

5. Busch, L., W. Lacy, J. Burkhardt, and L. Lacy. 1991. *Plants, Power, and Profit: Social, Economic and Value Consequences of the New Biotechnologies*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, England.
6. Cook, R.J. 1991. Challenges and rewards of sustainable agriculture research and education. In *Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education in the Field: A Proceedings*. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. pp. 32-76.
7. Dahlberg, K.A. 1987. Redefining development priorities: Genetic diversity and agroeco-development. *Conservation Biology* 1:311-322.
8. Doyle, J. 1985. *Altered Harvest: Agriculture, Genetics, and the Fate of the World's Food Supply*. Viking, New York, N.Y.
9. Ebenreck, S. 1992. A sense of place: The nature and significance of community. In *Alternative Farming Systems and Rural Communities: Exploring the Connections*. Institute for Alternative Agriculture, Greenbelt, MD. pp. 1-8.
10. Gardner, J.C., V.L. Anderson, B.G. Schatz, P.M. Carr, and S.J. Guldan. 1991. Overview of current sustainable agriculture research. In *Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education in the Field: A Proceedings*. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. pp. 77-91.
11. Harwood, R.R. 1990. A history of sustainable agriculture. In C.A. Edwards, R. Lal, P. Madden, R.H. Miller and G. House (eds). *Sustainable Agricultural Systems. Soil and Water Conservation Soc.*, Ankeny, Iowa. pp. 3-19.
12. Hightower, J. 1973. *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times*. Schenckman Publishing Co., Cambridge, Massachusetts.
13. Lacy, W.B., L.R. Lacy, and L. Busch. 1988. Agricultural biotechnology research: Practices, consequences, and policy recommendations. *Agriculture and Human Values* 5(3):3-14.
14. Lacy, W.B., L.R. Lacy, and L. Busch. 1992. Emerging trends, consequences and policy issues of agricultural biotechnology. In M. Hallberg (ed). *Bovine Somatotropin and Emerging Issues*. Westview, Boulder, Colorado. pp. 3-32.
15. Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture. 1990. *Annual Report*. Ames, Iowa.
16. National Research Council. 1989. *Alternative Agriculture*. Board on Agriculture. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
17. National Research Council. 1991. *Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education in the Field: A Proceedings*. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
18. Schaller, N. 1991. An agenda for research on the impacts of sustainable agriculture. Occasional Paper No. 2. Institute for Alternative Agriculture, Greenbelt, Maryland.
19. Schaller, N. 1992. A *Choices* dialogue on mandated training in sustainable agriculture: It's an opportunity. *Choices* 7(1):33.



## INSTITUTE NEWS

### ***Institute Conference Explores a New Time to Choose for Alternative Ag***

Future policy opportunities for alternative agriculture were explored by revisiting the past at the Henry A. Wallace Institute for Alternative Agriculture's 10th annual conference on March 1 entitled, *Alternative Agriculture Policy: A New Time to Choose*. More than 150 people attended. The morning sessions, moderated by Wallace Institute Executive Director Garth Youngberg, "looked back" at two landmark studies requested by U.S. Agriculture Secretary Bob Bergland during the Carter Administration: *A Time to Choose* (1981), a report on the changing structure of American agriculture, and *Report and Recommendations on Organic Farming* (1980).

*A Time to Choose* has had significant impacts on agriculture, according to Lynn Daft of the consulting firm Abel, Daft & Earley. "It produced forward movement on long-term conservation; tighter farm

credit; increased prominence of environmental, food safety, and dietary issues; integration of trade and farm policy; and a reduced role of government." Richard Harwood of Michigan State University discussed the "triumph and tragedy" of the organic farming report, including the difficulties faced by the research team in evaluating "indigenous knowledge" of organic farmers who were "outside the scientific paradigm" at a time when conventional scientific models dominated. Nevertheless, when the report was published, "no firestorm erupted, and some scientists began to see the potential of organic agriculture."

At the time, the reports were "a breath of fresh air for me on the farm," said Iowa farmer Paul Johnson, who served on a panel with Cornelia Flora of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and Bob Papendick of USDA's Agricultural Research Service, Washington State University. Flora stressed the importance of the organic farming report's use of indigenous knowledge within the context of agricultural policy, community and institu-

tions; according to Papendick, the study found that the motivation for many farmers to turn to organic farming was concern for soil quality, which is "the key to agricultural sustainability."

Wallace Institute Associate Director Neill Schaller moderated the afternoon session of "looking ahead" with Kathleen Merrigan of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a former key staff member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Forestry, and Nutrition, who reviewed the lessons of the 1990 Farm Bill that could help to encourage sustainable agriculture in the future. She cited a need to fill the "knowledge gaps" that occurred during the Farm Bill debate with more science and policy analysis, and to follow through on the legislation once it becomes law. "Many of the programs authorized by the Farm Bill didn't get off the ground" because of lack of funding, she said. Her advice for the future also included establishing a unifying image of sustainable agriculture, identifying key issues and participants, expanding the coalition of people who will

work on future agriculture policy, and organizing and orchestrating ahead of time.

The policy opportunities and challenges ahead were explored by a panel moderated by Kate Clancy of Syracuse University; Roger Blobaum of Blobaum and Associates; Chuck Hassebrook of the Center for Rural Affairs; Maureen Hinkle of the National Audubon Society; Jim Jontz, former Indiana Congressman; Fred Kirschenmann, farm leader from North Dakota; and Bill Lacy of Pennsylvania State University. They stressed the need for better coalitions, skilled labor, and sustainable communities to reach sustainable agriculture's full potential.

Bob Bergland, former Agriculture Secretary and Executive Vice President and General Manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, made the closing remarks at the conference, which he had hosted at the NRECA building in Washington, D.C.

### **IAA Conference Proceedings Now Available**

The proceedings of the 1992 IAA conference, *Alternative Farming Systems and Rural Communities—Exploring the Con-*

*nections*, are now available for \$6. Included are papers based on the presentations of 15 speakers and five work groups which explored strategies to restore or create healthy connections between agriculture and rural communities. The proceedings are available from the Henry A. Wallace Institute for Alternative Agriculture, 9200 Edmonston Road, #117, Greenbelt, MD 20770; (301)441-8777.

### **Farm Groups Urge Clinton to Increase SARE Funding**

Several farm organizations, including the Wallace Institute, have written to President Clinton, urging him to include the SARE program and the Sustainable Agriculture Technology Development and Transfer Program (SATDTP) among the increased research and technology investments presented in the FY'94 budget proposal.

"It is our sincere hope that over the next two or three fiscal years these two programs will reach their fully authorized levels of \$40 million and \$20 million, respectively," the groups wrote. The SARE program, they said, "plays a unique and important role in the overall federal-state research arena;" the SATDTP would

help train agricultural agents, and "improve outreach and technology transfer to the farm community."

### **South Dakota State University Economist is Visiting Scholar**

Thomas L. Dobbs, a professor of agricultural economics at South Dakota State University, is spending time at the Wallace Institute this spring studying farm and environmental policies and programs that could foster the sustainability of agriculture. His project, which makes a major contribution to the Institute's new alternative agriculture policy studies program, expands upon his ongoing research on implementation and impacts of federal programs in his region.

Dobbs, who earned a Ph.D. degree from the University of Maryland, brings to his assignment several years of pioneering research on the economics and policy implications of sustainable farming systems in the Corn Belt-Great Plains. He served for three years on the North Central Administrative Council which directs the USDA's SARE program in that region.



---

### *OPINION cont'd from p. 4*

tween family farmers and animal protectionists. Family farmers can make a convincing case that their farming systems usually offer animal protection benefits that the industrial systems cannot.

Several systems that respect animal protection have been championed by the sustainable agriculture movement. Hog farmers in Iowa are finding outdoor farrowing on pasture and other low-capital production systems profitable and enjoyable—for them and their hogs. University of Minnesota researchers have confirmed this, finding low-input hog production as productive as confinement, while requiring less capital and work for the farmers, and improving the hogs' welfare.

Dairy farmers in Wisconsin find that intensive rotational grazing benefits the land, their profits, and their cows' comfort and

productivity. A University of Wisconsin meat scientist found that compared with formula-fed veal, grain-fed veal was cheaper to raise, as palatable, and as productive. Most important, the veal calves did not require the confinement crates that are vilified by animal protectionists.

**Real animal protection at the family farm gate.** Clearly, there are workable, profitable alternatives to animal factories that will benefit farmers, their customers, and their animals. Farmers need to adopt and promote these systems to demonstrate how they benefit animal welfare—and their own profits. Farmers also need to direct animal protectionists' sweeping criticisms to the corner where their critical brooms should be aimed—the animal factories.

For their part, animal protectionists need to differentiate between the positive animal welfare benefits possible (but not

always present) on small and medium-sized family-operated farms, and the absence of those benefits in animal factories. There is precedent for collaborating with farmers on this issue. The Humane Society brought in livestock farmers to help it develop its "recommended humane principles" for livestock production. The Animal Welfare Institute worked with southern Minnesota hog farmers to develop a humanely raised pork product for direct marketing to consumers.

This is the kind of alliance that farmers must make with animal protectionists, environmentalists and others if they, not food conglomerate stockholders, are to be beneficiaries of livestock agriculture.

