



# **The Ethical Challenges Farming: A Report on Conversations with Missouri Corn and Soybean Producers**

**Harvey S. James, Jr.**

*Department of Agricultural Economics Working Paper No. AEWP 2003-05*

First Draft June 2003

Revised September 2004

The Department of Agricultural Economics is a part of the Social Sciences Unit of the  
College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources at the University of Missouri-Columbia  
200 Mumford Hall, Columbia, MO 65211 USA  
Phone: 573-882-3545 • Fax: 573-882-3958 • <http://www.ssu.missouri.edu/agecon>

# **The Ethical Challenges Farming: A Report on Conversations with Missouri**

## **Corn and Soybean Producers**

**Harvey S. James, Jr.\***

Agribusiness Research Institute  
University of Missouri-Columbia  
146 Mumford Hall  
Columbia, MO 65211-6200  
Phone: 573-884-9682  
Fax: 573-882-3958  
E-mail: [hjames@missouri.edu](mailto:hjames@missouri.edu)

September 22, 2004

Abstract: Interviews with Missouri corn and soybean farmers reveal what farmers consider are important ethical challenges in agriculture. In contrast to the literature, which characterizes ethical challenges in term of philosophical debates about soil conservation, the use of pesticides and genetically modified seeds, and the treatment of animals, for instance, this research finds that farmers perceive ethical challenges in behavioral terms. The reason is rooted in the industrialization of agricultural production, which creates tensions for farmers between doing what they believe is right and doing what they feel they must in order to survive.

\* Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the annual meetings of the Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society, in Austin, Texas, in June 2003, and at the IAREH Fifth International Symposium, Future of Rural Peoples, in Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada, in October 2003. This research was supported in part by the Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station.

# **The Ethical Challenges Farming: A Report on Conversations with Missouri Corn and Soybean Producers**

"We must diversify and deepen our capacity for saying what is important to us and why, and for hearing what is important to others (and why)." (Thompson, 1998, p. 208)

## **Introduction**

There are many important ethical issues and challenges in agriculture. These include, in part, the role of biotechnology, the treatment of farm animals, the use of artificial chemicals in farming and desirability of organic farming practices, the sustainability of resources (land, air, water), the decline of the family farm, and so forth. Wunderlich (1990, p. 21) summarizes these challenges as involving "animal (nature) rights, conservation, organization of agriculture, and people versus planet relationships." These are serious issues, to be sure. However, their delineation and exposition have been accomplished principally "outside" of agriculture – by academic researchers and philosophers, for instance. In contrast, there have been few studies devoted to an understanding of what those on the "inside" of agriculture – the farmer and other agricultural producers – perceive to be important ethical challenges in agriculture. For example, Dundon (1991, p. 63) identified "a set of dynamic first principles for an applied ethics in agriculture" by examining the writings of eight religious-based organizations, including the Reformed Church of America, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and the American Lutheran Church. The ethical challenges important to these religious organizations, which Dundon said involved representation from agricultural interests, included the impact of private ownership on society, the adequacy of the food supply, sustainability, and the environment. More recently, Schoon and Te Grotemhuis (2000) interviewed conventional and ecological Dutch farmers to

determine the relationship among the values of farmers regarding sustainability and nature and specific farming practices. They observed a correlation between values and the behavioral choices of farmers. They also found that farmers have a concern for "societal appreciation, continuity of the farm, and perceptions of 'nature'" (pp. 25-26).

This paper presents findings from interviews with Missouri corn and soybean farmers designed to learn what farmers feel are the most important ethical challenges today in agriculture. Instead of gauging farmer opinions on specific ethical issues, such as attitudes towards nature or satisfaction with farm life, as in Sullivan, McCann, De Young, and Erickson (1996), this study attempts to understand what ethical issues farmers believe are important from their own perspectives and in their own words. Because of growing concerns over food safety and security, and recognizing the role of the farmer within the agricultural system, it is imperative that we acknowledge the perspectives of farmers with respect to agricultural ethics.

This research builds on the distinction between two general types of ethical problems in agriculture previously identified in the literature (see James, 2003). One type of ethical challenge reflects philosophical "debates." For example, should farmers adopt genetically modified (GM) crops or should they use GM-free seeds? Should animal welfare be considered in concentrated livestock production? Should intensive farming practices be used or should farmers practice sustainable farming techniques? These are "debates" in the sense that answers are not obvious but rather are a source of protracted controversy. In contrast, the other type of challenge reflects behavioral issues in which people have incentives to do things that they or others understand to be inappropriate. Examples here include the dumping of toxic wastes into public water systems and the violation of food safety standards by food processors. Although it is generally recognized that one should not indiscriminately dispose of toxicants into public waterways or bribe

agricultural inspectors, for example, people often have incentives to do just that, thus creating an ethical problem.

Philosophers, agriculturalists, and academics who write about ethical issues in agriculture often focus on the philosophical debates, such as biotechnology, animal welfare, sustainability, and the proper use of the environment. An important question is whether farmers are also concerned about these issues specifically, or "philosophical" issues generally. As this study shows, farmers not only express concerns about the "debates," but they also are concerned about ethics from a behavioral perspective – doing what they know to be right, even though they face incentives to do otherwise. As will be shown below, in many instances farmers are more concerned about ethics from the behavioral perspective than the philosophical perspective. The reason is that farming takes place in an environment that is increasingly industrial, market-oriented and business-like. This is not to say that farming has not been considered a business until only recently – "it is important also to remember that a farmer is a businessman," says Edwards (1991, p. 75). Rather, it is an acknowledgment that the intensification of market processes in agriculture might compel farmers to believe that ethics should be thought about in terms of how they affect business. This could create the potential for farmers to justify unethical conduct because such behavior is seen as necessary in order to remain competitive. In short, ethics for farmers is summarized by the following statement of one farmer interviewed for this study: "*Most things come down to money, or power.*"

This paper describes the results from a series of face-to-face interview with Missouri corn and soybean farmers early in 2003. As shown below, the predominant theme of these interviews was the economic pressures farmers face as a result of the industrialization of agriculture. The paper then justifies these conclusions by highlighting changes that have occurred within

agriculture during the past 100 years by illustrating how economic pressures have increased for farmers. Finally, the paper concludes with a discussion of implications and directions for future research.

## **Methods**

I conducted face-to-face interviews with approximately two dozen Missouri corn and soybean farmers between January and May of 2003. My purpose in interviewing farmers was to learn from them – in their own words – what they believe to be important ethical challenges in agriculture. I identified potential interview subjects through personal contacts within the farming community. I also requested recommendations from farmers as well as University colleagues. Additionally, I met with a group of farmers attending a University extension meeting in central Missouri. No attempt was made to produce a formal or "scientific random sample" of interview subjects. Simply, I spoke with any farmer willing to meet with me. Thus, the selection and interviewing processes are more reflective of an ethnographic than scientific methodology, since my overall purpose was to obtain a general description of farmer attitudes regarding agricultural ethics. For this reason, caution must be made in generalizing the results of this study. Nevertheless, I did meet with different types of farmers from different parts of Missouri. These included small farmers (farming fewer than 300 acres) and large farmers (farming several thousand acres), and growers who use genetically modified (GM) seeds as well as growers of non-GM crops, so as to improve the generalizability of my findings. The ages of farmers interviewed ranged from 35 to 62. All farmers were male, although on four occasions the farmer's wife also participated in our conversations. All farmers considered themselves conventional farmers; I did not meet with any farmers who operated organic farms.

I intended my interviews to be open-ended discussions because I wanted to hear from them what they believed to be important ethical issues, not what they thought about what I believed to be important. Nevertheless, the interviews did follow similar format, based on three questions. First, I asked farmers to describe their farming operations, including the number of acres farmed, types of crops planted, and how long they farmed. Second, I asked farmers to explain their basic philosophy about farming (i.e., "why do you farm?"). Third, I asked farmers to explain what they perceive to be the most important ethical issues in farming (letting them define ethics for themselves). This research protocol was approved by the University of Missouri's Institutional Review Board. All subjects signed informed consent forms. All interviews were taped recorded except for two instances in which the farmer objected to the recording. Detailed notes were taken and compared to recordings to verify accuracy. My analysis, below, is based on my overall impressions of the content of the interviews.

### **What Farmers Say About Ethics**

Interestingly, a common reaction of farmers to my request to talk with them about ethics was that they would get a grin on their face, as if they had a story to tell about some ethical issue or problem they have observed or have had to deal with. All of the farmers I met with were quite willing to talk with me about ethics. In fact, some were even anxious. One farmer even broke down in tears as he described the pressures to do what he thinks is right even when the individuals and institutions he must associate with challenge his ethical principles. To that end, the most common theme that arose during my interviews was the growing industrialization of agriculture and the economic realities it produces. In fact, when asked to describe what they thought were the most important ethical issues in farming, nearly every farmer gave as their first

illustration some factor that can be linked to economic pressures created by industrialization. For example, one farmer observed that farming is becoming more cutthroat, one began by saying "you do what you need to do," two farmers specifically mentioned that business agreements in farming today can no longer be done simply on a handshake, and several described the necessity of increasing farm size and the trend toward concentration of farms. Only one farmer mentioned as a first example a non-economic or "philosophical" issue – pollution derived from hog waste and the question of whether livestock held in confinement should be exercised (he thought these were related) – but he also discussed industrialization and the difficulty farmers have in making a living as important ethical problems.

Many farmers referred to the industrialization of agriculture in terms of a tension between their belief in working the land out of a sense of stewardship and the economic realities of farming as a business. "*There is a high state of frustration in agriculture*" resulting from industrialization, commented one farmer. Technology, economies of scale, corporate interests, the need to make a living, the competitiveness of other farmers, agricultural production in other countries, government agricultural programs, and social interests for low-cost food were specifically mentioned. Most farmers, but particularly the older ones who reminisced about what farming was like in the past, lamented the fact that farming is becoming more like a business and less like a way of life. Farmers agreed that they farm to make a living – "*We farm to make a living, we farm to make money, to be quite honest about it ... You're going to be out of there if you can't pay the bills,*" said one experienced farmer. However, the pressure to make a living is increasing for them as competition squeezes profit margins. This, in turn, forces farmers to change not only the way they think about farming but also the way they farm.



As an illustration, several farmers bemoaned the fact that farms have become less diversified during the past decade by, for instance, shedding hog operations and scaling back cattle businesses in order to concentrate principally on corn, soybeans and wheat. "*Farming is less rewarding now than it used to be,*" said one farmer who recently sold off his unprofitable hog and cattle operations in order to free up land for row crops. Many crop farmers felt they should specialize in crops not only because they are losing money in livestock but also because low profit margins in grain require them to devote more acreage to crops in order to maintain income levels. Such specialization is expected as market pressures increase (see Stigler, 1951; Burda and Dluhosch, 2002), but the impact of the change is felt much deeper for the farmer. Some farmers enjoyed the physical labor associated with working with animals, in contrast to the monotony of driving a tractor up and down acres and acres of farmland. Others felt they had a moral imperative to have livestock on a farm, particularly if they were raised on farms that used animal labor, but the moral imperative could not be reconciled with the fact that it was financially impossible to sustain a livestock business. Specializing in crops rather than having diversified farms with crops and livestock also changes the way many farmers work and manage their finances. The cash flow from a hog business, for instance, could smooth farmer incomes throughout the year. Now, farmers must either borrow money throughout the year or take on second or third jobs during the "down time" in winter to generate additional family income. Most farmers have a spouse who worked outside of the home in order to supplement farming family incomes.

The concern that farming is becoming more business-like was a view widely expressed by older farmers. Younger farmers, however, did not necessarily see this as a problem *per se*. For them, farming was just another business or career choice. One young farmer, for instance,

expressed no sense of obligation to sell his grain to the locally owned grain elevator or to purchase his seeds and other farm inputs from local suppliers. Rather, he went wherever he could get the best price. Indeed, farmers reported, it is not uncommon for a farmer to own a truck in order to haul grain a hundred or more miles in order to capture a marginal premium in price. And this is in spite of the fact that farmers observe local elevators or supply shops going out of business.

The young farmer who specifically expressed a willingness to go wherever he could get the best price did acknowledge the importance of personal ethics, being trustworthy in business dealings, and soil conservation, for instance, because these are just "*good business practice.*" But for him, as well as for most of the farmers I met with, everything is done in terms of the business calculation. Hog operations are shed because they are no longer profitable. Grain is shipped to the next county because an elevator there offers a better price than the local elevator. Fertilizer and other nutrients are added to the soil because the increase in yields justifies the added input cost (if not, land is not maintained). Genetically modified (GM) seeds are planted because they require less pesticide and because they "*make a lot of money*" (in the words of a farmer). Interestingly, several farmers describing the business view of farming also expressed concern over the fact that corporate farms would come into their community, outbid local farmers on rented land (thus increasing land rental prices), bring in own equipment and supplies, farm land for a few years without fertilizing, then stop renting after yields declined. One farmer called this "*raping*" the land. "*People should farm, corporations should not,*" he said. For farmers, ethics is seen more from their own perspective than from the viewpoint of an outside observer. It is easy to identify unethical conduct of others, but hard to see it in themselves. The idea that farmers will take actions that benefit themselves without fully considering the impact of their decisions on

their surrounding community confirms Thompson's (1998, pp. 183-184) claim that "those who ... farm increasingly tend to see their operations as a business and resent the suggestion that they should be held up as moral exemplars."

Because farms are becoming larger and more specialized, and because farmers are feeling increasing economic pressures to compete to make a living, many farmers acknowledged a pressure to take short cuts that they otherwise would not have been willing to consider. However, no farmer specifically admitted to doing anything seriously unethical. Indeed, many professed strongly the belief that most farmers are very ethical people and that it is important to do the right thing. Nevertheless, nearly every farmer interviewed had anecdotes about things they had seen neighboring farmers do that they thought were either unethical or illegal. For example, one interview subject said that some farmers, in order to apply pesticides and herbicides according to a set calendared schedule, would spray regardless of the weather or wind, in violation of federal guidelines (see Environmental Protection Agency, 1999). As one insider put it: "*Some producers would rather pay another producer for damage to their crops caused by drift than delay spraying their field. They calculate that it is cheaper to pay them than wait and not get all their fields sprayed.*" Similarly, other farmers do not follow the label instructions regarding the quantity of pesticide spray to use. "*Instead of 2.5 quarts to the acre they spray 1.5 or 2 quarts to save money. Instead of spraying weeds at three to nine inches tall, then spot spraying skips later, they wait until weeds are 12 to 18 inches tall so they can spray only once. [This makes] it harder for the chemicals to work correctly. This leads to tolerant weeds and insects.*"

Several farmers reported a general decline in neighborliness, which they attributed to the pressure farmers have to increase the size of their operations in order to remain competitive. Where land prices are high, farmers believe they can only (profitably) increase their scale of

operation by renting rather than purchasing land. If landowners are uninterested in who actually farms the land, so long as the rent received is maximized, then they will rent to whoever offers the highest cash-rent price. For instance, two farmers I interviewed told stories of neighbors who had farmed a rented plot of land for many years, only to lose the lease because another farmer in the community, or a large corporate farm, came in and offered a higher rental price for the land. Both farmers who told this story expressed the opinion that overbidding a neighbor without first warning him was an unethical thing to do. But, they said it seemed to be happening with greater frequency today than in the past. This is in contrast to farmer recollections about neighbors helping neighbors. You "*didn't view [your] neighbor as your competitor,*" said a farmer.

Furthermore, farmers are increasingly seeing business decisions that used to be done on a handshake now being done through formal contracts. The implication is that conflicts, when they arise, are being resolved by courts or a reliance on the terms of the written contractual agreement rather than on the strength of personal relationships. For instance, one farmer explained how agreements to supply a certain quantity of corn to the local grain elevator were usually done over the telephone. If that farmer ever had difficulty fulfilling the supply agreement, because of poor weather, for instance, he and the grain elevator would renegotiate the contract in a mutually satisfactory way. However, after the grain elevator was purchased by an out-of-state agribusiness, all supply contracts with farmers were formalized, with delivery terms and remedies for breach made explicit within the contract. This farmer then explained how he tried to renegotiate delivery terms because of weather-related crop damage, as he had on other occasions when the elevator was locally owned, but was rebuffed by the corporate owners, thus forcing him to purchase grain at a loss from other sources in order to meet his delivery agreements. For this and other reasons, most farmers expressed a general disdain for large agribusinesses. This

disdain was particularly heaped upon those companies involved in biotechnology and the production of genetically modified (GM) seeds. They are "*the scourge of the earth*," said one farmer. One reason for the low opinion of large agribusinesses is that they are perceived as having too much economic power in agriculture. Most farmers feel squeezed by the flat or declining nominal prices of agricultural output, and many blame agribusiness. Says one farmer, "*Biotechnology ... [and] chemical companies, they're taking most of it. ... So there's not a whole lot [of money] left.*" Interestingly, each farmer interviewed admitted to planting GM crops, even those who expressed negative attitudes towards biotechnology in general and agribusiness producing GM products in particular, because doing so was simply good business. "*Is it worth it, or not?*" was the question one farmer regularly asks himself when questioning the appropriateness of using GM seeds. For farmers, the answer to this question is based not on moral concerns but rather on the economic advantages provided. For example, one farmer planted BT corn for one season but then stopped, not because of a concern for the appropriateness of planting a hybrid corn *per se* but rather because of a concern that he would not be able to market his crop as cattle feed.

The question of the appropriateness of participation in government programs was also a common theme discussed by farmers. In fact, there was a clear consensus among those interviewed that some form of government involvement in agriculture was necessary. The reasons expressed by farmers for government involvement varied, from a concern over competition by foreign agriculture to the opinion that government support ensured that consumers got the cheap and safe food they wanted. However, they each reflected the notion that farmers would not be able to farm without some form of government support. Indeed, several

farmers acknowledged that their total annual income was approximately equal to the size of government program payment received in that year.

Although the farmers interviewed did not believe that participation in government farm programs was unethical in and of itself, some believed that government programs encouraged farmers either to adopt an orientation of deception or to behave unethically outright. For example, one farmer expressed a concern over the U.S. government's "three-entity rule."<sup>1</sup> He said that this program allows farmers to obtain government payments as multiple farm entities from the same plot of land, thus encouraging them to misrepresent their farming activities in order to increase the payments they receive. Another farmer expressed a concern about farmers receiving payments from the government for activities that they would have continued to do even without the support payments. For example, he explained how he recently signed up for a government water conservation program in which he receives payments for conservation activities on certain plots of land, even though he had already been practicing water conservation without the government incentive. Finally, several farmers also expressed concerns over the government's crop insurance program, which pays farmers for crop failures due to natural or weather-related disasters. The problem with this program, as explained by some farmers, is that because neither the government nor the companies issuing the insurance policies regularly verify farmer yields on crop land insured through the program, farmers have an incentive to shift crops from one farm to another (thus lowering the yield on the first field) in order to fraudulently obtain insurance payments (see Kilman, 2003).

---

<sup>1</sup> The "three entity rule" is a provision in federal law that permits a farmer to exceed the annual cap on the amount of direct payments he may receive from the major farm programs. Thus, in addition to receiving payments from his first farm, the rule allows a farmer to receive additional payments equal to half his maximum cap on two additional farms.

## **Economic Context of Ethics in Agriculture**

Agricultural production has gone through dramatic changes over the last century. These changes are characterized principally by the term *industrialization*. The industrialization of agriculture resulted from the "application of scientific knowledge, both basic and applied, to agriculture, ... dating from the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century" (Johnson, 1997, p. 2). Agricultural industrialization is manifested as a shift from small size and labor-intensive farming practices to large-scale operations. Large-scale operations differ from small-scale farming by an increased reliance on machinery and technology and by the intensive use of land, chemicals and energy in agricultural production. The use of machinery in agricultural production results in greater productivity per unit of human effort, thus lowering the average cost of agricultural production. This creates downward pressures on farm prices even as input costs have increased (consistent with inflationary norms). The downward pressure on prices resulting from increased production and productivity causes what Cochrane (1958) termed a "technological treadmill." As Thompson (1998, p. 108) clarified, "agricultural technology increased farm productivity, but this in turn lowers prices, forcing individual farmers to run faster just to stay in place."

The industrialization of agriculture and the resulting technological treadmill on which farmers are increasingly being forced to run is a result of technological change as well as social preferences for low cost, high quality food. According to Burkhardt, "The historical analogies are clear: nearly every efficiency- increasing innovation in technology over the past 100 years that has been introduced into agriculture and widely adopted by agricultural producers has contributed to the industrialization and concentration of agricultural production. The predominant judgment on the part of the agricultural establishment (including farmers), as well as the implicit judgment on the part of consumers, has been that increased productivity, yields,

and cheap and available food are the prime concern. Economics appears to dictate that this will be best (or only) achieved by high-tech, large-scale agricultural operations, so that technologies favoring this structure have been and probably will continue to be introduced into agriculture" (1991, p. 321).

The desire for "cheap and available food" is particularly important. We (especially North Americans) value low cost and high quality not just in foodstuffs<sup>2</sup> but also in all products and services. We want it available, and we want it cheap. Perhaps the clearest evidence of this is the fact that Wal-Mart – a company that institutionalized the concept of low-cost pricing with its slogan "Everyday Low Price" – not only is the largest company in the United States, in terms of annual revenue, but also is the largest U.S. grocery retailer.<sup>3</sup> If society did not value low price over other ends, Wal-Mart would not be where it is.<sup>4</sup>

As long as low price is valued by society and the industrialization of agriculture puts downward pressure on agricultural prices, the "technological treadmill" on which farmers run will increase in speed and intensity. The implication is that farmers will face greater economic pressures over time to decrease the costs of production by adopting new technologies and increasing farm size or to increase the revenues generated, no matter how this is done. This is the economic environment – which one "insider" described as "hostile" (Edwards, 1991, p. 78) – within which today's farmers operate. Understanding the increasing economic pressures facing

---

<sup>2</sup> Indeed, "virtually all states desire a cheap food policy, either from humanitarian concerns for the poor or from a desire to avoid civil unrest, or both" assert Busch et al. (1991, p. 107).

<sup>3</sup> In 2002, Wal-Mart had revenue of \$246.5 billion, putting it at the top of the Fortune 500 list (Fortune, 2003). According to Wal-Mart's annual report (10-K filing on April 15, 2003 with the Security and Exchange Commission), its grocery operations accounted for 24 percent of its revenue, or approximately \$59 billion in sales. Interestingly, three other grocery retailers, Kroger, Albertson's, and Safeway, rank in the top 50 of the Fortune 500 list. But Kroger's, the second largest food retailer in the U.S., had revenue of "only" \$51.8 billion in 2002.

<sup>4</sup> Social preferences do affect the fortunes of businesses. Opposition by citizens of some small towns, for instance, has prevented Wal-Mart from entering some markets (see Hansen, 1994).



farmers is necessary in order to understand the perspectives farmers have on ethical issues in agriculture.

## **Conclusion**

Farmers have much to contribute to the debate about ethical challenges in agriculture. Scholars interested in agricultural ethics would do well in spending time with them. This paper presented a description of findings resulting from interviews with Missouri corn and soybean producers. Most of the farmers interviewed were articulate and opinionated, particularly when talking about what is right and wrong. Even so, farmers did not seem to be overly preoccupied with the philosophical debates about pollution, soil conservation, the use of pesticides and genetically modified seeds, or the treatment of animals (see, for instance, Te Velde et al., 2002), although these specific items were mentioned in the interviews as important issues. Rather, the ethical challenges facing farmers, as expressed by them, seemed to be more behavioral than philosophical. They reflected the idea that the industrialization of agriculture creates pressures for them that challenge their desire to do what is right rather than do what they feel they must in order to survive. Farmers are not philosophers, but they are businessmen. Therefore, the economic realities of farming are increasingly forcing them to balance "ethics" with "economics," or to consider dollars and cents when making ethical judgments. This is not to say that philosophical debates in agriculture are not of interest or immediate concern to farmers. Rather, the industrialization of agriculture has made behavioral issues stemming from the economic realities of farming more salient to farmers than philosophical concerns. Simply, farmers who tire of running faster just to stay in place may begin to look for alternatives to running – that is, they may seek unethical short cuts. Identifying the specific margins at which

farmers take ethical short cuts and how they perceive these in terms of overall ethical problems in agriculture is an important step in identifying and resolving important ethical problems in agriculture.

It is important that we recognize the behavioral characteristics of many ethical problems in agriculture in addition to the philosophical debates about technology, industrialization, sustainability and rural welfare. Thompson states that the "current generation of adults may believe that rural residents, particularly farmers, are more likely to exhibit ethically praiseworthy conduct and more likely to base action and decision on ethical principles. In one manifestation, agrarian ideology has maintained the notion that farm families are more likely to be guided by principles of ethics than are others, and that because farming is morally significant, agriculture should be given special consideration in matters of public policy" (1998, p. 95). Regardless of whether such perceptions are true, if current trends continue in the sense that industrialization is forcing farmers to think about farming more in business terms than in life choices, the potential for business-like ethical problems in agriculture will only increase. In short, the ethics of farmers may eventually become equated with the ethics of businessmen.

Is there an "Enron" waiting to happen in agriculture?<sup>5</sup> The answer is not clear, but there are at least two important forces at work suggesting that the ethical behavior of farmers will become increasingly important issue for society. First, in traditional agriculture the "process" by which farmers do agriculture (e.g., having diversified farms, being loyal to community-based institutions, neighbors helping neighbors, etc) is just as important to the farmer, if not more so, than the income farming provides. In fact, many farmers report that they could probably find

---

<sup>5</sup> This is in reference to the accounting scandals beginning in 2001 in the United States in which Enron, WorldCom, and other companies overstated revenues, misstated expenses, and otherwise falsified their accounting records for financial gain (see, for instance, Holtzman et al., 2003).

more profitable, if less rewarding, ways of making a living (see, for instance, Stevens, 1997), suggesting that farming as a vocation has intrinsic value to farmers. However, as farming becomes more industrial, farmers will become increasingly preoccupied with profitability and competitiveness because the economic pressures of the market will so compel them. As a result, the "ends" of farming – paying the bills, generating an income – may become more important to the farmer than the means by which bills are paid and income is generated. This could have important implications not only for agricultural production generally, but also the safety and security of our food system. Second, so long as food is plentiful, cheap, and perceived to be safe to eat, the ethics of farmers will not be an important consideration for consumers (see McEachern and Schröder, 2002). Therefore, it is not likely that farmers will acknowledge the importance of behaving ethically if consumers are not transmitting such signals through the market.

## References

- Burda, M. C., and B. Dluhosch. 2002. Cost Competition, Fragmentation, and Globalization. *Review of International Economics* 10(3): 424-441.
- Burkhardt, J. 1991. Biotechnology, Ethics, and the Structure of Agriculture. In *Ethics and Agriculture: An Anthology on Current Issues in World Context*, ed. C.V. Blatz, 317-330. Moscow, ID: University of Idaho Press.
- Busch, L., W. B. Lacy, J. Burkhardt, and L. R. Lacy. 1991. *Plants, Power, and Profit: Social, Economic, and Ethical Consequences of the New Biotechnologies*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Cochrane, W. W. 1958. *Farm Prices: Myth and Reality*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dundon, S. J. 1991. Sources of First Principles for an Agricultural Ethic. In *Ethics and Agriculture: An Anthology on Current Issues in World Context*, ed. C.V. Blatz, 63-74. Moscow, ID: University of Idaho Press.
- Edwards, S. 1991. Farming's Rewards at Risk. In *Ethics and Agriculture: An Anthology on Current Issues in World Context*, ed. C.V. Blatz, 75-83. Moscow, ID: University of Idaho Press.
- Environmental Protection Agency. 1999. Spray Drift of Pesticides. *Pesticides: Topical & Chemical Fact Sheets* (December). Available online at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/spraydrift.htm>.
- Fortune. 2003. The Fortune 500. *Fortune* (April 14).
- Hansen, J. 1994. Retail Megastores' Many Enemies Don't Take 'Progress' Lying Down. *Rocky Mountain News* (Tuesday, November 29): 42A.

- Holtzman, M. P., E. Venuti, and R. Fonfeder. 2003. Enron and the Raptors. *The CPA Journal* (April): 25-33.
- James, H. S., Jr. 2003. On Finding Solutions to Ethical Problems in Agriculture. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 16(5): 439-457.
- Johnson, D. G. 1997. Agriculture and the Wealth of Nations. *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings* 87(2): 1-12.
- Kilman, S. 2003. Abuses Plague Program to Insure Farmers' Crops. *The Wall Street Journal* (May 5): A1.
- McEachern, M.G., and M. J. A. Schröder. 2002. The Role of Livestock Production Ethics in Consumer Values Towards Meat. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 15(2): 221-237.
- Schoon, B. and R. Te Grotenhuis. 2000. Values of Farmers, Sustainability and Agricultural Policy. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 12(1): 17-27.
- Stevens, R. D. 2003. Why I Farm. Available online at <http://www.pinciecreek.com/WhyIFarm.html>.
- Stigler, G. J., 1951. The Division of Labor is Limited by the Extent of the Market. *Journal of Political Economy* 59(3): 185-193.
- Sullivan, S., E. McCann, R. De Young, and D. Erickson. 1996. Farmers' Attitudes about Farming and the Environment: A Survey of Conventional and Organic Farmers. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 9(2): 123-143.
- Te Velde, H., N. Aarts, and C. Van Woerkum. 2002. Dealing with Ambivalence: Farmers' and Consumers' Perceptions of Animal Welfare in Livestock Breeding. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 15(2): 203-219.

Thompson, P. B.. 1998. *Agricultural Ethics: Research, Teaching, and Public Policy*. Ames, IA:  
Iowa State University Press.

Wunderlich, G. 1990. Agricultural Technology, Wealth, and Responsibility. *Journal of  
Agricultural Ethics* 3: 21-35.