

Shafter to 58.4 percent in Delano, with Arvin in between. In Arvin, in 1931 and 1932, these classes represented still less of the Arvin-Weedpatch-Lamont intensive acreage.

Therefore, the growth of the total Arvin production is not nearly so sharp as figure 22 indicates. Earlier figures are not available for the other communities, but general knowledge about them suggests that the shift of production from cotton and alfalfa to fruits and vegetables has not been any greater than that indicated in Arvin. Therefore, the growth curve may be taken as showing the general relative position within broad limits of the several communities since 1921. On the whole, Arvin history from the standpoint of commodity production is reasonably like that of sister communities in Kern County, so that historical development can account for little of the difference found between them.

TABLE 44.—Intensive land use in Arvin (1931, 1932, and 1940) compared with land use in neighboring communities

Land use	Arvin-Weedpatch-Lamont ¹		Arvin :	Delano :	Shafter :	Wasco :
	1931	1932	1940	1940	1940	1940
Acreages:						
Orchards and vineyards.....	7,251	7,576	7,875	13,581	3,146	407
Vegetables, melons, and beets.....	1,094	1,139	2,707	1,033	9,464	5,569
Alfalfa.....	5,014	5,014	3,284	2,684	2,258	1,899
Cotton.....	7,756	9,306	6,274	7,741	8,672	4,836
Total.....	21,115	23,035	20,140	25,039	23,540	12,711
Percentages:						
Orchards and vineyards.....	34.3	32.9	39.1	54.3	13.4	3.2
Vegetables, melons, and beets.....	5.2	4.9	13.4	4.1	40.2	43.8
Alfalfa.....	23.7	21.8	16.3	10.7	9.6	14.9
Cotton.....	36.8	40.4	31.2	30.9	36.8	38.1
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ Data obtained from records in the Kern County office of the Extension Service, based upon a crop survey compiled by the Agricultural Commissioner in 1931 and 1932. The area includes a wider region than the Arvin community, but this region had no community as large as Arvin at that time, and the whole area has a comparable planting pattern. Absolute figures cannot be compared to present Arvin, but proportions are significant.

² Based upon Agricultural Adjustment Agency records.

Delano, Shafter, and Wasco have had high schools for many years (Wasco since 1918), all have had a bank for many years, Shafter and Delano are incorporated, and these communities show physical improvements that go far beyond anything in Arvin, though in general not so far as Dinuba. Delano, Shafter, and Wasco are intermediate in social position to Arvin and Dinuba, and each has an average farm size that is also intermediate between the two communities studied here.

In view of this relative development of Arvin with her sister communities in Kern County, the similarity of growth on one hand and the difference in social conditions on the other, it is hardly possible to assign to the time of growth a major share of the differences between Arvin and Dinuba.

The most probable effects of the historic recency of Arvin as compared to Dinuba are these: The relative newness is contributory to the fact that a large portion of the population is relatively young, while the old-age brackets are underrepresented. Since Arvin grew