

The important thing here is that the two communities, therefore, do not have divergent value systems and social customs, but rather that they meet their own values with different degrees of success. If we may be allowed an analogy, the differences between Arvin and Dinuba are like those between two individuals with different degrees of health and vitality rather than like the differences between two individuals of divergent racial characteristics.

Essentially, Arvin and Dinuba are part of a common system of agricultural production, best understood as industrialized. Both also partake of a single culture pattern which, in turn, can best be described as urbanized.

By industrialized farming is meant the system of producing crops intensively, solely for the cash market, with a high degree of farm specialization, utilizing great quantities of capital and requiring a large input of labor hired on an impersonal basis. Large-scale operations tend to intensify these qualities, but the pattern is not dependent upon large units. It seems probable, however, that the existence of large-scale—particularly of corporate—operations within the broader area and with which the small farmer must compete is an essential element in developing the industrial pattern.

The urbanized culture pattern that results clearly reflects the social behavior of the cities and follows from the industrial nature of farm production. Its primary characteristic is the general acceptance of pecuniary standards of value and a social status system based upon money wealth. Such a set of values inevitably leads to a more or less closed class system based upon economic status, and expressed to the individual largely in terms of occupation. These features are common to Arvin and Dinuba, though the degree of social segregation and the social distance between occupational classes are markedly different. Urbanized culture has further effects. As a result of class stratification, and because of the complexity of society, there is a tendency toward developing social action in terms of special interests rather than on a community-wide basis. For that reason associations of like-minded persons tend to play a very important part in the functioning of the community. While specific differences have been noted, here again we get a common fundamental pattern. This aspect of urban culture is reflected in the specialization of the activities and interests of the individual—the tendency to be concerned with a single and very partial role in the total functioning of the economy. The farmer has traditionally held out against this aspect of the industrialization of the world. The farmer as jack-of-all-trades is the accepted American picture. Yet in the economy of agricultural production in the irrigated areas of California, the farm operator, like his city-dwelling cousin, has become specialized in his operations. The 40-acre farmer as well as the operator of 4,000 acres will show such specialization, though obviously there will remain considerable difference in degree.

It is against a background of such common cultural characteristics that the divergence between Arvin and Dinuba must be examined.

RECAPITULATION OF SOCIAL DIFFERENCES

Within the framework of cultural similarity, the differences between Arvin and Dinuba take a clearer meaning. The picture in Arvin may be contrasted with the Dinuba situation in the following way: