



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.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

PROCEEDINGS

of the

WESTERN FARM ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION

Twelfth Annual Meeting

June 14, 15, and 16, 1939

University of California

Berkeley, California

THE PLACE OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR IN SOCIETY

Paul S. Taylor

Professor of Economics, Department of Economics
University of California

wish to acknowledge indebtedness to students in my seminar on
al labor for their work in collecting material on historical
rticularly to Isabelle Berg, LaWanda Fenlason Cox, Varden Fuller,
Williams. Responsibility for interpretation of these materials
P.S.T.

the traditional American ideal of the place of the worker upon the
expressed by Theodore Roosevelt in the words "working farmers,"
wrote into his introduction to the 1910 report of the Commission
Life. Nearly 50 years earlier the Homestead Act had laid down
tional policy that these working farmers should be owners. In
onal debate at the time a Representative from Indiana declared:

Instead of baronial possessions, let us facilitate
the increase of independent homesteads. Let us keep the
flow in the hands of the owner. Every new home that is
established, the independent possessor of which cultivates
his own freehold is establishing a new republic within the
old, and adding a new and strong pillar to the edifice of
the state.

of 1862 represented victory for northern farmers over southern
in the long struggle to determine the pattern of workers on the
ch found its culmination in the Civil War.

In the shaping of issues before the War, the existence of a growing
of wage workers employed on farms played no part. Indentured
had died out in the early 19th century, unnecessary in the North
posed by slavery in the South. Thus the appearance of the conflict
in terms of the extremes - slave labor on plantations on the one
d owners working their farms on the other.

In the first stages of colonial settlement along the frontier of
th, free land and the absence of a great cash crop to make slave
profitable resulted in a pattern with few farm workers who were not
But by the outbreak of the Revolution the institution of the farm
rker who lived with the family and was paid by the month had
d, and by 1800 it had become general. To describe this peculiar and
e relationship an Americanism was invented in the words "hired man,"
lieu of the inappropriate British term "servant man."

As the frontier rolled westward across the Mississippi Valley,
ere opened where cash crops could be grown which yielded returns

which labor could be paid. Family labor was not always sufficient, and as farmers acquired more land than one family could work. Thus "hired men" became numerous.

They did not, however, become a class. In their origins, they were sons of other farmers and their social status differed little from that of unpaid family laborers or of their employers.

The self-respecting [hired man] was a recognized and respected member of the neighborhood. His was the independence of a free citizen as really as that of his employer... If his wages were small, the scale of living about his was a simple one...The employer worked beside his man. (E. Chapman, New England Village Life, p. 118.)

An even more important determinant than their family origins, that which prevented farm workers from becoming a class, was the existence of opportunity. There was always an outlet for hired men who could push West by a new farm for themselves. Besides, farmers began to retire or to turn to other vocations, to live wholly or in part on the capitalized farms, either selling them on time or letting them to others. The trend was facilitated by general industrial expansion which raised the value of land and agricultural produce, raised the value of land and opened opportunities to those who chose to leave their farms. It opened a new opportunity on lands already occupied and formed the steps which came to be called the "agricultural ladder."

A contemporary description at the end of the 19th century of this agriculture of the farm laborer is given in the 1911 reports of the United States Industrial Commission:

Farm labor, in a large and true sense, is the work of the farmer, the tenant, the crop sharer, and the laborer hired for wages. These forms of effort are inextricably involved, the farm laborer of one year being the farm owner of another, and the sons of farm owners laborers temporarily, tenants later, and ultimately proprietors. In this country land titles are not tied up by primogeniture, nor agricultural classes held by caste to semiserfdom of social and industrial conditions. It is impossible to chain an American to a life service in any industrial class. (Vol. XI, p. 133.)

Later, statistics were adduced to affirm that

Correspondents were asked whether it was reasonably possible for farm laborers and tenants to save enough to buy a farm that would support a family even with the help of a mortgage and their replies indicated that 72 per cent of farm laborers and tenants find it reasonably possible to acquire farm ownership. (Geo. K. Holmes, Supply and Wages of Farm Labor. Yearbook of Agriculture, 1910, pp. 189-200.)

This statement included tenants with laborers, another inquiry was made to ascertain "to what extent male outdoor farm laborers were qualified

farm tenants." It produced the answer that in the north and
al states, 46 and 48 per cent, respectively, and in the north
atlantic states, 33 and 35 per cent of farm laborers were quali-
e on the land.

was on these terms only, that the existence of a group of wage
ch had been entirely outside of, and contrary to our dominant
eal for the place in society of workers on the land, came to be
If the group was not part of the original plan, at least it
general American opportunity to rise in the scale according to
capacity. Indeed, it was hold that this opportunity to leave
s so necessary a part of American ideals that cries of labor
m farm employers should be accepted with satisfaction as evi-
workings of democracy. This view found expression in the
e Commission on Country Life:

There is a general, but not a universal, complaint of
scarcity of farm labor. This scarcity is not an agricultural
difficulty alone, but one phase or expression of the general
ly problem.

So long as the United States continues to be a true
democracy, it will have a serious labor problem. As a demo-
cracy, we honor labor, and the higher the efficiency of the
laborer, the greater the honor. The laborer, if he has the
ambition to be an efficient agent in the development of the
country, will be anxious to advance from the higher forms of
labor, and from being a laborer himself he becomes a direc-
tor of labor. If he has nothing but his hands and brains,
he aims to accumulate sufficient capital to become a tenant,
and eventually to become the owner of a farm home. A large
number of our immigrants share with the native-born citizen
this laudable ambition. Therefore there is a constant
increase of efficient farm labor by these upward movements.

for the employer faced with labor shortage was not to press de-
mand on government to supply workers at wages and conditions which the
laborer would meet. It was rather to stabilize employment, promote rural
development, and make farm life more attractive to the laborer. The hard
task was faced without blinking:

The country must meet the essential conditions
demanded by the town; or change the type of farming. (Com-
mission on Country Life.)

In 1937, a quarter of a century later, national stock was again
in place in society of the worker on the land. Tenancy had in-
creased from 25 per cent of all farmers in 1880 to 42 per cent in 1935.
One-fourth of all persons gainfully employed in agriculture
were farm laborers (1930). Previously these facts had caused no concern.
The agent of the Industrial Commission noted the existence of a
shortage of laborers and an increase of tenancy, but he had reported
as follows:

The incumbent tenants are usually farm laborers or

of farmers, and tenancy is a stepping stone to ownership. That some do not succeed is more the result of bad management than of bad markets or bad laws, for the enterprising and persistent do succeed while others fail...It is found that the trusted farm laborer often becomes a tenant, and eventually a proprietor. It is shown that tenancy is temporary, but there is no tenant class and little likelihood of one. (Vol. XI, p. 85, 74.)

The Commission on Farm Tenancy appointed by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1933, saw in this growth of tenancy no steps to help laborers up. On the contrary, it reported with deep concern:

... an increasing tendency for the rungs of the ladder to become bars--forcing imprisonment in a fixed social status from which it is increasingly difficult to escape.

These facts confirm the apprehension of the Committee; they indicate that the laborer is forced to descend the rungs and that ascent has become more difficult. As the tenant has lost opportunity, so has the laborer.

When we are face to face, then, with the fact that a large number of farm laborers are gainfully employed in agriculture--probably not far from one-third of the farm population--on a more or less fixed labor status as wage workers or share-croppers, we are struck by the fact that such a status had no place at all in our original ideal for workers on the land. The existence, when discovered, was reconciled to our national ideal of democracy only because there remained free opportunity to the laborer to ascend the ladder. A group is now recognized to bear increasingly the mark of a fixed status, and the chances of ascending the agricultural ladder, or of finding outlets in other industry, grow more difficult. Can a large farm labor class be reconciled with democracy? The Commission of Theodore Roosevelt seems to have answered "no."

In the light of this question posed by the contradiction between the ideal and the actual status of the place in society of the worker on the land and the actual fact of historical development, let us examine the nature and structure of our present agricultural structure.

In 1930 about 52 per cent of those engaged gainfully in agriculture were operators--owners, managers, or tenants. About 16 per cent were laborers of the operator's family. Except as these are the families of croppers (the census does not tell us), they are not members of the farm labor class, and I omit them generally in my analysis of that class. Nearly 33 per cent are wage workers and the latter usually simply workers by another name, paid in cash. This third of our working population on the land whose place you have asked me to discuss.

Throughout our national history, divergent types of agricultural structure have predominated in different sections of the country. Those types remain. In the North the "hired man" survives as a type more common anywhere in the country. Of all the farm laborers, paid in cash in that section, wage workers constitute 77 per cent.

They are not greatly different from their employers, and this to the predominance of the family farm, ensures for the laborers of the favorable social status which our ancestors meant when "hired man" instead of "hired servant."

In the South unpaid members of the operator's family comprise an important part of the labor supply, but even there the combined wage workers and croppers comprises more than 60 per cent of all. The plantation system is a dominant form of agriculture in the true character as large-scale agriculture with many employees concealed by defective census classification which persists criticism from experts for at least a generation. Because of this, and the fact that its wage workers and croppers are so large, the laborers of southern agriculture have had little "place in the sun" other than as servants on the land. This pattern was rejected by the South in the 1860's, but nevertheless survived in the South. Except for a few times since the South has shared national political power, there has been no serious attempt to reconcile the status of southern laborers with national ideals of the proper place of workers on the

in the West, particularly on irrigated lands, a variant of the plantation system has developed, based on wage workers. These laborers comprise virtually nine out of ten of all farm laborers. Croppers are hardly more than one-tenth.

The scale of farming is large in the West. More than 57 per cent of all large-scale farms in the United States are located in that section. In the Central Valley, California, where an extreme development has been reached, the average cash expenditure for labor, per farm reporting to the Bureau of Economic Warfare, rises to \$3,498 or more than nine times the national average. This is well developed. In both Arizona and California, one-quarter of the total wage bill for agricultural workers is expended by managers on large farms for others.

These conditions sharpen the line which defines agricultural labor as a class, for they add to the difficulty of ascending the agricultural ladder. Their significance is now recognized by the laborers who seek sporadically to organize, and it has long been recognized by the leaders of western agriculture. In 1926 a spokesman for the agricultural department of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce said:

The old-fashioned hired man is a thing of the past... There is no place for him, and the farmer who does not wake up to the realization that there is a caste in labor on the farm, is sharing too much of his dollar with labor. We are not husbandmen. We are not farmers. We are producing to sell. (Quoted by Varden Fuller in his unpublished doctoral dissertation.)

The status of agricultural laborers recognized so clearly in this is not confined to California, although it is perhaps most clearly recognized there and in Arizona. Its existence elsewhere, especially in the contraction of industrial opportunity, is becoming more

ly apparent as labor conflict becomes incipient. Already it has spread in other sections of the West from the Salt River Valley to the Snake Valley, and in the El Paso and Lower Rio Grande Valleys of Texas. The Southern Tenant Farmers' Union is active in the Cotton Belt. Attempts to organize sugar beet workers are made in Colorado and Minnesota. Onion workers' strikes in Ohio and truck workers in New Jersey.

These conflicts and efforts to organize mark the recognition by agricultural workers of the disappearance of their opportunities to rise. They occur, like American trade unions of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, in those sections of their industry where commercialization and markets are most fully developed.

Deviation from the traditional farm labor pattern has always been recognized quickly when it assumed that form of mobile labor which is characteristic of highly specialized, highly seasonal, large-scale agriculture. As long ago as 1901 this departure from the national ideal was clearly visible and easily recognized as such:

...the annual inundation of grain fields in harvest time, hop yards in the picking season, fruit picking in districts of extensive market orchards, and similar harvest seasons requiring large numbers of hands for a short time, has a demoralizing effect on farm labor, reducing its efficiency in those lines. Such employments demand little skill; the requirements of each are simply and easily satisfied. They constitute a low order of farm labor, if worthy to be classed with it at all, and are excrescences upon its fair face. (U. S. Industrial Commission, Vol. XI, p. 79.)

Since 1901 mobile agricultural labor has grown in importance in the cotton belt because of the combine harvester, it has increased in the cotton belt as cotton moved on to the plains of Texas and Oklahoma. In the land of the South. It has grown, too, in the Southeast, along the Atlantic seaboard, and in berry and fruit crops of the Mississippi Valley. Industrial opportunity continues to lag, and agricultural depression is prolonged, evidences of the growing class character of agricultural labor, whether mobile or not, become plainer and more widespread. And they make agricultural employers uneasy, as the early trade unions made industrial employers uneasy.

Theodore Roosevelt's 1910 Commission on Country Life, as noted earlier, had been alive to the importance to democracy of the existence of opportunity for farm laborers. The President's Committee on Farm Policy of 1937 was equally alert to sense the danger to democracy of the fundamental change in condition of agricultural workers represented by its appearance. The report declares:

Should the rungs of the agricultural ladder become rigid bars between classes, an American ideal would be lost. In a community of rigid groups, normal democratic processes are unable to function. The Committee has noted

instances where disadvantaged groups in their attempts to organize and increase their bargaining power have been unlawfully prevented from exercising their civil liberties.

The effect of denial of civil liberties to a group, unfortunately, is limited. It permeates to many elements of the community and involves private citizens and public officials alike in its meshes. The report of General Pelham D. Glassford, who represented the Department of Labor and Agriculture and the National Labor Board in Imperial Valley in 1934 makes this plain:

After more than 2 months of observation and investigation in Imperial Valley, it is my conviction that a group of growers have exploited a communist hysteria for the advancement of their own interests; that they have welcomed labor agitation, which they could brand as "red," as a means of sustaining supremacy by mob rule, thereby preserving what is so essential to their profits, cheap labor; that they have succeeded in drawing into their conspiracy certain county officials who have become the principal tools of their machine...

Spread upon the pages of recent Imperial Valley history are certain lawless and illegal events which have been suppressed or distorted in local news accounts, and which have not been investigated by the officials who are charged by law with that responsibility. Reputable clergymen, lawyers, business men, and other citizens of Imperial Valley have informed of their personal knowledge and observations, insisting upon a promise of confidence, so great was their fear of retaliation, boycott, or actual violence. One active vigilante remarked "I'd like to be out of this mess, but what can I do? If I don't 'line up' my business will be ruined." (Hearings before House Committee on Labor, 74th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 6288, p. 37.)

It is with those traditions of democracy in agriculture which established themselves nationally in 1862 and have been confirmed by commissions of Presidents, is plainly revealed by the recently expressed wish of General [Imperial Valley] and breathe that pure 100 percent loyal Americanism."

The attempt to meet crystallization of farm labor into a class has lost the opportunity to rise, with a denial of the right to a piece with the insistent demand of large agricultural owners for a continuous supply of the kind of labor they need. In 1928 the Agricultural Legislative Committee of California recommended the limitation of immigration of laborers from Mexico on grounds of labor in the United States:

We must have somebody in this country to do our work. Somebody, somewhere, has to do hard physical labor, because it is here to be done. If the American people

refuse to do it, then what are we to do? Why, we must bring somebody else in from the outside who will do it. Under our present system of production, we must either bring somebody in here to do our hard work or we must go elsewhere for our foodstuffs and clothing. (Hearings before House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 70th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 6465, p. 307.)

This view is the diametrical opposite of the position affirmed by the Commission on Country Life which I quoted earlier. We are ready to do almost anything rather than face the alternative to our proposal proposed by that commission, namely, to "change the kind of

In the contemporary effort to reconcile facts with national ideals, we are faced with a problem more difficult than that which confronted the Commission of Theodore Roosevelt. We cannot simply do as they did--amend the formulation of the national ideal of the place of the laborer upon the land and reassure ourselves that all is well despite factual alterations from the original plan. In 1910 they could do this with validity for their time, at least for the time. In 1939 we cannot do so. Unless we are ready to accept such extreme measures as in times of crisis have found place in Imperial Valley, we must modify both the formulation of the national ideal and the facts have made this inevitable, and at the same time alter the facts of labor on the land. By doing so we accept the alternative offered by the Country Life Commission.

The Farm Security Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture is the agency most actively engaged in experimentation with the welfare of the workers on the land. Its work properly is characterized by--individual laborer's housing with subsistence gardens, cooperatives, and cooperative subsistence farming, communities of individual farmers for purchase and use of land, cooperation between individual farmers for purchase and use of machinery and machinery, cooperative large-scale farming under management and division of proceeds. The results of these experiments should be reported and there should be congressional support to undertake many

Formulation of the national ideal, too, requires some modification. While experiments are in progress, and doubtless longer, we face the prospect of a large class of agricultural workers. To those for whom the land has reopened opportunity with new patterns for security on the land, we must offer some alternative protection, in harmony with democratic principles, from the harsh workings of competition. In the light of a long and honorable tradition of protective legislation in both English and American industry, this need for protection requires logically the extension of social legislation to workers in agriculture. I shall illustrate this with a single example.

The United States Social Security Board has recommended to the President and to Congress within recent months that old-age insurance be extended to include agricultural workers employed in "large-scale farming operations" and that exemption should apply "only to the services of a worker employed by a small farmer to do the ordinary work connected

his farm." The reasons given for this recommendation are grounded on principle that "it is sound social policy to extend old-age insurance to as many of the nation's workers as possible" and on the belief that the proposed extension is "administratively feasible."

Provision of old-age insurance is one of the most popular measures in recent years, and the board has proposed to tax only the larger farmers for the support of their employees in old age. But curiously, employing agricultural interests have defeated the proposal in the Ways and Means Committee of the House. More than that, under leadership of large-scale farmers in the West, the protection of old-age insurance has just been extended (July 1939) from some 300,000 agricultural and quasi-agricultural workers previously covered, many of them employed in the highly industrialized operation of processing farm produce.

If our historical analysis of the place of agricultural workers in industry is correct, the leading spokesmen within agriculture, but not those on the industrialized side, may be expected to support rather than to oppose extension of social security to their workers. Indeed, agricultural leaders on the President's Farm Tenancy Committee have joined in the recommendation. It will be interesting to observe, therefore, which of the representatives who lobby for organizations of working farmers will choose.

A basic fact which underlies any proposal to extend old-age insurance into the agricultural industry is the concentration of employment in a relatively few of our more than six million farms. The number of farm workers who reported to the census of 1930 that they spent no cash for labor was 58 per cent of the total, or 3,657,000 farmers. Wendzel's study of the 1935 census showed even higher percentages of farms employing wage workers in January and July of that year, namely, 85.8 and 78.2 per cent respectively. The same study showed that in January only 1.3 per cent of all farms, with ten or more wage workers per farm, employed 14.9 per cent of all wage workers. Another 1.4 per cent of all farms, with nine wage workers per farm, employed 24.5 per cent of all wage workers. Thus 2.7 per cent of all farms employed nearly 40 per cent of all wage workers. Another 12.6 per cent of all farms, with either one or two wage workers per farm, employed the remaining nearly 61 per cent of all wage workers in agriculture.

This concentration of employment both adds justification to a proposal to extend coverage into agriculture, and makes it administratively feasible. The more fully that the impersonal relationships characteristic of industry extend into agriculture, the more appropriate it is that protective rules and practices developed for manufacturing industry should be applied also to the agricultural industry. The fewer operators with whom contact is necessary to ensure observance of the law, the simpler the problem of administering it.

To exempt small farmers from taxation on their employees as the Social Security Board proposes, it is suggested as a reasonable and consistent line of distinction, that all employees on farms with annual gross income of less than \$500 be omitted from coverage. On the basis

generally to permit payment of the tax. Colored laborers who comprise one-fifth of all farm wage workers frequently are subject to additional discriminations against voting on the grounds of race. Migratory workers often find themselves disqualified from political participation because of residence requirements for eligibility, or because absence from home on election day is necessary to obtain work.

The place of agricultural workers in society is in transition today. We face again as in 1862 and in 1910 the periodical necessity of restating our national ideals of what that place should or can be. In 1877 this restatement was made by the President's Committee on Farm Agency, modifying, but continuing the working-farmer-owner democratic tradition established by the Homestead Act and followed by the Commission on Country Life. This tradition has its challengers again as it had before the war between the states. Their effort is strongest and best realized in those sections of the country, particularly of the West, where in industrialized forms, modern variants of the plantation system of agriculture have been established.

DISCUSSION OF DR. PAUL S. TAYLOR'S PAPER ENTITLED
"THE PLACE OF FARM LABOR IN SOCIETY"

George B. Herington
Labor Relations Representative
Region XI
Farm Security Administration

The
natur
of t
shes
e of
the
d wes.
er and

D
lalty
mic
nit
consist
er ty
rayer, se.
's, in
generely
na must
roce-
n, and
as.

work.
on u
00
t Sog
es
es
al rel
Idaho
his
nisti

Dr. Taylor has made clear beyond cavil that there has been a change in the social status of farm labor and has particularized on a statistical basis certain structural changes in the agricultural which have materially contributed to this drastic, in fact drastic, change. These changes are on the West Coast until recently we have had a distinct migrating agricultural workers doing seasonal work, living on the West Coast. Some follow the crops from Arizona, through California, Oregon, and on into Canada; some shift back and forth in less extent.

There has been a rapid change in this pattern recently, accelerating from 1930 to a peak in 1937-8, and now decreasing. From the 1930's, with a long series of crop failures and exhaustion of a living, subsequent foreclosures, consolidation of these lands into large mechanized farming enterprises by the residual holders, and the resulting displacements, there has been a constantly increasing number of displaced, disestablished people, moving west, and directly

from Arkansas, Southern Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas, a preponderant group. In Washington, one-crop area, there has been a flow of families into the Pacific Northwest. About 90 per cent have come from the named localities, and the remainder has arrived as a result of similar causes a large group, about 90 per cent, from the states north of the Oklahoma-Kansas boundary. This group comes from a country of more general farming activity. Nearly 400,000 people have come from the southern area to the Pacific Northwest coast; nearly 100,000 have come to the Pacific Northwest from the more northerly general farming area. This movement represents a direct westward migration.

A highly intelligent sampling of the southerly group is noted in a recent survey of 6655 migrant families by Dr. Omer Mills of the Farm Security Administration, made in cooperation with WPA in a limited area. This sampling and a detailed survey by the Labor Relations Division of the Farm Security Administration in cooperation with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics covering Oregon, Washington, and Idaho are nearing final tabulation, each establishes conclusively these sources of migration and shows in the Pacific Northwest about 20,000 families of 100,000 people. For the Bureau of Agricultural Economics Mr. McEntire is conducting a similar study under way in California.

These people are no longer able to support themselves in their local areas, due in the main to causes beyond their own control. Their home counties from the same causes have become publicly impoverished in tax source. Unable to find reason or encouragement for a better improvement available as an invitation to go east, south, or west, they have headed west, even as generation after generation has done, and finally come up against the great ocean. They can go no further and have nothing to go back to. They are here.

Dr. Taylor has called attention to the enormous industrialized ranches of California, with a feudal status in their social and economic contacts, their talent for becoming industrialized in all except their contacts in labor relations, and their tendency to create serfdom among the laboring—or else. In the Pacific Northwest this rapaciousness is in the minimum. However, greed runs between the farmer and the laborer. Labor is often caught in the narrow margin remaining to the farmer in which case, if labor must starve or find relief, the relief is only what agriculture did not pay, a living wage on which the laborer can just live, or starve. Who here is subsidized, labor, the grower, or the landowner? This is food for thought certainly.

Various figures have shown that the original coast, migratory, seasonal labor group was composed of some 200,000 people in California. In Washington there were added at the two peak seasons another 40,000 to 45,000; Washington has had a peak of 30,000 in Yakima Valley and another 15,000 around the Puget Sound; Idaho from 20,000 to 30,000 in peak seasons. The Washington figures are deduced by Dr. Paul Landis of Washington State College in his recent publications of the results of field studies. The figures for Oregon and Idaho are from unpublished studies made under the direction of the author and are for the Labor Relations Division of the Farm Security Administration.

Into this aggregate of 300,000 to 350,000 persons of a found and seasonal labor source, dependent on seasonal agricultural labor, have arrived an added 500,000 people who in the main find only seasonal agricultural labor as a hazardous means of potential support. Thus to 900,000 people are available to do the work of these four states formerly carried on by an already present force of about 3/8 of the currently available labor pool of supply.

This then is a migration of major intensity, closing in far more rapidly than natural growth of work has demanded. These predominantly unskilled people seek work under the wild urge of stark hunger. They do the work in from one-third to one-half the usual time, job by job, and the average of family seasonal earnings down by just such proportion. In such a condition there arises a series of potential and actual social conditions which must find remedy or which embody the virulent forms of social explosion.

In these conditions there is present one item alone which bears food for thought of remedied measures, and that is, in this great unskilled, disestablished mass of people, socially unaccepted, as yet socially undigested, there is a vast group of growing children. If

accepts no responsibility for these children, who are here, what ability toward society may be expected from these children, who bid remain here, in five and ten years from now as maturity is reached? Living in a true hell of poverty, struggle and hunger, growing up and hate, these children are shunned, pushed around, outcasts, and for daily bread is bitter. What have we to expect of them? no one asked them here. Certainly they would not have come in except they had no other way to turn. There is nothing to go they could go back. The way of life back there has already They are here.

Two agencies of the Federal Government, the Farm Security Administration and the Farm Placement Service, have used every effort to stay. The Farm Security Administration has, by grants, rehabilitation at the source, by information, and advice against moving on, every way the means would permit to hold back this interstate flow force. But when an American gets just so hungry he is going to do about it. He cannot eat advice. The Farm Security Administration undertaken to aid and has aided local authorities in the destination care for the problems of relief, medical aid and in undertaking place and a way to live. As an example, the Farm Security Administration in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho has already found places on a self-supporting basis for some 2500 families on farms. It seeks

In Oregon, Washington, Idaho, California, Arizona, and Texas sanitary facilities and clean living quarters of the simplest type and are being provided in farm family labor camps, together with assistance gardens and cottages, some self-help facilities, and in already listed by Dr. Taylor. Here school adjustments can be being aided, cleanliness augmented, and self respect reestablished, the facilities will permit. In this chain of camps also there becoming available a means of spreading news of need or scarcity of from locality to locality authoritatively, through cooperation the Farm Security Administration, which furnishes the quarters, Farm Placement Service, which catalogues the work and its timing places workers on jobs in a systematic manner. This tends to put some order and a longer continuous working season for each without the time loss of running around looking for work from one job to another potentially needed job, available only when found.

But even this systematic approach to remedy has other problems. It has been possible to carefully work out by time work study crop, by crop area capacity, by aggregating and integrating the time and work factors, a knowledge of what number of workers a area and series of areas can support if a full season's work is made to a minimum requirement of force, which answers the first question. analytical approach.* How many families can the available work

to Oregon State Planning Committee Publication, "Agricultural Requirements in Oregon". Prof. H.L. White, Ore. State College, Corvallis, 1936-37. Time studies by various crops, etc., as to price data base.

i.e. what hired force is needed to systematically serve the work
 at the reasonable best earnings economically available, thence
 as near as may be to a maximum of support by such earnings thus
 of some to be determined number of families.

This becomes then a determining, fundamental positive, bounding
 floating work force which can be best and decently supported
 cultural work available to former agricultural people. This sum
 from the subtotal of the whole temporarily settled down mi-
 group, who have come from farms and are adaptable most naturally
 ways of living, leaves one remainder which indicates roughly the
 the next group, which may best be approached with a view to deter-
 on a self-supporting way of life through agriculture, of a problem
 here, which bids fair to remain here and can only continue to be
 humanitarian and increasingly definite relief funding problem of
 dimensions, all sitting on an explosive foundation, until some such
 tive policy can be determined and carried out.

Perhaps we can see some light on the solution if we can assume a
 mathematical approach to solving the fundamentals of the division
 groups, one, that actually needed group required for mutually best
 tion in seasonal labor to the interest of both grower and worker,
 second group, that number formerly engaged in occupations other than
 culture, (which the Pacific Northwest surveys are now determining) and
 properly directed may become available to original or allied non-
 cultural pursuits, (figures so far deduced indicate something less than
 cent immigration in the Pacific Northwest is of farm origin.), and
 third, that group which may and can be again attached to the land as
 supporting families. In this the question immediately ranges around
 strikes against the problem of availability or non-availability of
 which may become useful in such manner and in such quantity as may
 necessary to handle economically any determined number of carefully
 qualified families.

There is nothing official or bearing the stamp of official ap-
 in what I will hereafter offer; it is my own individual thought
 approach to remedy.

We have the Columbia Basin with 1,200,000 acres to be watered,
 for agriculture, and provided with settlement facilities and
 We may find room for doubt of existence of the former type of
 settler. This area is on a non-speculative basis as set out by
 Bureau of Reclamation. Timing, simultaneous effect of prepared land,
 and settlers are indicated in the approach suggested.

Then there is the Imperial Valley area extension under the All
 Canal, also some considerable area now coming under canal in
 These storages are ready. New lands are needed to carry new
 Means must be found to settle people and settle land, if this
 social procedure is to be followed through. Should the land
 by purchase or otherwise to the government? Should the surplus
 put to work on clearing and making ready this land and by what
 These items are mentioned merely as one type of idea wherein

for thought exists, looking toward a constructive approach in social economic betterment and so that a certain approach may be made to the solution of a problem that must certainly and soon be solved.

These people are American people and there must be a decent and practical solution in an American way. To provide free public land was an American way for generations until the naturally and economically exhausted land was exhausted. To use our recent immigration as an asset instead of burning it as a liability may become the really sensible and constructive approach. To measure the problem and constructively determine the best way and promote and accomplish its forwarding is an approach of a civilized nation. A people able to think out and to construct the Hoover, Owyhee, and Coulee Dams, to erect in a desert a great factual irrigated farming economy, to erect such great bridges as we see from the Statue of Liberty, the Empire State Building, and the Chrysler Building, are certainly a people who can be expected to apply an engineering approach to the same solution of social and economic hazards by other means than indefinitely continuing relief and vigilantes. We cannot shoot half a million American citizens because they are hungry and are too early, but we can use our heads and find ways and means to work out a reasoned and forward looking plan for making of them an asset, not a liability, after an explosion.

There can be no rest in the problem until it is constructively reached and solved, for we have here in concentrated form a labor force, hungry, ready but unable to work, a social status en masse, which is not by any historical criterion stay submerged. We can do this job, the solution is a challenge.