

impoverished labor class and/or the speculative cash production of the enterprise? Formulated this way, the question permits of but one answer—the latter. Yet this raises a real problem, if cotton *per se* is to be explanatory. The detailed analysis of farm production shows that both communities engage in production for the cash market and, furthermore, that the amount of labor required is higher in the grape-producing area of Dinuba than in the more diversified Arvin community. Requirements for labor are, therefore, not the differentiating factor and cannot explain the divergence between Arvin and Dinuba.

One other possibility presents itself, namely, that labor attracted to the cotton fields is measurably different from labor working in fruit-producing areas. We have seen that the laborers in Arvin are somewhat below those of Dinuba in educational attainments and that more of them come from the poorer states. It does not seem improbable that Arvin laborers are, on the average, persons with fewer cultural attainments and fewer advantages of background, though only within a very limited range. It is noteworthy that laboring groups in both communities receive median incomes in the same bracket but that the specific median (estimated) would be slightly lower in Arvin than in Dinuba. The effect of such differences would necessarily be slight. First, because the observable differences are very small. These differences could be accounted for by the fact that the social environment, as distinct from the character of economic opportunity, repels the workers whose capabilities are higher. Second, because labor in both categories is generally interchangeable; i. e., that farm laborers move from fruit to cotton to potatoes seasonally as a regular thing. Third, because the social milieu of the California community quite clearly is created by the nonfarm labor population—the farmers and white-collar workers. It would, therefore, be impossible to claim that measurable differences in social and economic facilities are the result of fundamental differences in the characteristics of that element of the population which in neither community offers the leadership in creating such facilities.

Cultivation of cotton and other "row" crops, especially potatoes, may be partially responsible for the large operations in Arvin. Insofar as this is the case, the type of production is responsible for the proportions of farmers and farm laborers. However, the proportion of row-crop farms in the lower size categories is almost as great as the proportion of fruit operations, and some of the largest units are devoted chiefly to fruit production. Like the water situation, the kind of crops grown is therefore partially responsible for the size of farm pattern in Arvin.

FARM ORGANIZATION FACTORS

Three aspects of farm organization attract our attention as possible causative factors in determining the differences that exist between Arvin and Dinuba: tenure pattern, labor requirements, and size of farm operations.

Arvin has a high proportion of tenants whereas Dinuba has far fewer. Likewise, the proportion of absentee owners in Arvin—here defined as owners reported living outside the county—is over twice that in Dinuba. In general, it is expected that owner-operators and resident-owners are more concerned with community welfare and