

high tenancy in Arvin, since owners could rent to operators who irrigated several pieces of land from a single well.

The scale of operations that developed in Arvin inevitably had one clear and direct effect upon the community: It skewed the occupation structure so that the majority of the population could only subsist by working as wage labor for others. It probably had some effect upon the development of row crops. The relatively late development of Arvin placed it in a period of growing demand for vegetables and other row crops as contrasted with fruit. These two forces combined to give Arvin a large proportion of row crops, though fruits were also developed to a considerable extent. The large need for labor, and the period of major growth resulted in the aggregation of a large proportion of destitute white migrant labor with poor social and economic background. There is evidence that the quality of persons attracted by the kinds and conditions of work opportunities is somewhat poorer than was attracted to the situation in Dinuba.

The occupation structure of the community, with a great majority of wage workers and very few persons independently employed and the latter generally persons of considerable means, has had a series of direct effects upon the social conditions in the community. These effects are applicable only given the total cultural situation that exists in America and particularly in California agriculture. The large labor population means inevitably large groups with poor economic circumstances, for the conditions of wage work in agriculture have permitted of nothing else. This in turn means poor housing, low level of living, existence of slum conditions and little money for community improvement. It means that a large portion of the population has little vested interest—economic or social—in the community itself. Such lack of ties, together with the seasonal nature of wage work in agriculture, results in a high turn-over of population (or instability of residence). The laboring population does not take leadership in general civic action and rarely supports organizations that exist, out of a usually well substantiated feeling of ostracism that results from the large differences in economic status. Thus general social facilities do not come into being for lack of leadership and support. This tendency is furthered by their own lack of funds and by their instability as residents in the community.

The occupation structure leaves few who are in an economic and psychological position of leadership. These few consist largely of people who can afford to engage in the social activities of urban centers and who regularly do so. This mobility tends to drain their social interests away from local activities and renders them a less valuable asset to local community welfare than are less well-to-do farmers, though their value to the broader area of activity may be equally great.

This social mobility engendered by their well-being was made possible by the fact that the automobile gave them physical mobility as well. That this mobility was available to them from the outset made it unnecessary to develop local satisfactions, whereas if they had once been developed they would likely have continued. Thus the period of development of Arvin was a contributory cause to its social poverty.

The fact that the large farming community is of necessity made up of large groups of laborers with low incomes on one hand, and a small group of well-to-do persons on the other tends to impoverish its social institutions of the leadership they require. It also impoverishes