanes to apply dusts—31 per cent of the acreage was treated this way in 1961. Nearly all the small and medium-size growers used tractor dusters.

The large producers also used airplanes for spraying cotton. Of the 46 per cent of the acreage treated with sprays, 10 per cent was covered by airplane. High clearance sprayers were used on another 28 per cent with tractor-mounted rigs handling the rest. The use of airplanes and high clearance equipment gave the large farmers better control over infestation and permitted them to spray cotton later in the season when the plants were too tall to use tractor equipment.

Researchers estimated the weighted average yield of lint for the area was about 50 pounds per acre higher on farms where insect control was practiced compared to farms where no spraying or dusting was used. However, part of this difference in yields could be due to use of fertilizer, herbicides, defoliants and the kind of cultivation practices followed.

When the operators were asked to estimate their yields without using insect control, the replies ranged from 214 pounds of lint per acre on the small farms to 324 pounds on the large farms. Farmers estimated that with no insect damage, their yields would have been around 677 pounds of lint per acre on the small and medium-size farms and 690 pounds for the large operations.

Farmers were also asked about other production practices they used in 1961.

Pre-emergence herbicides were used on 10 per cent of the cotton planted on the small farms, 26 per cent of the acreage on the medium-size operations and 33 per cent on the big farms.

Small growers used defoliants, mostly in dust form, on 1.5 per cent of their cotton, medium-size producers on 7.5 per cent and the large farmers on 20.2 per cent.

At harvest time, small farmers handpicked 92 per cent of the crop, 6 per cent was picked by machine and 2 per cent handsnapped. On medium-size farms, 77.2 per cent was handpicked, 20 per cent machinepicked and 3 per cent handsnapped.

---

**Farmland Footnotes**

—The asking price for farmland in urban fringe areas is likely to be high regardless of whether the buyer wants to continue farming or convert the land to commercial use. Farming enterprises on the edge of metropolitan areas are land-, labor- and capital-intensive. Typical operations are truck cropping, nurseries producing flowers and shrubs, poultry and egg farms and dairy feedlots. All these enterprises usually yield high net incomes per acre.

—The drive to enlarge farms has provided continuous strong demand for farm real estate during the past decade. Purchases of land for enlarging farms have steadily increased from 26 per cent of land transfers in 1952 to 46 per cent in 1962.

—How much of a return do farmers make on their land investment? For the past 10 years, average net returns to farm owners from farm production (after allowances for returns to labor) have been relatively stable at about 5 per cent of the estimated annual market value of all farm real estate.

—Machinery and land go hand in hand. From 1962 to 1967, the number of farm workers declined 14 per cent as farm wage rates advanced 30 per cent. Faced with the shortage of help in combination with the increase in labor costs, farmers bought more and larger farm equipment. In turn, the bigger machinery meant more land and larger fields for economical use.
The rural-urban fringe is getting frayed. As cities checkerboard into suburbs, and the suburbs move into the countryside, the loosely woven community of farmers and nonfarmers who live just beyond the edges of suburbia is beginning to unravel. And no one seems able to agree on what to do about it.

Small wonder. About the only common denominator of the rural-urban fringe is a preference for living in the open country. To find out what the spread of the suburbs is doing to these semi-rural communities, researchers surveyed Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, the counties that embrace Washington, D.C., on the Maryland side of the Potomac.

The area qualifies as a laboratory for the study of suburbanization for two reasons: The growth of Washington has caused the combined population of the two counties nearly to double in the past 10 years. At the same time, farming is still an important part of the local economy.

Unlike the suburbs, where families are about the same age, have roughly the same incomes, and live in similar if not identical houses, the fringe resident is not easily fitted to a type.

Shacks and stately homes may be neighbors in the fringe area. Farms share space with industrial parks and airports. The population includes a bit of everything: Prosperous farmers and poor ones, businessmen, laborers, professionals—all make their home in the fringe. And though most of the land in the fringe is devoted to farming, only about one family in 10 actually lives on a farm. Even then, about a third of the families living on farms got most of their incomes from something other than farming.

The fringe population also represents a higher proportion of white collar workers than rural areas in general. At the same time, the fringe areas have an unusually high percentage of unskilled workers and farm laborers. It's the skilled, blue collar workers who are in the minority.

Family incomes for the fringe areas show the same diversity. The median income for nonfarm families in Montgomery County in 1959 was $4,451, the lowest for the two counties. At the top of the scale were the farm families in Montgomery County with median incomes of $7,031.

The level of education in the two counties follows a similar pattern. The farmers in Montgomery County could boast more schooling than any other group; the median level was high school.

The farm population in the fringe areas was, by and large, older than the nonfarm population by 10 years. The farmers had also been living in the area longer. Some 85 per cent of the farm residents in Prince Georges County, and 71 per cent in Montgomery County, were either born in the area or had lived there since before the war.

The fringe residents do get together in their preference for country living. The degree of rural or urban orientation was determined by the answers to a series of questions about the number of trips to the city (aside from commuting), membership in rural or urban organizations, reading rural or urban newspapers, and where the residents spent their leisure time.

By this scale, the lives of fringe area families were focused on rural life, rather than city activities. Oddly enough, the nonfarm families in Montgomery County seemed to be more rural in their outlook than farmers or nonfarmers in Prince Georges County.
Despite Lacks in Rural Education
Diploma Essential to Later Success

A young man with a diploma from a rural high school finds it tougher to get a good job in the city than a city graduate. Because rural high school education is usually not up to the national average, country graduates often lose out to the better trained men.

But although the rural graduate has trouble competing with city boys, he's still better off than the rural high school dropout. Rural graduates who find jobs in the city earn a lot more money than the dropouts who remain in the country. At least this is true of young men who attended high school in eastern Kentucky.

For example, in a recent study of more than 300 boys who were in the eighth grade in 1950 in eastern Kentucky, researchers found that the boys who completed high school and got jobs in the city earned $5,000 annually 10 years later. The high school dropouts who remained in the country earned about $2,100 a year.

The study, sponsored by ERS in conjunction with the Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station, revealed that the parents had little formal education—80 per cent had eight years or less of formal training. The more education the parents had, the more likely it was the children would complete a high school education.

The researchers found that the high school graduates, compared with dropouts, held higher job aspirations, expressed stronger intentions to do something positive to reach their goals.

Some 65 per cent of the graduates remaining in eastern Kentucky belonged to labor unions, churches and lodges.

More than half the young men in the study did not complete high school. Of the 139 who finished high school, 47 entered college, but only 12 earned degrees. (21)

Jobless and Underpaid

Unemployment isn't nearly the problem underemployment is in rural areas. Underemployment means not getting enough return for a normal period of work.

For example, in 1959, the last income census year, USDA economists estimated that about 2,100,000 persons in rural areas had net annual incomes of $1,200 or less. But only 250,000 of these persons were unemployed or only partially employed, according to the Census.

This means that only one-tenth of this lowest level of rural underemployment is recorded in our present unemployment statistics. The 1,800,000 unreported persons with low incomes represent a tremendous opportunity for economic growth.

Most of the rural families with net annual incomes of less than $1,200 are in the southern states. Many of these states have more than 50,000 families in this low income group. (22)

Many Farm Areas Are Still Plagued
By High Rate of School Dropouts

Retardation in school is still a problem in rural high schools, despite marked improvement in school attendance during the past 10 years.

In 1950, 38 per cent of all farm school children 14-15 years old were in grades below the normal grades for their age; by 1960, the percentage had been reduced to 18. Although the school progress of farm children has improved, the improvement has not been sufficient to erase the difference between farm and urban children, and in 1960 only about two-thirds as many urban as farm 14-15 year olds were retarded in school.

When a student falls behind his age group, he lowers his chances of graduating from high school. And if the student does finish school, he is apt to find himself at a disadvantage in the job market, since employers tend to prefer the younger graduates.

But whether he graduates early or late, he is still far better off than the boy without a high school diploma.

A high school diploma is often the minimum qualification for even the most menial jobs these days, especially in the city. And the city is where many rural students will end up working.

The rural student who doesn't make it through high school, or who lags behind his classmates, can look back to his preschool days for part of the cause. More than half of all the city children five years old were enrolled in school in 1960; only 29 per cent of rural five-year olds were in school. These figures mean that far fewer country children have the advantage of nursery school and kindergarten to prepare them for the beginnings of their formal education. Thus the rural child is probably more apt than his city cousin to repeat the first or second grade.

From the point of view of the rural school system, high rates of retardation mean additional expenses as the students repeat grades.

Rural youth face still another handicap; their parents do not emphasize the importance of education as much as city parents do. Without such backing from their parents, the rural child finds it all the harder to keep up his work in school. (23)

Nutrient News

Farmers added plant nutrients to 48 per cent of their cropland and improved pasture in 1959—only 30 per cent was fertilized in 1954. Crops with more than half of the total acreage fertilized in 1959 were: tobacco, 99 per cent; sugar crops, 92 per cent; potatoes and sweetpotatoes, 86 per cent; vegetables, 76 per cent; fruit, 73 per cent; corn 64 per cent; and cotton, 64 per cent. (41)
THE WHOLESALER?

There's a produce wholesaler in Allentown, Pa., who used to make several trips a week to the Philadelphia or New York terminal markets. Today, he can pick up a phone and order a partial truckload of vegetables from south Florida and have it topped with citrus on the way north. He can combine as many as 28 different vegetables in this mixed load.

Without leaving his office, let alone the city, he has assured himself of the supplies he needs.

This is just one example of the way direct buying, split and mixed loads, and other developments in the produce trade are increasingly bypassing the primary wholesale markets and fruit auctions.

The leaders in the trend to direct buying are the national and regional food chains.

For the largest chains, the attraction of direct buying lies mainly in cost reduction. By going directly to the shipper, the chains hope to eliminate the cost of handling in the terminal markets.

Smaller chains are moving toward direct buying less because of price than quality. Direct buying gives these retailers a greater assurance of getting the quality they want. Direct buying from shippers who are known for delivering quality produce helps to reduce the day-to-day unpredictability of the local markets.

The proportion of direct purchases from shipping point by chains and affiliated groups has just about doubled since the mid-thirties. Today, such purchases are about 20 per cent of total market receipts throughout the country.

Some of the indications for the next five or 10 years are:

**Direct buying.** Continued growth in buying groups big enough to buy directly from shippers. The outside limits of such a growth will be set by the needs of: 1. restaurants, hotels and the like, 2. unaffiliated independent grocery stores and 3. chains making local purchases. Of course, the more the terminal markets can offer adequate supplies at competitive prices, the less incentive there will be for the smaller groups to buy direct.

**Wholesalers.** Greater emphasis on specialized services, such as the service wholesaler who supplies unaffiliated independents and small groups. Such functions as prepackaging will grow.

**The market in general.** A shift away from trading, with its emphasis on profit from price changes, to merchandising, where specialized services are the key to profit. (24)

---

**Peach of a Crop**

This year growers of fresh peaches in the Southeast had bumper crops that resulted in marketing difficulties. The same was true for growers of fresh plums in California.

The Department of Agriculture has surplus removal programs designed to assist growers in disposing of large supplies without undue losses. In July, USDA bought 44 cars of fresh peaches in Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Alabama. In California it purchased 122 carloads of fresh plums.

USDA purchases go to orphanages and other charitable institutions. (25)
Consumers Like Ripe Tomato Flavor; Dealers Buy Green for Even Quality

Vine-ripened tomatoes offer plenty of appeal to marketers and consumers alike. They offer problems, too.

Some of the problems were indicated in a recent study of the marketing of vine-ripened Florida tomatoes. The study was made by ERS in cooperation with the Florida Agricultural Experiment Stations.

Vine-ripened tomatoes can be shipped directly to receivers.

A majority of the terminal market handlers thought the vine-ripened tomatoes were superior to the mature-green fruit usually shipped. About 60 per cent of the handlers thought the customers, also, would prefer the appearance and taste of the vine-ripened tomatoes.

On the other hand, more than half of the receivers surveyed noted drawbacks to the vine-ripened tomatoes. The most frequently mentioned complaints were the uncertain quality and uneven color of the vine-ripened fruit.

The vine-ripened tomatoes also call for a little more skill when it comes to grading the product and sorting it for color. Specialized repackers usually take care of both of these chores for mature-green tomatoes.

After weighing the pros and cons of the two kinds of tomatoes, the dealers indicated the vine-ripe product might gain a larger part of the winter market. But they also felt shippers of vine-ripe fruit wouldn't be able to achieve the consistent quality of mature-green fruit.

Some of the dealers in the survey suggested a need for wider promotion of the vine-ripe fruit to stir up consumer interest. (26)

STUDY OF CONSUMER REACTION CAN STRETCH AD DOLLARS

Situation: You are a processor of frozen orange juice concentrate and must move large inventories to make way for the next season's crop.

Question: Should you cut prices or increase advertising and other promotional activities?

Twenty-two cooperating processors in Florida faced this problem in the latter part of 1959. Taking a gamble, they solved it by a promotional campaign which increased sales by 13 per cent over what they could have expected without an advertising effort. This produced $18 million more in sales revenue than would be produced by cutting prices enough to sell a comparable quantity.

Yet although promotion of agricultural products is already big business, with 1,200 firms spending about $100 million yearly to influence the demand for their products, little research has been done in promotion. Farm commodity groups are seldom able to afford extensive promotional research like that of big industrial companies.

As an example of a research question which needs answering, take the relationship between promotional themes and levels of sales. A study of apple promotion shows that sales in six midwestern cities went up 32 per cent for Washington-grown apples when their many uses were publicized and only 21 per cent when the "health theme" was used. However, sales of grapefruit also showed a large increase when the health advantages of apples were advertised.

Another question concerns the broiler industry. Do frequent retail specials depress the farm price? Or do they raise sales revenue and farm prices in the long run? No one knows.

The agricultural industry vitaly needs promotion research. (27)
Latin American countries are worried. Their trade position with Europe has been declining, and the future looks no better.

Traditionally Latin America has depended upon European nations as major buyers of its agricultural exports. Prior to World War II almost half of all South and Central American agricultural exports went to Western Europe. Now less than 40 per cent do. And since 1954 Latin America's generally favorable trade balances have been weakened and the capital inflow diminished due to a continued decline in world prices for basic agricultural products.

In this situation the gathering force of the European Economic Community (EEC) or Common Market has been viewed by Latin countries as a serious threat to their trade and economic growth.

Three aspects of the European Common Market particularly concern Latin American officials:

(1) The trade impact of the Common Agricultural Policy which proposes a common market for wheat, coarse grains, sugar, livestock and other important products as early as 1967-68. If the EEC adopts a policy of self-sufficiency in these commodities it would seriously affect Latin American exports.

(2) Special Common Market concessions to former European colonies in Africa whose exports compete with those of Latin America.

(3) The possibility that the Common Market may become a restrictive trade bloc encompassing all of Western Europe.

Many of these fears are based on past experience. Latin America's share of European coffee imports dropped from a prewar average of 77 per cent to 55 per cent in 1960. In cocoa the drop was from 20 to 12 per cent. In both cases the increased competition from African colonies or nations with tariff concessions has been a major cause of the decline.

What's more, coffee is considered a luxury item by European governments and taxed accordingly. In France the internal taxes on coffee are 51 per cent of value; in Germany, 148 per cent. This is added to external import duties of more than 20 per cent of value for both countries. Former French colonies, though, do not pay the import duties in France.

Duties on cotton and sugar, by way of contrast, have been much lower, sometimes nonexistent, and the Latin American share of West European imports has risen.

The new EEC arrangements call for a uniform tariff schedule with some variable levies (on wheat, for instance) and some fixed percentage duties. In the case of wheat and other variable levy commodities, any price advantage which non-European goods have previously enjoyed is to be eliminated. Some of the fixed levies may achieve the same result.

Duties on commodities important to Latin America include (by per cent of value): coffee beans, 16; cocoa beans, 9; bananas, 20; sugar, 80. Other basic agricultural products, raw wool and cotton among them, will enter duty-free under the new tariff.

The future impact of the EEC on Latin American trade is difficult to predict. For, although increased per capita consumption should accompany the expected acceleration in the Common Market's economic growth, Latin America will be competing with African products that will eventually enter duty-free.

Pressures from Germany, Italy and the Netherlands may yet overcome the Belgian and French insistence on tariff preference for African countries in favor of development loans. They would reduce this preference by lowering the common tariff on commodities which Africa exports to Europe duty-free such as coffee or cocoa.

The EEC may also be induced to expand Latin America's export possibilities in order to supply foreign exchange so the Latin countries can increase their imports of European manufactured goods. (29)
Brazil Seeks to Double Meat Output By 1970 to Up Home Use and Exports

Brazil has set out to put more meat on more dinner tables at home and abroad.

Total meat production was estimated at 2.41 million metric tons, carcass weight basis, in 1961. National planners hope to almost double this output of meat by 1970.

As a first step, President Goulart last January appointed a work group whose job is to fix production goals for home consumption and export over the next three years.

The need to step up meat production for domestic use becomes more pressing year by year.

The largest Latin American nation, both in area and population, Brazil had 73 million people to feed in 1961. Growing at an annual rate of 3.1 per cent, population is expected to jump to over 95 million by 1970. And even though total agricultural output has increased by over 6 per cent on the average in recent years, per capita output has climbed by less than 3 per cent a year.

Brazilians ate approximately 2.35 million tons of meat in 1961. By 1970 consumption may reach 3.81 million tons, an increase of over 60 per cent.

On the export side, Brazil hopes to develop overseas markets for meat and other livestock products valued at $250 million annually by target year 1970.

This would provide much-needed foreign exchange. The world’s largest coffee exporter, Brazil has been hit in the last few years by the decline in world coffee prices. Farm products, two-thirds coffee, have slipped from 90 per cent to 80 per cent of total Brazilian exports.

Brazil has the basic agricultural resources to expand its livestock industry. Range land is plentiful. There is marked potential for increasing output of feed and fodder.

But there are problems, too. Poor soils, especially in the vast tropical and subtropical regions, keep pasture productivity quite low.

Also, supplemental feeding will be needed to tide livestock over the long dry seasons in many areas, or more drought-resistant pasture grasses will have to be planted.

Then too, there is the animal health problem. Control of aftosa and other diseases is necessary before production and exports can be much increased. Unless Brazilian meat can pass muster in importing countries that have disease restrictions, exports will be pretty much limited to lower value processed meats.

Finally, positive programs are needed to improve processing and marketing systems and to give livestock producers greater incentive to raise and market more animals. (30)

More Peruvians With More Money Have Helped Double U.S. Exports

U.S. farm commodities are enjoying a boom in Peru. Between 1956 and 1961, U.S. farm exports to Peru almost doubled, increasing from $13.3 to $25.5 million in the five-year period.

A growing population in Peru and slowly rising per capita incomes have been behind the increase in food imports. Also, Peru has been able to increase its imports because of greater foreign exchange earnings from copper, iron ore, fish meal and sugar.

Wheat is by far the most important of Peru’s imports, with corn, lard and edible oils next on the list. Government action has kept bread prices low which has helped to increase the demand for wheat and wheat products.

Since 1958, the U.S. has supplied about half of Peru’s total wheat imports. Argentina is the next most important source and Canada supplies most of the remainder.

About 38 per cent of the U.S. grain shipments to Peru have been financed under Title I of Public Law 480 (shipments paid for with local currency). Wheat shipments under other government programs have accounted for 29 per cent of the U.S. trade and cash sales for the remaining 33 per cent.

Imports from the U.S. represent from 30 to 40 per cent of Peru’s total agricultural imports. (31)

U.S. Has Fewer Nontariff Controls On Farm Imports Than Most Nations

Many nations use tariffs on farm imports to protect their own agriculture. But some countries also use such nontariff controls as import quotas, variable levies, import licenses and preferential treatment of one country’s products over another’s.

Some countries continue to use nontariff controls to regulate the transfer of foreign exchange. But others retain nontariff controls that apply to farm imports even though these countries have no serious balance of payments problem.

A new USDA study shows the following percentages of agricultural production protected by one or more nontariff restrictions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages are indicators only. No satisfactory way has been found to get a precise measure of the actual protection of nontariff controls. But USDA economists used official reports of each country and applied the same rules to each.

Today the United States has
nontariff import controls only on
wheat, sugar, peanuts, cotton and
dairy products. All other farm
products can enter in unlimited
quantities, provided they meet
health and other safety require­
ments and pay fixed tariffs where
they apply.

Our tariffs on agricultural im­
ports also are lower than those
of most other major agricultural
exporters. The average tariff rate
was reduced from 88 per cent in
1932 to 10 per cent by 1959, with
slight reductions since and more
in prospect under the new Trade
Expansion Act. (32)

Asking Farmers to Live on Farms
Is Part of Bonn Plan to Up Income

The houses cluster around the
square. Geraniums bloom on the
window sills and storks sometimes
nest in the chimneys. Children
play in the dust of the road.
Above the rooftops rises the
onion-shaped spire of a white­
washed church.

These are the farm villages
that dot the German countryside
from the rolling hills of Fran­
conia to the Bavarian Alps. To
outsiders they evoke peace and
tranquility. But economically
they represent a farm system that
hinders more than it helps the
rural population.

German farmers earned 38 per
cent less in 1961-62 than workers
in industry and other nonfarm
jobs. Without government assis­
tance it's estimated that farm in­
come would have been only half
that of nonfarm workers.

True, 1961-62 was a particular­
ly bad year because of very poor
harvests of grain and root crops.
Cash expenditures, particularly
for feed, climbed markedly. But
even in 1960-61, a relatively good
year, farm income was 26 per cent
below that of other sectors of the
economy.

In an effort to raise farm in­
come, the Bonn government has
 earmarked more money in 1963
than ever before to improve the
structure of agriculture. Pro­
grams are geared to improve
rural roads and help farmers con­
solidate their scattered land hold­
ings and enlarge their farms to a
more efficient size.

Equally important, the pro­
grams encourage farmers to move
their homes and farm buildings
away from the villages to sites on
the farm. This is a distinct break
with the traditional pattern of
rural life, but the government
feels it's essential to promote bet­
ter farm management and higher
returns to capital and labor.

Most farm aid is administered
under the Green Plan which costs
about a half billion dollars a year.
Another $200 million goes for
farm support through various
marketing orders, some recently
superseded by Common Market
regulations, and other measures
of trade protection. The govern­
ment, for example, retains fairly
strict import controls on a num­er of farm products not yet regu­
lated by the Common Market.
Then too, German agriculture
benefits from special tax exemp­
tions or reductions, averaging
$128 million a year, that are not
granted to other parts of the
economy.

With better harvests and with
cash outlays estimated to increase
only $50 million compared with
$321 million in 1961-62, farm in­
come should be up this year. How­
ever, the industrial labor force is
now pressing for wage increases.
So while the disparity between
farm and nonfarm income may
narrow somewhat, it isn't ex­
pected to return to the level of
1960-61.

In fact, it looks like the farm
income problem will face German
policymakers for some time to
come. Meanwhile, there's little
visible change in village life. This
time of year the hay has been
stacked, the honey wagons
brought in from the fields, the
stones replaced on roofs to secure
them against the Alpine winds
through the winter. (33)

U.S. Exports of Corn to Austria
Might More Than Double by 1975

U.S. exporters may be able to
increase their feed grain ship­
ments to Austria during the next
10 or 12 years, according to re­
cently completed projections of
agricultural trade for this central
European country.

However, American exporters
currently face keen competition
in this market and probably will
face even more difficulties if Aus­
tria becomes an associate of the
European Economic Community.

But for the moment at least, the
prospect is attractive, and the
curves that take off from the
1960-62 base period have a brisk
upward swing.

The Austrian market for feed
grains (largely corn), starting
from an annual average of 518,-
000 metric tons for 1960-62, is
forecast to reach 1 million metric
tons by 1965 and 1.2 to 1.6 mil­
lion metric tons by 1975.

Even the most conservative
view of U.S. expectations shows a
handsome increase in this coun­
y's exports of corn to Austria.
The projections indicate that the
U.S. will increase its total corn
exports to Austria between 94 and
106 per cent by 1965, compared
with 1960-62. The figures for 1975
indicate the U.S. may increase its
shipments to this market between
134 and 235 per cent, compared
with the same base period. In
1960-62, the U.S. supplied 32 per
cent of Austria's total corn im­
ports.

The projections also show in­
creased imports of citrus fruits,
tobacco, vegetable oils and poultry
meats. It could be good news for
U.S. exporters, but only if this
country is given an opportunity
to maintain its access to the Aus­
trian market.

These projections are based on
a study conducted by the Austrian
Institute for Economic Research
for the Economic Research Serv­
ice. (34)
Government Assistance for Exports Sustains Crops in Foreign Markets

U.S. agriculture annually supplies about one-fifth of all farm commodities entering world trade. Nevertheless, U.S. exporters often have difficulty competing with low-priced commodities on the world market.

In order to maintain our leading position in international trade, the federal government provides several methods of assisting exporters. This assistance takes the form of cash or commodity payments or sales from government-owned stocks at less than domestic market prices.

Prior to 1956, with the exception of sales of wheat and flour under the International Wheat Agreement which received cash export payments, the bulk of export sales of government (Commodity Credit Corporation) stocks were made at competitive bid or announced export prices which at times were below domestic market prices.

Among the several commodities which receive export payment assistance, wheat is by far the largest, with $1,088 million of exports aided in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. Cotton ($661 million), feed grains ($137 million) and milled rice ($128 million) followed. Since late 1961, domestic feed grain prices have been at levels to permit record quantities of wheat continue to be smuggled to neighboring countries where prices are higher.

SOUTH AFRICA. Corn exports to Japan are fast catching up with U.S. exports. Valued at about $4 million in 1959, a year U.S. shipments totaled $15 million, South African exports hit $48 million in 1962; U.S. exports were just under $60 million.

COMMUNIST CHINA. Crop losses from heavy rains are indicated in Peiping's negotiations with Australia and Canada for more grain. If negotiated sales go through, grain imports, mostly wheat, will be above last two years. Other principal shippers are France and South Africa.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC. Inspired by TVA success, the Alliance for Progress is considering a vast irrigation project that would double the income of more than a quarter of a million rural people. (36)
Going shopping? You may find 85 different cuts of meat and poultry or 100 different kinds of canned vegetables—it's just a fraction of what modern foodstores offer.

The horn of plenty held scant rations compared with today's food store. Housewives know it; they shop the copious canyons of food every week. Economists can prove it; a team of them has just returned from counting up the abundance available in a typical American community. Their statistical grocery cart is ready to collapse under the weight of their food figures.

Item by item they counted up selected inventories for supermarkets, superettes and curb stores in two neighboring towns in North Carolina. Then they did it all over again, by size of store and by the neighborhood it served.

Any way they counted it, the economists found food in an almost stupifying variety.

Meat or poultry on the shopping list? The housewife could have found 85 different kinds and cuts of meat. That's what one store offered in the way of T-bones and chuck roasts and broilers and bacon and pork chops and veal steaks.

If that weren't enough, the shopper could have pushed the possibilities up to 135 by investigating all the stores.

Cold cuts and sea food, incidentally, weren't on the list. There is, after all, a limit to what one economic shopping bag will hold.

Or take canned green beans for a sample of everyday bounty. There were cut beans and French style, fancy long vertical packs and whole beans. Green beans with or without seasoning. There were, in fact, nine different varieties of canned green beans, not to mention fresh and frozen green beans.

The big food stores offered well over 70 different varieties of canned vegetables and the choice in one store was from as many as 100 varieties.

But as a measure of variety, the figure isn't even near the mark. You have to add, as the economists did, brands—to please the individual housewife's taste—and can sizes—to suit the needs of her family. One store in the survey offered 262 different combinations of can sizes, brands and varieties of vegetables alone.

The most likely place to find the widest variety of foods, incidentally, is not in the richest part of town. The survey found the biggest stock of items in supermarkets in lower income neighborhoods. It's the budget conscious housewife who needs and gets the widest selection of foods to make her budget stretch.

Variety, however, is not the only service the housewife wants; convenience is another. And convenience in the form of late hours and seven-day service is a near-monopoly of the little neighborhood stores and larger independ-
ents or superettes.

The old-fashioned neighborhood store and the new superettes both make a point of being open for the housewife who decides to do her shopping at nine or 10 o'clock at night. And of the two the doors are apt to be open later at the little neighborhood store.

Though the variety in these stores is nothing to compare with the big supermarkets, the little stores could take care of most of a week's shopping satisfactorily.

Should the housewife care to go on a city-wide shopping spree, searching for the ultimate in variety in foods, she is apt to find she would have been just as well off to stay within her own neighborhood. The manager of her local food store does his best to provide the items she wants, whatever they may be.

The biggest supermarkets in the study, for instance, offered as few as 65 different items of fresh meat and poultry, or as many as 85. The range is a pretty good indication that the managers knew what their customers wanted and had it ready for them. (37)

Granddad's Apple-A-Day Prescription Is Concentrated in Today's Freezer

Fresh fruit on the sideboard was almost a permanent fixture in the dining room of 1910.

Today the dining room fixture has moved into the kitchen, as concentrated juices in the freezer and as canned fruits on the shelf.

ERS has just updated to 1962 its yearly series on how much fruit we eat per person. It shows we ate about 3 pounds less fresh fruit last year than we did in 1961, but 50 pounds less than our grandparents did back in 1910.

Among the fresh fruits, only oranges and grapefruit, luxury items a half century ago, have climbed the consumption ladder.

The new figures show homemakers have simply switched from fresh and dried fruits to processed fruits — concentrated juices, canned fruit slices, frozen pies and the like. In 1962 we actually ate over 36 pounds more fruit in one form or another than our grandparents in 1910, more than 2 pounds more than we ourselves did in 1961. (38)

Food Imports Rose Last Year; Slightly Higher Than in 1961

About 13 per cent of the food Americans ate last year was imported—that's slightly more than in 1961. Coffee comprised the largest part of the total.

All of the coffee, tea, cocoa, and bananas we consumed in 1962 was imported. Some edible oils such as olive, and coconut, plus certain tree nuts such as cashews and Brazil nuts, and most spices also were imported. Of the total crops we used for food last year, about a third came from overseas.

About 78 per cent of our total imports of all agricultural commodities was used for civilian food. The remaining 22 per cent consisted of foods consumed by the military or were such nonfood products as wool, tobacco and cotton.

Only a little more than 3 per cent of the total food use of livestock products in 1962 was imported. Much of this was used in processed products.

The long dock strike beginning last December on the East and Gulf coasts paralyzed shipping and reduced most food imports in January this year well below the same period in 1962.

Imports of processed fruits and vegetables in January were more than a third below a year earlier. Imports of many fresh fruits, however, were increased to offset the freeze damage to southern crops last winter. (39)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of ownership, retail food establishment</th>
<th>Stores</th>
<th>Fresh meat, poultry</th>
<th>Fresh vegetables</th>
<th>Canned vegetables</th>
<th>Frozen vegetables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Av. Range</td>
<td>Av. Range</td>
<td>Av. Range</td>
<td>Av. Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-unit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76 67-85</td>
<td>26 17-31</td>
<td>78 73-84</td>
<td>34 26-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72 53-84</td>
<td>25 21-31</td>
<td>86 71-100</td>
<td>39 19-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31 17-52</td>
<td>15 7-21</td>
<td>51 33-63</td>
<td>16 8-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12 8-19</td>
<td>10 8-10</td>
<td>38 33-46</td>
<td>17 7-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different kinds of items available in sample stores, two communities</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Man faces one of the greatest challenges of the twentieth century between now and the year 2000.

Even at its simplest, the problem is staggering:

How can the world produce food for a population that will more than double from 3 billion to 6 billion plus in less than four decades, when there is little new land to draw on in many areas and not enough capital to raise yields much in most areas.

A comprehensive new study by the Economic Research Service presents the problem in three dimensions: Man, how fast he is multiplying; land, how little new acreage can readily be brought under cultivation; and food, how much it will take to feed a world population grown to over twice its present size by the year 2000.

The world food problem is not in the so-called developed world or industrial West—Europe, including the Soviet Union, North America (Canada and the United States) and Oceania (Australia and New Zealand). Diets in these regions have improved steadily since the beginning of the century. Today there are no nationwide food shortages anywhere in the western world.

But there are food deficits almost everywhere in the less developed world—Asia, Africa and Latin America. The study shows that people in some 50 less developed countries don’t get enough of the right foods for a balanced diet. Population has simply outraced food production, and the number of people suffering from malnutrition has actually gone up since the early 1900s.

The less developed region will be hard put in the years ahead to provide more and more people with even the same low quality diet.

And this is not enough in an era of new nations and new aspirations.

People want more food, better food, with enough of the proteins, fats and other nutrients that spell the difference between chronic inertia and normal health.

What will it take to raise the per capita food supply of the less
IDEAS OUTPACED MAN: Two great religions came into being. A single document laid one of the cornerstones of justice throughout the English-speaking world. Printing and the Renaissance opened new worlds of ideas and art. Yet for 16 centuries man could not make births much override the death rate. World population, 250 million at the time of Christ, had only doubled by 1600, a rate of growth ranging from 2.5 to 5 per cent a century. With advances in medicine and nutrition, the growth rate by 1900 was nearly 1 per cent a year. Today it's more than 2 per cent a year and rising. Estimated world population by the year 2000: 6 billion plus. How to feed spiraling populations is a problem that underlies economic development programs in most emerging countries.

REAL EXPLOSION STILL AHEAD: Disease remained the great leveler of populations in Latin America, Africa and Asia well into the twentieth century. The growth rate in the early decades of this century actually lagged behind that of the developed world where medical advances first helped to prolong life. But the less developed world has caught up fast. Latin America's population is growing fastest but Asia, which started the century with far more people, has the most critical problem. In the last four decades of the century the less developed region is expected to add well over 3 billion people, a number equal to the total population of the world today.

MAN: Four Births Per Second. From the dawn of man to the time of Christ, world population grew only to a total of 250 million. It took another 16 centuries to double this figure. Then medical science, colonization of new lands and somewhat better living conditions began to make slow but sure inroads in the high death rate. Population increased more rapidly, and by 1900 had reached an annual growth rate of 1 per cent.

Today's rate of increase is well above 2 per cent a year. In the world today four children are born every second, 240 a minute—or well over 300,000 a day. This growth rate is so recent a phenomenon that man has scarcely begun to assess its long-term impact.

The study shows that, even with expanded food imports, if the less developed world succeeds in raising the food available per person 20 per cent above present levels by the year 2000 it will have to:

—Nearly triple its present output.
—Add to present food output an amount approximating the current food production of the entire world.
—Achieve, with limited resources, an annual rate of increase in food output considerably higher than that ever attained by the affluent societies of North America and the rest of the industrial West.

Moreover, the less developed world will have to accomplish all this in less time than man has spent developing a single variety of high yield grain—hybrid corn.

developed world, say, 10 per cent above present levels by 1980, or 20 per cent by the year 2000?
From now until 2000, well above a decade. The less developed and a much smaller per capita greater than the present population growth. Projections show it will growing at less than 10 per cent (26%) the decade rate for Africa (18-22%) or Asia (22-25%).

However, Asia, with more people to start with, faces the most critical problem. By 2000 Asia alone will have a population greater than the present population of the entire world.

History suggests that the developed world has made the most progress when population was growing at less than 10 per cent a decade. The less developed world is trying to raise its economic level under the double burden of a population growth rate more than twice that of the West and a much smaller per capita endowment of land, water and other natural resources.

**LAND: The Shrinking Ratio.** Population growth is not in itself the critical factor in the protracted food shortage facing the less developed world. The real problem is that the man-land ratio is out of balance. Populations with enough land to support their food needs are not the ones having the most children.

Well into the twentieth century population pressures could still be eased by bringing new acreage under cultivation. But at mid-century this escape valve began to close. Over the next four decades higher yields must account for the larger part of the required increase in food output.

**FOOD: The Chronic Need.** The study shows that 92 per cent of the people in Asia live in countries where the average energy intake, measured in calories, is below the accepted minimum standards for good nutrition. The situation is less critical in Africa, where 38 per cent of the population is in calorie-deficient countries, and in Latin America, where the figure is 29 per cent.

However, people may get enough calories from starchy foods and still suffer from malnutrition. They also need livestock products, vegetables, fruits, and other types of foods that provide proteins, fat and vitamins.

By all protein indicators, diets met accepted standards in only 25 of the 60 countries in the less developed world in 1958, the last year studied. The other 35 countries, lacking one or more of the proteins, have 79 per cent of the population of the less developed world.

Thirteen of the 20 countries in Latin America had protein shortages of one kind or another, 10 of the 21 African countries, and eight countries in Asia.

Fat deficits showed up in eight countries in Latin America, eight in Africa. Again Asia had the greatest need. In India and Red China, the two population giants, fat intake per person per day was well below recommended standards. Overall, 90 per cent of Asia's population lived in areas where meat, milk, and other livestock products were not available to meet dietary needs for fat.

As these deficits show, actual starvation is not the problem. Nor is widespread famine a threat; emergency food aid is available from the United States.
POOR DIETS ARE CHRONIC PROBLEM: Nutritional standards based on what people in various regions need per day to sustain normal health and vigor show calorie shortages in most less developed countries, protein and fat deficits in many.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Calories</th>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Fat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>Pulse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist Asia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, South</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaya, Fed. of Pakistan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian Congo &amp; Ruanda-Urundi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Equat. Africa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. West Africa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanganyika</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Political entities as they were in 1958. 2 Mainland China, North Korea, North Vietnam.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY: Diverging Growth Rates. Since the less developed world must rely chiefly on land now under cultivation to supply food for future generations, each larger than the last, it will have to greatly increase yields per acre.

To gauge progress to date, the study compares the agricultural productivity of the less developed world with that of the industrial West, prewar to 1960/61. Grain is used as the indicator of trends in acreage, yields per acre, total production, and output per farm worker and per person of total population.

There are several reasons for this choice. Grains account for 70 per cent of the world's harvested cropland. They provide 52 per cent of man's food energy that is consumed directly and a large part of the remainder that is consumed indirectly in the form of meat, milk and eggs. Also, grains completely dominate world food trade.

Comparisons show that the industrial West and the less developed world produced in the aggregate about the same amount of grain in 1934-38, 334 million and 317 million metric tons respectively.

By 1960/61 both regions had increased total output considerably, but they did it in different ways. The West achieved a 51 per cent increase for an aggregate output of 506 million metric
tons on about the same amount of land it used prewar, mostly because of markedly higher yields in North America and Oceania.

To achieve an increase in total grain output of nearly 42 per cent, for an aggregate of 450 million metric tons, the less developed world used 30 per cent more land than prewar, a resource that cannot now be easily expanded.

In raising yields per acre, the hope of the future, the less developed world has not progressed as rapidly. By 1960/61 it had increased yields per acre only 8 per cent over the 1934-38 base period compared with a 51 per cent increase in the developed world.

By region, the study shows Asia upped yields 7 per cent, Latin America 8 per cent, while yields in North America climbed 109 per cent.

Perhaps the best gauge of agricultural progress is the amount of grain produced for each person in the total population.

For the entire world, grain output per person improved 7 per cent from prewar to 1960/61. The developed countries achieved a 26 per cent increase, from 1,036 to 1,307 pounds a year, for populations that grew relatively slowly. Starting at 494 pounds per person before the war, output in the less developed countries fell sharply during the war and early postwar years. Output per person began to climb during the 1950s, but by 1960/61, with the population explosion already underway, it was still 3 per cent below prewar.

By region, per capita output of grain in 1960/61 was 16 per cent below prewar in Latin America, 2 per cent in Asia. Only Africa among the less developed regions managed to keep ahead of population growth with a per capita increase of 8 per cent.

**TRADE: The Widening Gap.** Rising per capita food consumption and lagging per capita output in Latin America and Asia, plus

## MENUS VARY

In developed countries where income is higher, people eat more meat and a wider variety of other foods. Less developed countries rely chiefly on low-cost starchy foods.

### GRAIN YIELDS PER ACRE

Prewar, the less developed region had average grain yields slightly higher than the developed region. Since the war, yields have risen rapidly in the developed region but remained virtually static in the capital-scarce less developed region.

### TABLE: PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CALORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Grain products, roots and tubers</th>
<th>Fruits, nuts and vegetables</th>
<th>Sugar</th>
<th>Fats &amp; oils</th>
<th>Livestock products</th>
<th>Fish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic regions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed region</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less developed region</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic regions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Europe &amp; USSR</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE: GRAIN YIELDS PER ACRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1934-38</th>
<th>1948-52</th>
<th>1960/61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pounds</td>
<td>Pounds</td>
<td>Pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic regions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed region</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less developed region</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic regions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>2,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Europe &amp; USSR</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Less developed region includes Asia, Africa and Latin America. Developed region includes all others.
Grain output per person: Fast growing populations have kept the less developed region from regaining its prewar per capita output. With a slower rate of population growth, the developed region has moved well ahead of its prewar level, now producing almost three times as much grain per person as the less developed region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1934-38</th>
<th>1948-52</th>
<th>1960/61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic regions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed region</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less developed region</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic regions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe and USSR</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure of progress: Grain output per worker in the farm population, a measure of labor productivity, shows North America has about tripled output, Oceania more than doubled output since prewar. Latin America has fallen back slightly while all other regions have gained moderately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1934-38</th>
<th>1948-52</th>
<th>1960/61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic regions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed region</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>3,503</td>
<td>4,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less developed region</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic regions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>15,524</td>
<td>21,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>2,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe and USSR</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>5,143</td>
<td>8,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher consumption per person in Africa, have severely altered the trade and foreign exchange position of all three regions.

Prewar, each region was a net exporter of grain, earning foreign exchange needed for economic development. Today all have to import grain to help meet the food needs of their growing populations.

Just before the war, Asia had net grain exports of some 2 million metric tons a year. By 1948-52 it was importing nearly 6 million tons a year and by 1960-61 the figure had jumped to an unprecedented 16 million metric tons. About half of the grain imports in 1960/61 were needed to offset the drop in Asia's own per capita output, about half to provide slightly more food per person.

During the late 1930s Latin America was the dominant supplier of the world grain market, exporting more grain than North America and Oceania put together.

Over the next quarter century Latin America increased production 42 per cent. Population, however, increased 69 per cent. By 1960/61 the region was importing grain both to feed a bigger population and to provide a little more per person.

Never very closely tied to the world economy, Africa was not traditionally either much of a grain exporter or importer. Also, Africa is the only less developed region where grain output has kept pace with population growth. Nevertheless, Africa has slipped over the line from sometime exporter to importer of about 2 million metric tons of grain a year in order to meet its people's growing demand for more food.

Western Europe, of course, has long been the world's biggest grain market, buying what it can't produce. The Soviet Union, currently struggling to produce all its own grain, along with the rest of Eastern Europe will de-
develop a sizeable deficit if past trends continue.

This leaves North America and Oceania as the only major grain suppliers. And North America will become increasingly important as a supplier of grain to the world's deficit regions.

A HARD LOOK AHEAD. What will it take to give people in the less developed world 10 per cent more food than they now have by 1980, 20 per cent more by 2000?

Counting domestic production and imports, Latin America, Africa and Asia now have on the average about 489 pounds of grain per person a year.

A 10 per cent increase would make 536 pounds available per person. A 20 per cent increase would up the amount to 584 pounds, about a third the amount of grain per person available today in North America.

Imports are not the answer. Now running about 19 million metric tons a year, they account for 8 per cent of the total grain supply of the less developed world. By 2000, imports, chiefly from North America, are projected to increase five-fold and account for about 5 per cent of the total supply. But this is about the maximum imports the marketing and transportation systems of the less developed regions can be expected to handle. The other 95 per cent of the grain needed will have to come from domestic production.

This means that the less developed world will have to triple total grain output by the year 2000, from the present level of 433 million metric tons a year to 1,253 million.

For Asia, this means expanding grain output 69 per cent above the present level by 1980, 187 per cent above the present level by 2000.

Africa will have to increase production 22 million metric tons or 58 per cent by 1980 and 62...
MAN, LAND AND FOOD

Developed region:

Production: 1,036
Net trade: +33
Availability: 1,069

Less developed region:

Production: 494
Net trade: -18
Availability: 476

THE TASK AHEAD: To provide 20 per cent more food per person by the year 2000, a modest goal, the less developed world will have to add to current grain production an amount almost equal to present world output. Slight declines in output from prewar have been offset up to now by growing imports from the developed world. However, imports now providing 3 per cent of the total food supply, are expected to account for not more than 5 per cent by century's end for a population more than double its present size.

Total grain available, with projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed region:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net trade</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less developed region:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net trade</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>+68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

million tons or 163 per cent by the year 2000.

Latin America will need to increase grain output 71 per cent, or 30 million metric tons by 1980, 212 per cent or 89 million tons by the year 2000.

The less developed world has few resources for a task of this magnitude:

Land: Limited. As already shown, not much new land can be added to present acreage.

Agricultural research: Inadequate. Although most less developed countries are tropical or semi-tropical, little research has been done on improving plant varieties and farm methods suitable to the hot, often damp climate.

Labor: Abundant. Manpower is expected to be plentiful in agriculture. But more workers per acre can do little to increase output without the addition of capital inputs.

Fertilizer: The key to higher yields, but seriously lacking throughout the less developed region.

The less developed world now uses about 5 million tons of chemical fertilizers a year. Assuming it takes one pound of fertilizer (measured in plant nutrients) to produce 10 pounds of grain, the region would have to increase fertilizer use to 34 million tons to raise per capita grain availability 10 per cent by 1980. A 20 per cent increase in per capita grain availability by 2000 would take 87 million tons of fertilizer a year.

Asia, now using 3.3 million tons of chemical fertilizers annually, will have to increase use to 27 million tons by 1980. In other words, Asia alone in less than 20 years will have to use a quantity of fertilizer almost equal to current world production of 28.6 million tons.

From 1980 to 2000, Asia will need to almost triple fertilizer use, to 67 million tons.

Africa, currently using less than one million metric tons of chemical fertilizers a year, will have to increase the amount to 2.7 million tons by 1980 and to 6.7 million tons by 2000.

Latin America will need to step up fertilizer applications from the current one million tons a year to 4 million by 1980 and to 10 million by 2000.

In sum, a great increase in the use of chemical fertilizers is essential to the ultimate solution of the growing food problem.

But to build enough chemical fertilizer plants to raise fertilizer use from the current level of 5 million metric tons a year to 87 million metric tons by 2000 will require a tremendous capital investment. And most of the less developed countries have little money to invest in agriculture.

While actually confined to less developed countries, the growing food problem is in a larger sense a world problem. The industrial West is equally committed to its solution. (40)
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THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—AGRICULTURE AND TRADE. Leon G. Mears, Regional Analysis Division. ERS-Foreign 51.

The Dominican Republic's foreign trade is growing rapidly, and the United States is sharing in the increase. The United States is the principal market for Dominican agricultural exports as well as the major source for its farm and nonfarm imports. With recent wage increases and the decline in unemployment the purchasing power of the Dominican people has increased and new import demand has resulted.

NEW ZEALAND’S AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION, MARKETING, AND TRADE POLICIES AND THEIR BEARING ON U.S. FARM EXPORTS. Mary E. Long, Regional Analysis Division. FAER-9.

This study was made to obtain more thorough knowledge of the competition faced by U.S. farmers from New Zealand’s products in both local and foreign markets. Until recently the bulk of New Zealand’s exports went to the United Kingdom, but since 1958 a larger proportion has been diverted to the United States, Japan, and certain West European countries. In the New Zealand market, the United States encounters stiff competition from Australia and the British West Indies.

SPECIAL PROMOTIONAL PROGRAMS FOR WINTER PEARS—THEIR EFFECTS ON SALES OF WINTER PEARS AND OTHER FRUITS. James F. Hind, Cleveland P. Eley, and Carl R. Twining, Marketing Economics Division. MRR-611.

Research was conducted in 75 food supermarkets in five cities over a 20-week period to evaluate the relative sales effectiveness of four promotional techniques for winter pears. Techniques tested were: (1) point-of-purchase displays, (2) store demonstrations, (3) dealer contests with cash prizes, and (4) media advertising programs of low intensity. Store demonstrations and dealer contests were the most effective techniques.


Important structural changes in the breakfast foods industry from 1947-49 to 1961 are examined in this report. The number of establishments manufacturing prepared breakfast foods decreased from 64 in 1947 to 43 in 1958-33 per cent. At the same time the number of companies decreased 53 per cent. Consumer preference was switching from hot cooked cereals to cold ready-to-eat breakfast foods. Ready-to-eat cereals increased from 45 per cent of total production in 1939 to an estimated 65 per cent in 1961. Larger volumes of grain, grain products, and breakfast foods were flowing through fewer channels in 1961 than previously.

STATISTICS ON THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY. VOL. 2—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION. Regional Analysis Division. ERS-Foreign 46.

The Department of Agriculture has compiled data pertaining to
the production, utilization, and trade of agricultural commodities for the Common Market members, Greece and those countries which are currently applicants for membership. Because of the magnitude of this data, the material has been published in two volumes. This volume contains data on acreage, yields, livestock numbers, output, prices, farm requisites, and food consumption. Volume 1 (ERS-Foreign 43) contains information on trade, finance, income, and population.


Ionizing radiation pasteurization is a method that might be used to extend the cold storage life of fresh strawberries, peaches, tomatoes, grapes, oranges, and grapefruit. Fresh produce handlers who were surveyed gave two main advantages of the process: It would reduce spoilage losses, and maintain quality. Among the disadvantages they expected is consumer resistance due to fear of the process. The Department of Agriculture conducted this study for the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

CHANGING SHIPPING PATTERNS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—WITH EMPHASIS ON UNITED STATES GRAIN EXPORTS. Marketing Economics Division. MRR-621.

Traffic on the St. Lawrence Seaway more than doubled in the period 1958-62, rising from 11.3 million tons to nearly 26.0 million tons. Agricultural commodities were 42 per cent of the tonnage moved through the St. Lawrence River in 1958, and 47 percent in 1961. Grain was more than 85 per cent of all agricultural tonnage. This study evaluates the traffic record of the new waterway since it opened.

AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION BY NONTARIFF TRADE BARRIERS. ERS-Foreign 60.

The following nontariff controls were studied: Import quotas and embargoes, variable levies and gate price system, conditional imports, monopolies, advance deposits on imports, import discrimination and preferential treatment, import licensing and bilateral agreements. The study was made by ERS in cooperation with the Foreign Agricultural Service.