



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMISTS

HELD AT
ST. ANDREWS
SCOTLAND
30 AUGUST TO 6 SEPTEMBER 1936

LONDON
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
HUMPHREY MILFORD
1937

2 cards

Part-time farming

PART-TIME HOLDINGS FOR URBAN WORKERS

SECOND OPENING PAPER

K. HOOD

Pennsylvania State College, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

ONE of the most interesting developments in our rural population in America to-day is the movement of urban workers to homes in the country. This movement is in evidence in all sections of the nation, but it has attained its greatest growth in the vicinity of our large industrial centres concentrated in the eastern part of the United States.

Is this an entirely new development, you may ask? No, the movement is not new. In fact, it has been in progress for a long number of years, but it became especially significant immediately following the World War. The greatest growth, however, has taken place since 1930. To-day it is estimated that fully three-fourths of all those living outside of our incorporated cities are dependent upon some source other than farming for a large portion of their income. A large number of these are commuting daily to their jobs in the city.

Why has this movement gained such widespread popularity during recent years? Back in the days of the horse and buggy, the dust road, and the long working hours in the factory, it was practically impossible for the man who worked in the city to live in the country. The coming of the hard surface road, the automobile, and other cheap methods of transportation, the shorter working day and the shorter working week in the factory, together with some tendency towards the decentralization of industry in some areas, have all contributed to make this, what we often term the 'new-back-to-the-land movement', a desirable one politically, socially, and economically. Thousands of our people in the industrial States have found it economical, convenient, and desirable to live in the country and drive back and forth to their jobs in the city.

While at Cornell University a few years ago, I had the privilege of making a study of about 3,000 of these families. I went into their homes and asked them a number of questions concerning living costs, farming operations, participation in community activities, cost and availability of modern conveniences, advantages and disadvantages of country life, earnings obtained from the city occupation, and numerous other questions pertaining to their economic and social well-being.

Allow me to talk about these people for a little while, and then I shall tell you something about what our Federal Government is trying to do in order to encourage this very worth-while movement.

Our interest in the rural-residential movement in New York State began when we started our intensive work in land utilization. We found that considerable areas near our industrial centres were devoted to country homes and part-time farms. Some information on the situation was needed, and so we began our studies of this development in the summer of 1932. A total of 725 records were obtained in two different areas during 1932 and 1933. In the spring of 1934, a total of 2,400 abbreviated records were obtained in co-operation with the Division of Subsistence Homesteads, which was a government agency engaged in the development of homestead projects in various parts of the country. All of the ensuing discussion will be based upon the findings of the Cornell studies conducted in 1932 and 1933 unless otherwise stated.

Many of these families obtained a part of their living from home gardens, one or two cows, and small poultry flocks, while others did considerable farming. The farming operations of the great majority, however, were rather limited. The average holding was about 12 acres in size. Less than \$100 worth of live stock was kept on the average place. The total farm receipts were under \$100, and the food and fuel produced and consumed on the premises were worth \$105. Approximately 15 per cent. of those interviewed had neither crops nor live stock. Most of the families were obtaining practically all their income from outside work. It was found that on the average the head of the family got \$751 a year from outside employment, and other members of the family earned an additional \$93 outside.

We found that less than 5 per cent. were dissatisfied with the country way of life and wished to return to the city to live. Why should these commuters be so enthusiastic about country living? Does it not mean, inasmuch as these people are working in the city, that they must necessarily rise earlier in the morning in order to get to their city jobs on time? Does it not mean lack of modern conveniences in numerous cases? Does it not mean the lack of educational opportunities for their children? Does it not mean the lack of numerous valuable social contacts? In short, does it not mean a complete revolution in ways of living for a group accustomed to city life? I know of no better way to answer these questions than to tell you what these people have told me.

One question that this group was asked to answer was: 'What are the chief advantages and disadvantages of country life?'

Almost 40 per cent. gave as the chief advantage of living in the country the possibility of improving their financial position compared with what it would be were they to move to the city in order to be closer to their place of employment. It was the opinion of these people that they could add to their earnings by small farming operations and at the same time live more cheaply than they could live in the city. Twenty-one per cent. listed as the chief advantage of country life the fact that they preferred country living to living in town. Fourteen per cent. listed as the chief advantage the improved health conditions of the country, and 7 per cent. said the most important advantage of living in the country was the fact that rural regions proved to be a better place for raising children.

And now, what about the disadvantages of living in the country compared with living in the city? Listen to what these people say. More than 43 per cent. said that there were no disadvantages. Approximately one-fourth listed the transportation problem as the most serious drawback of living in the country. There were 16 per cent. who listed lack of conveniences as the greatest disadvantage. Bad roads ranked first in about 3 per cent. of the cases.

Disadvantages there are, but, when these disadvantages were compared with the advantages, the great majority held that this new type of rural life was preferred to living in the city.

The economic advantages of living in the country were emphasized, as has been pointed out previously, by the families interviewed. Do our researches substantiate this conclusion? A comparison of the costs of living in the country and in the city was made for a group of families who had moved from the city to the country within five years of the time of the interview. This comparison showed, after making adjustments for the decline in the general price level, that the average family in this group was living for \$170 less per year than it would now cost them to live in the city; assuming that they had the same standard of living in the city as they had when living in the city previously.

Seventy dollars of the \$170 saved by living in the country was the result of a lower standard of living in the country—that is, they may have had electricity in the city and oil lamps in the country; they may be doing without certain types of amusement; they may be dressing less expensively; or they may be living in houses which are somewhat less desirable. When the comparison was made on the basis of the same standards of living in the country and in the city, it was found that the families saved on the average \$100 per year by moving from the city to the country.

The largest saving made by these families was in house rent or maintenance. The saving in this item averaged \$126 per year. The next largest saving was made in food. Small savings were made in clothing and amusements. The average cost of getting to work was increased \$31 per year by moving to the country.

The annual savings increased as the food and fuel produced for home use increased, as the size of the family increased, and as the miles to the city occupation decreased.

In addition to the savings resulting from living in the country, there is also the opportunity for making money from part-time farming operations. The average net family income from farming operations was \$93 per year. A few netted as much as \$1,000 from the farm in the year studied.

One of the most important factors to consider in the location of a rural home for a city worker is the distance from the home to the urban occupation. The average cost of transportation to and from work was 30 cents per day. The cost ranged from 10 cents per day for those who travelled less than one mile to 88 cents per day for those who had to travel 13 or more miles per day. Those who were located at long distances from the city job found that excessive transportation costs offset the savings made in house rent or house maintenance cost.

The type of road on which the property is located is very important. It is highly desirable that it should be located on, or very close to, a hard road. Electric light and telephone lines are more likely to be found on hard roads. Income from boarders, roomers, and over-night guests is greater on paved highways. Such roads offer more opportunity for the sale of produce at the roadside. Paved roads are less likely to be impassable during periods of inclement weather. Homes on improved roads are likely to appreciate more in value than others.

The value of the land for agricultural purposes has an important bearing on the desirability of the location of a rural home if any gardening or farming is contemplated. Electricity, telephone, and other facilities are being extended into the more productive areas. Some people buy land in poor agricultural areas because it is cheap. Our studies show that this is inadvisable because these areas are seldom provided with modern services; crop yields are low; farm incomes are unfavourable; and a process of gradual abandonment is everywhere in evidence. Real estate in these areas is declining in value.

Our studies indicate that the city worker should locate his country

home: (1) on or near to a hard road; (2) within six to eight miles of the place of employment; (3) on a good agricultural soil, if any gardening or crop farming is contemplated.

The growth of rural homes for city workers has taken place so rapidly that many communities which were distinctly rural a decade ago are now mainly rural-residential. Scarcely a rural community in our industrial East has escaped the influx of these new 'back-to-the-landers'.

Almost every time I discuss this very interesting group of people, the question is asked: 'What does the farmer think about this movement?' Most farmers were found to be in favour of it as long as farm production was confined largely to the production of commodities for home use and as long as the people were financially able to take care of themselves without appealing to the welfare agencies for support.

The rural residenter has made a very definite and worth-while contribution to the economic and social well-being of most of the rural communities in which he has settled. His coming has increased the population of many rural communities and has made it economically feasible to install electric lines, telephone service, and city water lines. The tax base has been enlarged, and this has made possible more and better schools, improved roads, and more efficient government service. A brisk demand for well-located properties within commuting distance of the industrial centres has enlarged the market for farm real estate. The rural resident, moreover, has helped to support numerous organizations in the rural communities. The study of subsistence homestead families showed that of all the memberships of organizations three-fourths were held in country organizations.

Most farmers realize that this movement is a permanent one and that they as farmers should co-operate in order to make the movement as satisfactory from the farmers' standpoint as possible. To most farmers, this commuter is a new neighbour who is helping him to pay his taxes and to support his schools, churches, lodges, farmers' organizations, and other activities in the community. Moreover, his coming has enhanced the market for farm real estate and has helped to make modern conveniences available to many farmers who could not otherwise afford them.

President Roosevelt has long recognized the value of rural homes for city workers. I remember an address which he gave at Cornell University while he was Governor of the State of New York. In this address he told us about the Commission which he had just

appointed to study plans for stimulating the movement of city workers to rural homes. Soon after Roosevelt's inauguration to the Presidency, he revived the ideas which prompted him as Governor of New York to appoint the Commission on Rural Homes. The Division of Subsistence Homesteads was organized as a result. The purpose of this act was 'to provide for aiding the redistribution of the overbalance of population in industrial centres' and 'to establish experimental homesteads' projects in various parts of the country.

At the present time there are 32 of these projects in active operation. These subsistence homesteads are established and administered in groups, accommodating from 25 to 100 families and in exceptional cases a larger number.

The individual 'homestead' ordinarily consists of from 1 to 5 acres, depending on soil, size of family, character of agricultural operations contemplated, opportunity for wage employment off the homestead, and other factors. On this plot of ground the family is expected to raise vegetables and fruit and, depending upon circumstances, poultry and possibly a pig or two; in some cases a cow is kept. Production is on a subsistence basis for the household use of the family and not for sale in the market. The homestead, in other words, is intended to be a supplement to work in office or factory. In some instances, a factory is established on the homestead in order to provide employment for the homesteaders, while in some cases outside employment is obtained in the factories of nearby towns.

Just before I sailed for Europe, I paid a visit to the homestead project in my own State of Pennsylvania. Here I found 167 families living in their new homes. About 90 more families will move in as soon as the construction of their new homes has been completed. At present the families in residence are all occupying their future homes under temporary licensing agreements, but when construction has been completed they will be offered a permanent sales contract which calls for payment on a forty-year basis. Each of these families has a large garden and, in most cases, a flock of chickens.

In addition to these small individual properties, there is a large farm which is owned by the entire group. This farm is devoted to the production of crops and dairy products which are used by the homesteaders. Some of the men work in factories in nearby towns, but the great majority are engaged in construction work on the project.

The work of the Division of Subsistence Homesteads has been taken over by the Resettlement Administration. No more new pro-

jects are to be started, but all those which have begun are to be carried to completion. This phase of the Government programme has not met with much success, but a few of the individual projects appear to have some chance of becoming worth while.

The Resettlement Administration is now interested in the development of three large suburban community projects, housing from 750 to 1,500 families each. The distinctive features of these projects are that they are planned as complete communities and are surrounded by an area of recreational and agricultural land to protect the towns from encroachments by undesirable developments. The prototypes of these towns are the 'garden-cities' of Welwyn and Letchworth in England.

Out near Berwyn, Maryland, ten miles from the heart of Washington, the Resettlement Administration is building Greenbelt, the largest and most complete housing demonstration ever undertaken in the United States. When completed, there will be 1,000 homes at Greenbelt to be rented to people with incomes of \$1,200-2,000 a year who are now employed either by private industry or by the Government in Washington or in nearby Virginia and Maryland. Although the new community at first will provide dwelling units to accommodate 3,500 people, the planners, architects, and engineers have also thought of future problems of expansion. They have created a town plan, purchased land, and constructed utilities capable of servicing 2,000 additional homes which would shelter an ultimate population of 12,000 to 15,000.

Greenbelt will be a new town built from sewers to parks. It is a town which will provide adequate homes in healthful surroundings for low-income families at rents they can afford to pay. And the job of building these houses is being done by men who, only a few months ago, were forced to accept public relief in order to keep themselves alive. As a demonstration of large-scale planning, it is hoped that they will be a stimulus to private enterprise and afford an example for future subdivisioning, whether private or municipal.

These experimental rural housing projects may be of some assistance in pointing the way to the solution of some of our larger problems. I feel, however, that a much greater service could be rendered to the majority of the city workers who contemplate moving to the country if more adequate credit were made available for the purchase of small rural properties.

This urban-rural movement in general has not taken place because of any general legislative programme or because of the activities of social reformers interested in the welfare of city workers. It has

developed because individuals have found it more desirable and more economical to live in the country than to live in the city.

I feel confident that this movement will continue to grow in importance, and every assistance that is possible should be given to these people in helping them to locate wisely, to buy advantageously, and to produce economically.

This movement, associated with the trend of working hours, improved transportation facilities, and the increase in hard roads, need not necessarily conflict or compete with full-time farming. With a wage level accompanying regular employment sufficient to provide an adequate income, these people will produce less of their own food and purchase more from farmers. But during periods of unemployment and reduced incomes, families should have immediate recourse to the land and be in a position to obtain the major food requirements which they no longer are able to purchase because of their reduced buying power.

DISCUSSION

F. VON BÜLOW, *International Labour Office, Geneva.*

My reason for taking part in the discussion now is that Dr. Krause has been too modest to tell you himself that he has a definite practical aim in his paper. About a year ago, or some time in the course of the winter, I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Krause for the first time when he passed through Geneva, and we got into a very long discussion on this question of industrial part-time farmers or whatever we called them on that occasion. We did not come to any conclusions with regard to the value of the system, but we both agreed that two things were missing. First of all, the terminology was in an awful disorder. Everybody had his own pet name for the movement, which was not correctly understood by the rest. Secondly, some very important problems involved in this movement, if it is to take place on a large scale, were not sufficiently understood and analysed in a systematic way. We therefore agreed that it would be good if something could be done. I asked Dr. Krause to write an article for the *International Labour Review* which was published in December 1935, where he introduced this question, and in the next number of the *International Labour Review* another article written by an Englishman on this movement in England will appear. Dr. Krause suggested that it might be a good idea to use this Conference to have an exchange of views on the subject in the hope that, out of that discussion, would result some improvement in the terminology and a better general view of the problems involved. Dr.

Krause took the initiative with the organizers of the Conference to get such papers presented; he has presented the first paper himself, and Dr. Hood has been kind enough to present the second paper.

I think we all agree that these papers have been most interesting, and I think we all agree, too, that in spite of all the interesting information it would be very difficult to have a really useful discussion on the value of smallholdings for industrial workers on the basis of the information at present available. The papers read by our two colleagues already show the difficulties in terminology. Dr. Krause referred several times to industrial smallholdings of about 1 morgen of land, and he also presented a graph which speaks about the industrial or *Stadttrandsiedlung* up to 7 morgen. Dr. Hood used, without any difference as far as I could grasp, the terms 'rural homes', 'part-time farmers', and 'subsistence holdings'. In this field of terminology there is a good deal to be done, and also, with regard to the problems themselves, I think that we are still too much at the stage where we examine the problem only after having made up our minds. In other words, we say we are going to organize agricultural holdings, and then we discuss and examine all the difficulties and disadvantages involved. But it is not looked at in close enough connexion with the whole social background and the economic activity of society as such.

The question of the relation of such smallholdings to agriculture is not solved by finding out that the farmers in the district to which these people come are satisfied. If the settlement is done on a really large scale, the problem is much wider, and farmers in the United States in fact were enough afraid of the subsistence-holding movement to cause Secretary Wallace in his first report after the passing of the A.A.A. to make a special reference to the question. Further, there is an enormous difference in referring to smallholders and industrial part-time farmers as they exist in many parts of Europe, in Württemberg, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, established in a more or less natural way, and the occupants of smallholdings which are financed by the State. These latter are in quite a different position from the former who, more or less by the help of their own money, have settled in the country-side. That is a problem which troubles me very much, especially from the point of view of the International Labour Office in Geneva. It is a general policy in many countries, in order to divide existing industrial work among all people unemployed, to reduce the hours of work. The State attempts to pass legislation for that purpose, and in many cases the same State on the other hand gives money to people in order that they may employ the time, which

they cannot employ in industry, on activity which may be just as harmful to other people as if they had worked in industries. There is a lack of logic in the general social policy because the problem has not been sufficiently understood.

I have no definite opinion on the subject at all. I find it most puzzling. I only hope that the discussion which will follow will show more aspects, more problems, not mentioned either by the authors of the two papers or by myself, and that the result will be that we all agree that some practical steps in investigation are desirable. It is my intention as far as possible to continue that series of articles which we have started in the *International Labour Review*. The first thing we shall do will be to ask Dr. Hood to write us an article for the United States, which would supplement very well the article we have on Germany and the one we are about to publish on England. If any one of you would like to write similar articles describing the situation of your own country, and at the same time contributing to the general discussion of the subject, I shall be very glad to discuss the matter with you. I think I ought to make one definite practical proposal, viz. that, as somebody has to make a start, Dr. Krause should get into touch with Dr. Hood and with anybody else who would like to join, and that they should correspond about the terminology.

I. DE ARLANDIS, *Madrid, Spain.*

Dr. Krause has said that many workmen prefer living in the country, because living in the country is less expensive for them. I shall only point out here that experience from Germany shows that people who are moving out from the radius of the towns, especially of Berlin, often do so to escape the municipal taxes. May I ask Dr. Hood whether the same thing is observed in America and whether there has been any study made of the influence which 'moving back to the country' has on the municipal budget, on the income of the town, and also on the rents of the houses, and on the activity of the building industry, communication-system, and so on?

Reference was made to the belief that this type of industrial worker, who works in the town and gets a part of his income from his garden, would disappear; that the new tendency was for all the workmen to think in terms of money, and for the value of his work to be translated into money. There is, however, a very important thing which might be pointed out both on to-day's discussion and on the discussion of Farm Organization. In Germany and in quite a lot of the European countries, where there has been an inflation, people have lost their

faith in their monetary system and in the State's payments. They prefer, therefore, to possess a small property of their own, the 'concrete' to the doubtful value of the money they receive for their work. I understand that this is quite a continental point of view, for the English have not experienced an inflation and still trust their monetary system. They have also the Empire behind them. It should also be added that these little farm households are not utilized only by workmen, but also by middle-class men; for instance in Germany, clerks, teachers, professors, and physicians. I believe that there is the same idea behind it; the 'sure' investment of their little capital or savings. They trust the land, but they do not trust their currency system.

R. HENDERSON, *Seale-Hayne Agricultural College, Devon.*

This is a topic upon which there is very great confusion of thought. Indeed, I know of no other subject upon which there is such a tremendous amount of confusion, and this is the more remarkable for we have been discussing it for at least twenty years. As a body of economists we do not appear to have got down to the subject in any proper manner, and it is evident that there is no real understanding of the problems involved as between one country and another, or even within national borders. In England, however, a certain amount of work has been done, and inquiry has been made regarding the extent to which it is economically and socially desirable to develop, particularly, the smallholdings movement. As a result, many of us who were, only a few years ago, strong upholders of the smallholdings movement have become convinced that the limits within which smallholdings can be developed are very narrow. This applies equally strongly to the part-time farm. There are, of course, still some people who have faith in the extension of smallholdings, &c., as being a means of relieving our unemployment problem. Reference is often made to the placing of people on the land who have failed to maintain their position in industry. It is advocated that these human residues of industry should be put upon the land with the object of producing more food. Now I am greatly concerned about this for, having myself been an agricultural worker, I know what an extension of the numbers already in agricultural production would mean. The crux of the matter is that, by increasing the number employed in agriculture, it does not follow that the total agricultural income will be increased. Indeed total income might be lowered. The result then is that a stationary or even smaller total agricultural income has to be distributed over a larger number of

people, which must inevitably lead to a lowered standard of living for all concerned. Assuming that we bring 500,000 of our unemployed people back to the land, we may increase the total product, but, with markets already glutted, there is no certainty that the agricultural income will be increased, or that the new agricultural workers will be any better off than they were when living on unemployment insurance benefit. The only way of increasing the standard of living in agriculture is by increasing incomes, and this cannot be done simply by increasing the numbers engaged in agriculture. Professor Ashby pointed this out, but whether he was understood or not I am not quite so sure. I think it is perfectly true to say that, where agricultural populations tend to increase relatively to the industrial populations, standards of living in agriculture will deteriorate rather than improve.

I have been very interested in the several points of view put forward, and I can quite see that conditions are different in this country from what they are in other countries. At the same time I tell you to your faces that you have not thoroughly investigated the problem about which you talk. I am not satisfied that we are tackling these problems in the right way. There has been a certain looseness, and a certain tendency to generalize rather than to probe and investigate, running right throughout the discussion. The point raised by Señora de Arlandis, indicating that people in other countries may have more faith in their land than their currencies, is probably one of the most interesting, and it may explain the attitude of some of those who have taken part in the discussion, and also the obvious differences between the points of view of representatives from abroad and those of Great Britain. I think probably the point is most important because it indicates national psychologies. People in certain countries may prefer to put themselves and their money into the land because they feel that is safest, but in this country the difference lies in the fact that if people were offered a sum of money or an equivalent amount of land they would almost without exception choose to have cash. In other words, we have as much, or more, faith in our currency than we have in the land. The point raised, should further investigation be made, may throw a great deal of light on the problem. There may, at the same time, be many other reasons accounting for the differences in the systems of land holding and land policies as between this country and other countries.

Several people have attempted to extol the life and conditions of living on the smallholding in various countries. Personally I have much experience of farm labour on large farms in England and some

direct experience of work and life on a smallholding elsewhere, and, if I had to choose between the two, my choice would always be that of being a labourer on the large farm. I would readily sacrifice that so-called independence—I doubt whether it is independence at all—which the smallholder is supposed to enjoy, for the sake of the standard of living and the other things that the ordinary worker enjoys in this country.

Probably my remarks have had more bearing on yesterday's discussion, but they would not have been greatly varied had I confined myself rigidly to part-time holdings.

The President, L. K. ELMHIRST.

May I suggest before we go on with the discussion that those who take part in it describe or perhaps define, when they begin, the actual nature of whatever it is they are going to speak on. I find that there is a good deal of mixture of epithet. When Mr. Henderson was talking, he was talking about smallholdings. A smallholding is an entirely different thing from the thing our American friend was talking about and I believe what Dr. Krause was talking about. I do not know whether it is to the point, but it may be helpful if I state some of the distinctions in this country. There are workers without any gardens at all, with just a house. Then the next type is a man with an allotment who may travel a mile or more from his house to get to this allotment, a little patch of garden, half or a quarter of the size of this room. Then there is, as in America, the part-time farmer, though not quite the same. In America, he may find a deserted farm and squats on it, and because cars are cheap he goes to and from the town. The smallholder is quite different because he must get the whole of his living from the smallholding. I quite agree with Dr. von Bülow that we do need definition, otherwise we waste a great deal of time fighting one another over different things and calling them by the same name. Will those of you, therefore, who carry on the discussion, just say what type you are talking about. This evening we are not talking about smallholdings. We are talking about part-time farms, though in a lot of other terms that you must define.

G. H. N. PETTIT, *University of Cambridge, England.*

I want to raise one point which is partly to do with allotments and partly to do with part-time holdings. If I understand this discussion rightly, there seems to be an idea in some of the contributors'

minds that the disadvantages of part-time holdings from the purely economic point of view may be outweighed by the benefits to the physical and moral condition of the man who is more or less derelict in the city. Well, I would like to suggest that it is possible to obtain these moral and physical benefits without moving the man out of the city at all, by the very simple expedient of providing him with an allotment. That sort of work has been done on a large scale in this country through the operation of the Allotments Scheme administered by the Quaker Society of Friends. There have been difficulties in this scheme. I was the secretary of a small one once, and we had troubles such as the men eating the seed potatoes which were given out, instead of planting them. I think that in the north of England particularly, these allotments have often been very valuable in giving unemployed men something to think about, some competitive interest amongst themselves, and something they can talk about over their half-pint, and have, therefore, done a lot of good. From the point of view of the general community in a small country like England, such a scheme has big advantages in that one does not cover the landscape with a lot of unsightly part-time holdings.

My impression of the part-time holdings that one sees round London (the type which I think the president means when he speaks of 'squatting on derelict land') is of terrible unsightliness. Large areas near London have been got into a terrible mess from the scenic point of view, through the development of these part-time holdings. That may be rather a curious argument to bring up at this meeting of economists, but I think it is one which should be considered. After all, the tourist industry is quite important in England, and there are relatively large areas of this small country which are being spoilt from a scenic point of view, by indiscriminate development of a ramshackle 'squatter' type of holdings.

W. SEEDORF, *Göttingen, Germany.*

I do not want to claim too much time, but I would like to say a few words, because I too have worked in this field. I speak of the settlement of people living in the country, but working in the industries or in the cities. If we come to England, we Germans in approaching the cities notice the lack of something; it is the lack of a belt of small gardens (*Schrebergärten*, as we call them in German). Only here and there have I noticed the commencement of such a development around English towns. The German worker who is banished to the towns has long since had the wish to own a small

garden, even if he must perhaps travel an hour to get to it. This shows how very much the German worker is attached to the land, how 'land-minded' he is, as I think you say in English. That is also the reason, I think, why many workers stay on the land, although perhaps many workers' wives would like to leave the land and share the comforts of women in the towns.

I think we ought to encourage this clinging of the people to the land for another reason, already mentioned here. If I may speak of myself, I was brought up on a peasant holding and, from the very beginning, was called upon to work, and I deplore nothing more than the fact that I have not the chance to educate my children by work on the land. I can only do that during the holidays. How much greater is the happiness of country children than of city children growing up in narrow streets and in back yards! And how much more efficient a population we could have, in my opinion, if the greatest possible number of our children could grow up in the country! These are the social aspects which have to be mentioned. We have quite extensive experience in Germany of what is here called 'part-time farming', or of something very similar. It is to be found in Westphalia in a certain form of share-tenancy (I do not know whether Dr. Krause has included this form), but it is also to be found everywhere else. I will not deal with this in detail, but it would undoubtedly be of value to study these examples in Germany in all their various forms.

Reference was made to the difficulties that might possibly arise in marketing. The agricultural market which I like best is that in which every one consumes his own produce. Then there are no marketing difficulties. Even if the milk is not produced with the same cleanliness on the holding of the small farmer, the germ content will certainly not be as high in the milk he drinks fresh half an hour after milking as in the milk which is consumed half a day or a day later in the cities. I think there is no cause for anxiety on that score.

The whole matter of part-time farming is one which will be extremely important in the future.

B. VON ZASTROW, *Berlin, Germany.*

The business of suburban settlement has so far only been discussed from the point of view of the man who wants to go to the country-side, from the point of view of agriculture, and from the aspect of competition. But we have not spoken—and I think Dr. de Arlandis very correctly hinted at this—of the effects of settlement on

the finances of the cities and, in general, of the costs arising from this settlement. At the outset, I would like to say that I am a great friend of this settlement. I believe that it must be promoted in every possible way; but, particularly, when we want to support it, we must clearly perceive the difficulties which prevail. The experience in Germany is, as far as I know, very different according as the settlement is developed near large cities or near small towns. In the case of small towns, the problems are much more easily solved. There it is not necessary to establish special means of transport and special services. In addition, the people leaving the smaller towns are not so much accustomed to the achievements of civilization, such as wireless, the pictures, illustrated papers, &c. In the case of the large cities, if such settlements are established—and if they are established the plan must be on a greater scale—they require first of all quite special means of transport, and, as the people must be brought to their work early in the morning and home again in the evening, they will be a great expense for municipal finance, for here we have to deal with a spasmodic form of transport that will be greatly utilized in the early morning and again in the evening. During the day, a housewife or two at the utmost will go into town to do some shopping. The transport is not utilized, and, even with omnibuses, it will not be so easy to handle the traffic, because a considerable volume must be dealt with. Furthermore, the cities may easily be obliged in these difficult locations to build roads, to lay electricity, and perhaps even to provide sanitation for the smaller settlements. These create heavy expenditure for the cities, and, if the question is to be followed up, we must examine by what means these difficulties can be most easily overcome in order to make it possible to accord this benefit to as many people as possible.

G. BAPTIST, *Agricultural Station, Ghent, Belgium.*

I just want to mention a very interesting type of part-time farming that we have in Belgium. We have in various industrial towns little societies that can get money from the Government to buy a piece of land, and on that money they have to pay only very low interest. The land is generally situated a little outside of the city; it is divided up in small portions which have to be let to workers. This system has very big advantages. First, the worker has a system already built up so that he is able to avoid making any big mistakes. Secondly, there is the advantage that it does not compete too much with agriculture, because the worker grows only potatoes and vegetables some of which he would not in any case buy.

G. P. WIBBERLEY, *University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.*

I feel I am hardly competent to speak on any economic matters at a conference such as this, but I would like to bring up just one or two points. I am considering part-time farmers, i.e. those persons who have small farms and produce farm produce for their own consumption, but obtain the main part of their total income from some other source than farming. Now, I think the same problem arises whether these persons merely produce enough for their own needs, or produce just a little extra to sell. The present market for agricultural products in this country—at least the present effective demand—seems to be deficient for the produce already available in this country. If a large-scale movement of part-time farms is developed, then it means the effective demand of the urban population will be decreased. Surely we must remember that, if a large movement like this is developed, a large part of the demand for agricultural and market-gardening products, dairy products, vegetables and things such as these, will be taken away, and the present difficult marketing problems of our farmers will be further increased.

Taking my second point, we find that small producers with just one or two cows producing only a few gallons of milk are a great bugbear to the present marketing scheme, and if we have a vast number of new producers of this type—as would be the case under a large scheme of part-time farms—surely this would increase the administrative difficulties of the present marketing schemes. I feel sure that the present Milk Marketing Board knows that the bringing of 4-cow producers within the Scheme's jurisdiction will cost in administrative expenses more than can be offset by the advantage of having them in the scheme. I would like other speakers in the discussion after this to consider these two points; that under a large scheme of part-time farms administrative difficulties and expenses of organized marketing will be increased, and that in large part the present effective demand for agricultural products will be decreased.

I. DE ARLANDIS, *Madrid, Spain.*

I would like to add just two remarks. Mr. Henderson and Mr. Wibberley said that the part-time farm for workers will have the effect of increasing agricultural production and of decreasing the demand for agricultural products on the market. I do not think so. At least, it is not the tendency in the German system of part-time farming. There, the aim is to give to the industrial permanently employed workers—not to the unemployed men who are

not regarded as the ideal type of part-time farmers—some new additional real income, not in order to raise wages, but to raise his standard of life. He receives real income from his small farm, which he would not have received otherwise. As he receives the same wages as before, there is no less purchasing power for agricultural products in the market. If more industrial products are purchased, new income for industrial workers is created, and this new income could fully compensate for the decreased demand for agricultural products by the part-time farmers.

Part-time farms are quite different from the allotments for unemployed men, which are created in England. I do not agree at all with Mr. Pettit that an allotment given to the unemployed would constitute a solution for unemployment. If even small farmers with experience do not get on in these times, how can an industrial worker, without knowledge of farming, turn from being an unemployed workman to being a successful small farmer?

K. HOOD, *Pennsylvania State College, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*

I think that some of us who have taken part in the discussion here this evening are becoming unduly excited about something which we cannot avoid. This movement is going to continue even though it results in some conflict with the farmer for a part of his markets and even though there is some difficulty encountered occasionally in regulating the sale of produce from these part-time farms.

I tried to indicate in my paper that my study showed that there are certain economic factors of long-term importance such as the shorter working week, the shorter working day, and the improvement of transportation, which seem to point to the fact that this part-time farming movement and the rural residential movement are both going to continue.

I think that we probably should have spent more time and thought on the discussion of how we are going to make the best of this population development. The farmers to whom I talked see that the movement of city people to rural homes is inevitable, and they are going to co-operate in order to make it as satisfactory as possible.

Two major criticisms of this development were made; namely, the difficulty of regulating the marketing of produce from part-time farms, and the movement of relief cases from the city to the country.

Let us consider the problem of market regulation. To begin with, the 3,000 whom I had the privilege of interviewing were not marketing very much. Practically everything that they raised was for home consumption. In fact, they produced less than one-half

of the food that was required for the family table. Approximately one-half of those studied were marketing nothing at all, and the average value of the produce marketed by this group was less than \$100 per year.

I wonder if an improved financial position and better living for these industrial workers are not more important than the regulation of the sale of three or four pumpkins a year and a few eggs and a quart or two of milk every day. Is it not possible that we have gone a little too far with trying to regulate everything that the farmer sells? We had a Potato Act which was put into effect in the United States and later declared unconstitutional. The original plan called for regulating sales of potatoes down to 5 bushels per farm. This is just about the type of regulation that would be put into effect if we were to regulate the sale of produce from these small part-time farms.

And now let us consider the second criticism. Has this development been characterized by an exodus of people on relief who have gone out to the country and settled on deserted farms in order to escape certain starvation in the city? This may have been true in some sections. I am not trying to make any general statement other than what I have found on these 3,000 part-time farms surveyed. There we found less than 15 per cent. on relief. Some were not on relief for the simple fact that they had in addition to their city employment a small income from the farm, and they were producing a part of their food and fuel needs, which helped to balance the family budget. During 1930, 1931, and 1932 there was a considerable movement of the destitute from the cities to the country. Some of these settled on barren hill-sides and poor land areas and tried rather futilely to eke out a miserable existence from operating 3 or 4 or maybe 10 or 15 acres of rather poor soil. I thought that I was rather careful in pointing out that this type of movement was not a success and should be discouraged at all times. That is why we have tried as far as possible to associate our part-time farming studies with the studies we have made on land utilization. We have found that the man who settled in good agricultural sections and on good soil was the man who was making more of his part-time farming operations than was the man who settled unwisely.

In so far as people on relief have been encouraged to move to the country in order that the city would no longer have to support them, it should be discountenanced, but, as far as I have been able to see, this has not been of any consequence in the movement. Certainly over a long period of years this development is not going to take place because people are starving in the city and because city authorities

are making an effort to move their relief clients into the surrounding rural areas, but because men and women of their own volition want to move to the country because they like country life and because of the advantages of country life which have been enumerated previously.

I was glad to have the president's statement that what we were talking about was part-time farms and not smallholdings where a man makes all his living or tries to make all his living on the farm. The president's definition of a part-time farm was, however, somewhat inaccurate. The part-time farmer is not a man who goes out on deserted farms and squats there and tries to farm. There are a few who do this. Some people become part-time farmers because they try to be full-time farmers, and the farm is too poor to provide an existence. Most of the people settle on a small plot of land and supplement the income from their city jobs by part-time farming activities.

There are several other questions that I would like to discuss. I was interested in Mr. Pettit's discussion of allotments. Had I heard him talk of this two or three weeks ago, I should not have known what he meant, but I have since had the good fortune of travelling through a few European countries and I saw from the train any number of these small garden settlements. I wish that there was some research on this development. Have these people made money? Have they saved money as a result of cultivating these gardens? I think, without having any evidence at my disposal, that in most cases these projects would be very much worth while. There are other advantages, however, to country living besides having a garden. Possibly a person wants some live stock and he should be there to take care of it. Cheaper housing has also been in evidence in the studies made. It is possible that these allotments would prove to be less successful in America than they have been in Europe. I have a feeling that it would be necessary to drive out considerably further than would be economical, unless, of course, we wanted the ride anyhow and did not charge the cost to the garden operation.

Mr. Pettit also suggested the possibility of indiscriminate building of country homes. There is considerable evidence of this in America, but on the whole our industrial workers have built substantial dwellings. The time may come when we will have to have zoning ordinances in our rural residential areas. In a few of the New York counties at the present time, particularly in the areas contiguous to our important cities, we have township zoning ordinances. There it is almost impossible for a person to go out and build a shack alongside of a decent home.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I see this movement as inevitable, and I think our problem as economists is to help these people to locate satisfactorily, to buy wisely, and to produce economically. More research should assist us in answering some of these many perplexing questions which have arisen in this spirited session this evening.