

leadership, economic well-being, and business activities are relatively impoverished.

The central position of scale of operations and the resulting occupation structure of the community do not deny other contributory causes. The importance of such other forces is difficult to assess. That the period of community growth and the high tenancy rates have an impoverishing effect may be accepted. Other factors, such as the types of commodities produced and the state of origin of residents appear to have some significance.

Such force that these other causes may have in determining community conditions does not vitiate the central hypothesis that large-scale farming does create poorer social conditions in the rural community such farming supports. It is the position of the present writer, after detailed sifting of the evidence presented in this study, that large-scale farming does, in fact, bear the major responsibility for the social differences between Arvin and Dinuba. Several reasons may be summarized as to why such a position seems most tenable.

First of all, the causal mechanism by which large-scale farming creates social conditions is clear and understandable in terms of known social relationships and patterns of behavior. These were developed in earlier sections of this chapter and need no further discussion here.

Second, if we carry large-scale operations to their extreme, we reach the company town. Whatever physical assets may be developed in a company town, there inevitably remains something contrary to normal accepted standards of social life in such a community, with its social hierarchy and dependency ratio. Where company policy does not grant good physical conditions, then the company town is a miserable community indeed. The position of the large-scale farming community lies intermediate between the norm for America and such aberrations on community life. It must be remembered that, though Arvin is dominated by the large operation, a small nucleus of working farmers exists. In the light of the statement made about the function of the small farmer at the Farm Bureau Center, it seems highly probable that had this nucleus not existed, and the land all held in large farms, some of the existing Arvin institutions would not have developed.

Third, similar conclusions were reached by scholars and observers of the California scene a generation ago. A "before and after" picture of the city of Modesto, showing the effects upon community life of small-scale farming was presented in a pamphlet written in 1920 by Prof. R. L. Adams and W. W. Bedford for the Anglo and London Paris Bank of San Francisco.²² These authors describe the difference between the pre- and post-irrigation development, and while their emphasis is upon the effect of irrigation as such, it is quite clear that size of holdings plays a prominent part in the differences they describe.

In the preirrigation period, the area around Modesto was described, in the Adams-Bedford book, as—

an extensive strip of country devoted solely to grain growing and presents a rather monotonous succession of treeless and vineless fields.

Isolated groups of farm buildings [are found which] are not especially inviting or homelike. The holdings of necessity are large and social intercourse is some-

²² R. L. Adams and W. W. Bedford, *The Marvel of Irrigation: A Record of a Quarter Century in the Turlock and Modesto Irrigation Districts—California*. Compiled by the Bond Department of the Anglo and London Paris Bank, Sutter and Sansome Streets, San Francisco. Second edition, 1921.