Large firms, less
f4a labor/land

ch. 5 9&7, p. 43. 52% landlords in U.S. depend on rented land for chief source of income, '46.
564

ch 5 p85. Indian immigrants to lower Burma, "whose lower living levels enabled them to rent land at higher prices than the Burmese farmers."
5151

Marcoux
PtI ch1

The small independent inventory-carrying craftsman predominated where raw material was cheap, -- various qualities of wool existed of course -- and more labor needed. Big capitalist came in where expensive raw material needed, less skilled labor. The Yorkshire vs. SW contrast drawn above is not general, but this paragraph is moreso.

Smaller firm more labor intensive

Mgr vs owner

2 '.. & aid which this STTgys mks cpct of less impnce than adaptability, passive, & indstry.' S 41

p. 7-8 Cites Gardner Means, "The Structure of the American Economy", p. 240-263. Means studied 22 industries which in 1935 produced c. 50% all US mfrs. The 4 largest co.s in each of the 22 industries made 88 co.s, except it was some fewer because of duplication. There were "many thousands" of co.s all told. These 4 largest in each industry, about 80 co.s, had 40% of the total business. But they employed only 25% of the workers. 5175

He vaguely attributes this to their mechanization. I think it is likely due to their better land. Now here, in industry, is the same trend we can see so clearly in farming. Labor thrust out to the margins. The better lands underused, undermanned.

A Rep't on Large Landhold'gs in SC

Cal Com-sion of Imm. & Hsg 1919 Sac. 6

p. 30 Tenantry most extreme in Imp V, owners escape climate, const.

p. 31 influx of poor fmrs from S, '& th mrvls prdctvty of a sl whch brgs hi rntls from th ctvtr, thus enblg th owner to live cmfrtbly in sm ls torrid lclty.' S104

hi rent → tnntry

Ventura Cty, wage labor, owner ~~mngs~~. mgrs.

S 23, p. 650

Petrol refining ind., 1939
wages to 13,000, $190m.
value added, $527m

Get a few data like
these, for real picture.
Ec. Conc. & W.W. 2.
S 29, p. 75 (q.v.)

Larger outfits, higher
output/man.
Very hi output/man, mfr
grnds - $1,500!! check.

"U.S. Will Lose Goodwill of Africa, Asia, If It Supports 'Small Paris Clique' Against Algeria," Says Landau

FRIDAY FLASHES—APRIL 18TH

From Address by DR. ROM LANDAU

Chairman, Dept. of Islamic and North African Studies, The American Academy of Asian Studies

"SINCE I am neither a politician nor a 'rebel,' I'll try to give the facts of the Algerian war as they emerge from personal knowledge and documents. And I shall quote no rebel sources but only French, trying to elucidate the French thesis point by point:

—'Algeria is a part of France.' By what right? By the right of brutal conquest. French documents show us clearly that France set out in 1830 on her Algerian war with the aim to destroy as much of Algeria and her people as possible.

—If 'Algeria is a part of France?' why was there always a Governor General? Why was there an Algerian state bank and customs between Algeria and France?

Had Own Diplomats

—'Algeria was never a state or a nation?' This is obviously a fiction. For Algeria had her own diplomatic representatives, signed treaties with, among others, the United States and France, and had her own greatly feared navy.

—If it was not a nation, what about Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, all of which were not states before 1914 but became states after 1919.

—'There is neither racial nor religious discrimination?' Yet Algerians seldom were full French citizens. There was a French and an Algerian Assembly. While French women living in Algeria have the vote, the Muslim women don't. Mosques were turned into churches.

Only 10 Per Cent of Natives Schooled

—'France brought culture and education?' French scholars tell us that most of Algerian culture and schools were destroyed by the French. While, at the start of the war of liberation in 1954, 100 per cent of the French children in Algeria had schools, only 10 per cent of native children received any schooling. In the University of Algeria, 4,500 students are French, only 500 are Algerian.

—'France brought economic prosperity?' Yet, while the average yearly income of a Frenchman in Algeria is $750, that of a native is just over $50. Before 1954, the minimum daily wage for the native agricultural worker was 54½ cents.

—There are 25,000 French 'colons' on 2½ million acres; 600,000 natives on slightly fewer acres.

—The average size of a settler's farm is 120 acres, that of an Algerian is four acres. On that type of land, a man on four acres can barely starve.

—'France is not fighting a war in Algeria but conducting a campaign of pacification.' Almost 100,000 natives have been killed during that pacification. There are 200,000 Algerian refugees in Morocco and an equal number in Tunisia.

"Brutalities" Protested

—French Cardinals, intellectuals, church leaders, professors and others have protested again and again against the brutal tortures of the natives at the hands of the French army.

—French generals and scholars have resigned in protest against French brutalities. Neither women nor children are being spared.

—I cannot report some of the tortures that take place because we are on the air and it might be too shocking for some to hear.

—'There is collusion between the "rebels" and Communism?' The 'rebels' never accepted communist offers of help. But if the West continues supporting France in Algeria, the 'rebels' may soon find themselves forced to ask communist help.

Whose Fault If Not Ready?

—'The Algerians are not ready for self-government?' If they are not after 120 years of French rule, whose fault is it? Would 1,300 years be enough?

—'France cannot abandon one million Frenchmen?' But of the million, less than half are of French origin. The rest are Spaniards, Maltese, Italians, many others.

—The 'rebels' have no wish to kick out the French settlers upon whose cooperation

(Continued on next page)

Do you know of any Father-Son membership teams in the Commonwealth Club that have not been published? Tell us!

"Our Commonwealth Club has the confidence of its wide community. It maintains this standing because of the character and quality of its membership, its activities, and its programs. We stress facts, not emotion. We place truth before causes. We seek light. We avoid propaganda. We consider ourselves a public service institution. As free men, it is our duty to focus our attention on any problem which concerns the welfare of our citizenship, and to determine its most effective solution." —PRES. RAY B. WISER December 30, 1949

Asks U.S. to Live Up to "Historic Principles" In Algeria

LANDAU (Continued from preceding page)

they must depend for many years to come. Neither Morocco nor Tunisia have kicked out the French since they regained their independence.

Examples of Morocco, Tunisia Cited

—It is charged that the Jews will be massacred. Let us look at what has happened in Morocco and Tunisia. After Morocco and Tunisia gained independence one of the Moroccan ministers was a Jew. A Jew was appointed economic advisor to the Moroccan Embassy in Washington.

—There are far more Jews employed in top jobs in Morocco and Tunisia than there were under France.

—It is claimed that there is no government for France to deal with, but this difficulty was overcome in Morocco and Tunisia.

—No French government dares to do the right thing, while they know they are continuing to do the wrong thing.

—What should the United States do? It can either go on supporting a small clique of reactionary settlers and their spokesmen in Paris and, finally, lose the good will of the whole of Africa and Asia, or it can live up to its historic principles of fair play, support the independence movement, and thus strengthen its ties with the Arabs, the Africans and the Asians."

Answers to Written Questions from Floor:

Q: (T. L. Lungon) If Algeria gets independence, will she honor contracts signed by French with private companies? **A:** Examples of Morocco and Tunisia—have not abrogated single contract.

Q: (Charles Ginsburg) Safety of French settlers? **A:** In Morocco and Tunisia, French have not been touched. Fifty thousand French officials are still in Morocco; French know-how is needed.

Q: (H. I. Doherty) Are not Communists in France behind unrest in Algeria? **Q:** (Norman Elkington) Who is furnishing weapons? **A:** Algeria did not accept Communist support. Up to last October I know they had refused Russian offers but their last hope was good offices of Mr. Robert Murphy. They might now be more amenable to Russian offers.

Q: (Edgar M. Kahn) Alternate solutions? **A:** I don't see any solution but independence for people who want it in this century.

Q: Ultimate outcome? **A:** Independence. North Africa is part of the West, wants a future with West—but if West won't help, Russia may come in.

Q: (Herbert Hanley) Two rebel groups? **A:** There are parties but except for few stooges everybody is for liberation.

Q: (J. Rupert Mason) In what economic way does trouble in Algeria differ from Cyprus? **A:** Algeria has been a cost to France, except for a minority of industrialists.

Q: (Akbar Khan) Isn't France in Algeria for good of Algerians? **A:** If so, why do not all Algerians go to school, why do not Algerians have same income as French, why do not Algerian women have the vote?

Club's Former Orchestra Maestro, Giulio Minetti, Dies

The late '20s and early '30s were a period of the flowering of the arts in the Commonwealth Club, and for a number of years Maestro Giulio Minetti — who died March 31st—served the Club as volunteer director of the Commonwealth Club Orchestra.

This group of our talented members met weekly for rehearsal under Maestro Minetti's direction, and presented to us an annual concert as part of the Club's Literature and Music Evening, which, together with the Club Men's Chorus, was also inaugurated during the same period.

Maestro Minetti was long a leading San Francisco musician, and (in the days of President Benjamin Ide Wheeler) beloved Director of the U.C. Orchestra; had also served as Concert Master of the San Francisco Symphony and directed the Sinfonietta Orchestra.

'A Cal. Case Study in Location Thy: The Globe Artichoke on the Moro Cojo

JFE, P 538-44. Wm. O. Jones Aug. '49

Rancho Bolsa del Potrero y Moro Cojo, Mex govt granted Capt JBR Cooper, 1828

Bottom of Salinas Valley. 1,000 acres. Ideal for artichokes. Still controlled by descendants, mostly one individual. Cooper-Molera family.

Refile to Diff MRs

Spreckels leased it for sugar beets for years. 1921, tried to beat them from $15 to $12.50/acre, 5 yr lease. For years 1888-1922, 'Rent was paid in advance, & the owners had no responsibility in the adm. of their prop. other than cash'g the rent check & pay'g the taxes.' & negotiat'g new lease ea. 5 yrs

e.g. of misuse by tenant

A.J. Molera, son of old Mrs, came into control. Got more active interest, turned to artichokes, vastly ↑d rent -- $35/acre & up, by drill'g wells, actively supervis'g.

Author emphasizes how this differs from mere response to ec. forces -- how very large owners under no pressure to economize, if don't wish (I add, small owners, too.

perfect mkts wd cause, ~~effect~~ perfect land use

Many think land wd be ideally used
imperfect comp. is sole caused misalloc.

How else shall we interpret this passage from JTE: " "

Or this from Joe Bain

(Device for ~~forcing~~ forcefully bringing out mng of weakkneed quotee)

Labor Intensity by ~~size~~ size.

✓A. By acreage.

1. Major data.

~~Bachman & Jones – gross output.~~

'The Land', for Eng. S181

~~Goodrich? – that is indirect, by cfg regions.~~

~~and that's all!~~ May have to make pt indirectly, from data cfg regions. Or

✓ ~~recheck Census, maybe is there.~~

~~All~~. study cited by W&C, S168 p.55. – ~~& cite them that this is typical~~

(Denmk)

~~S169, corn~~

2. Incidental citations

S108 (cornbelt). Recheck it, make it a big citation

~~S66 (Okla)~~

~~Aull on South vs no.~~

~~Jacoby, Indo-China~~ ~~Jacoby – Indo-Ch.; phillips.~~

~~S174~~

~~Vonder Goltz & Sering~~

~~(cd. use Stanley Hamilton)~~

✓ J. S. Mill (save, & also save Laing, to prove greater gross output from small)

E. Anti-Hammar

S152 p.39

technique

✓B. By gross output

✓ ~~Bachman & Jones.~~ S169 good. 2 sheets

? D. G. Johnson, 1940

~~1950~~ data, good

~~S169~~

✓C. By regions

~~Goodrich~~

~~(Rumania)~~

~~(Lebanon)~~

~~S. Hamilton~~

~~Pl-n-sheaf~~

~~S66, Okla.~~

~~I-Ch., Philippines~~

C-1 ~~By~~ land classes or values per acre

~~Hammar & M.~~

~~Vonder Goltz & Sering~~

~~S171 – use w. Goodrich~~

~~Piedmont v. W Tex.~~

~~Carver~~

~~E. Ear.~~, S174

~~D.~~ By value of fm?

Hedges, cont.

1912, Dennis (the land sales agent, who was always more eager to sell than Shaughnessy, the extremist) pushed thru 20 yr terms, more tough dealing with speculators who hadn't paid up, etc. Despite CP's being tougher on speculators than Am roads, & giving easy terms to settlers, unlike Am roads, they had plenty of speculators.

A

1912, they set up new agency which they controlled more. Previously a land agent got a commission for selling to anyone, so he encouraged spec. Now they controlled that. & it worked great things — a different sort of advertising, different sort of info. disseminated, settlers bought more, spec. less.

V

2.95 Brit. emigrants had turned out to be poor farmers. Central Eur. furnished much better ones.

B1 (another reason why tenantry would be more profitable than owner-use is that one who had enough capital to be an owner operator would also have enough skill in non-farming occupations so he could get a higher r ward for his labor than it would bring doing common labor about the farm. Hence he will be outbid by one who will rent land to one without those other skills, one who can do little but common labor. And those owner-operators who do succeed may be just the ones who have no talents for anything but work by themselves, hence they won't hire laborer assisstants much -- so you don't get problem solved by having owner operators who hire labor for crude work -- like Edgerton. You have -- well, why don't you hav specialists in farm management over crude labor who outbid all for land? I suppose here is another explanation: there are lots of people with odd funds to invest, and if they invested them thru a farm manager they'd have just as many problems trusting him as they have if they have their own tenants.

ch. 9 p iii 3 areas: NW best, wheat p 19, highest lv. here Okla

566

Most people on cheapest land

SW almost as good, cotton & wheat

SE timbers, more. But, p 18. denser pop. smaller holdings.

Tried to hand pick settlers, choose those with cap. & farm experience. They got many with cap., from Eng. when areas rejected. p 237. Hedges.

Size of Hldg	Steady Workers per acre
< 1.25 acres	0.96
1.25 - 5	0.36
5 - 12.5	0.26
12.5 - 50	0.14
50 - 250	0.06
250 & up	0.04

S 350
Ey.
"pre-1914"

Oppenheimer, Franz, "Lebensraum in Ey", Freemen, 7-42, p 204-5

S201 ~~p. 150.~~ M. Arnold Dánel.

p. 149 Hungary ~~vast no.s~~ less dense ag. pop. than e-n & s-n neighbors.

Distrib-n of land makes "over-pop" problem in Hungary.

4½ m. ag. pop. ⅔ have no land or under 5 yokes (1 yoke = 1.4 acres)

¾ arable land in cereals. Hence ag. labor finds work only c. 150 days a year.

✓ p. 150 Hungary, 1 yoke in 'large farm', takes c. 14 working days a year. "Small peasant holding", 31 days.

ch. 3 Peasants on small farms go in for animal prod-n, fruit, wine "& other quality production" -- latifundia, cereals. (clearly more cap/acre on p'sants)

S201

CS108, ~~[illegible]~~ (L 333 Un 31) Dist. of Pop. Baker, O.E.,

p.16. Cornbelt, tnt fms > o-op fms

p.20 In both tnt & o-op fms, man-land ratio falls sharply as fm size Δs.
As tnt fms ave. larger, they have fewer men per 100 acres gnrly.

Recheck.

Conc. & tenancy

S 108 (Baker, Corn Belt, '39)

p. 57 'Tenant op. fms in the areas studd are sign-ly larger than owner op fms, ...'

ave size owner op fms, 122 a; 50% of them < 110 a.
" " tenant " " 158 a

(& these are just op; not ownership, units)

c)
Fewer people make liv on larger fms — on tnt fms, better land.

S 108

Ch. 9

On owner fms, ave. 3.2 pop/100 a.
" tnt " " 2.8 " "

This due to larger size, not tenure status, for larger owner fms also have lower pop. Arng fms, classified by size, is no diff. in density by tenure.

Plantation Theaf. - S180, 1930s

a. Mainly proves large on better land.

b. a ~~bit~~ little, rather poor, data on intensity & size, by regions.

c. Good data on conc. ~~by~~ of ownerships greater on better land for own-p vs. op-n

✓

Big on better land: conclusive | (7 figs on ~~5180~~ all in this sheaf)

p. 70

Table 26 Gross Inc. for the ¼ of the 648 "pl.s" in ea. area w. highest & lowest inc. per plant.

QA	No. of pl.s in ea. inc. group.	Upper ¼ per pl.	Upper ¼ per cap.	Upper ¼ per crop acre	Lower ¼ per pl.	Lower ¼ per cap	Lower ¼ per crop acre	Landlord-op.'s net income (fn 632 pt.s) p. 218) Average per plantation
Total	162	$21,143	$196	$29.69	$2,728	$131	$14.50	2,576
A+I C. Pl.	14	$15.5t	248	43.78	2.8	111	11.40	2653
U. Pied.	10	9.1	188	29.98	2.4	92	14.97	1737
Bl. belt (a)	28	9.6	168	22-	1.6	101	9.17	1,474
Bl. belt (B)	25	8.4	158	25-	.9	151	4.75	1,344
Upper Δ	33	39.1	208	34-	4.7	135	23.35	3,897
Lower Δ	12	12.1	151	28-	.6	113	4.76	1,728
Muscle Shoals	6	7.1	186	19-	1.9	167	12.47	1,340
Interior Plain	8	26.4	186	22-	2.7	100	18.27	2,365
Miss Bluffs	12	22.9	199	27-	1.9	94	14.97	2,434
Red R.	7	36.8	204	34-	3.6	216	18.58	4,483
Ark. R.	7	59.7	197	29-	9.9	211	25.67	7,162

Note, upper ¼ have ~~land~~ about twice the income per acre of the lower ¼ — & much more inc., c. 8 times more. Obviously this does not come from intensive use, as they have a considerably higher income per cap. So they have better ~~men~~ land & fewer men per ~~acre~~ unit of output. They are land-intensive.

p. 202. Same sample (nearly)

Crop exp.s per pl., 1934. $3,472.

Values unreliable from tax roles?

p. 206. Use of land, 1934 (Total area of 646 pl.s in sample, 586,042 acres)

	No. of Pl.	Acreage: Acres.	Acreage: ave. per plant-n p. 217	~~% cropped~~ No. of persons per pl. (for 646 pl. p. 217)	Persons per acre	Land alone ~~Table~~ Value per pl., for 632 pl. p. 201	Pasture	Woods	Waste.
Atl C Pl	56	44,000	785	42		13,000 ~~19,000~~			
U. Piedm	40	17,000	437	33		9.4 t			
Bl. B	211 ~~112~~	171,000	(785) (840)	61		12.1 t			
U. Delta	133 ~~[illegible]~~	137,000	1,031	91		31.2 t			
Lower "	50 ~~133~~	57,000	1,146	35		13.5			
Muscle Shoals	22 ~~50~~	12,000	555	25		15.2			
Int. Plain	30 ~~22~~	35,000	1,160	58		38.4			
Miss Bluffs	47 ~~30~~	37,000	786	57		17.1			
Red R.	28	25 –	901	77		48.7			
Ark R.	29	50 –	1,722	143		66.6			
Total	~~646~~	~~586,042~~	~~607~~	~~55~~	42.4 (% cropped)	~~(7.0)~~ ~~(% idle)~~	~~17.8~~	~~23.6~~	~~9.2~~

Divide out, gex this column, note larger hold'gs on better land

Divide out this, note more persons on worse land

Over

p. 70, cont.

can take per cap & per crop acre figs., arrange regions in order of density of use. & then...?

—

Inc. figs are gross. Smaller places use ~~less~~ more labor/acre. If had contrast of net inc. of land, small vs large, wd be more contrast.

—

Note, figs are per crop acre, not per acre. Thus, in poorer regions, where less % land is cropped, figures jack up inc. per crop acre unduly. & in these poor regions, have smaller plantations. So, again, contrast is understated – actually smaller places have considerably worse land.

—

The inter-regional of-sons are not very fruitful. Bes, after all, these largest plantations are not typical of their regions – there nee. may be a few upper Piedmont areas better than any delta lands, etc.

Large hldgs on better land

p. 26.

	No. of Pl.s	Crop acres per pl.	No. of Pl.s w specified acres in crops						
			< 200	200-400	400-600	600-800	800-1,000	1,000-1,200	1,200 & up
Total	646	385	241	213	81	42	29	15	25
a+l. C. Pl.	56	294	20	25	5	6	–	–	–
U. Pied.	40	211	22	15	3	–	–	–	–
Bl. Belt A	112	275	46	41	20	4	1	–	–
" " B	99	256	52	35	7	3	1	–	1
U. Delta	133	563	23	41	21	13	17	10	8
L. "	50	207	32	15	–	1	2	–	–
Muscle Sh.	22	225	13	8	–	1	–	–	–
Interior Plain	30	523	7	11	7	–	1	1	3
Miss Bluffs	47	378	21	9	5	6	3	1	2
Red R.	28	531	4	11	3	5	2	–	3
Ark. R.	29	998	1	2	10	3	2	3	8

Intensity & fm size | S180

Sample of 646 cotton "plantations", ~~i.e. holdings > 260 acres~~. (& unified in space – for they had holders w >1 "plantation")

By work'g these figs over, cd. show some trend toward larger hld'gs on better land; larger less intense; etc. But, being by regions, not sizes; l being just ~~[illegible]~~ larger hld'gs in the regions; full of inconsistencies. Don't bother with them.

	No. of Plant. (p. 206)	Total acres in the pl.s. (p. 206)	Ave. per pl. (computed from 2÷1)	Ave per pl., from p. 217, for 646 pls.	Crop acres per pl. (p. 217)	Value of land alone per pl. (p. 201 for 632 pl. – no data for other 14)	Value per acre (computed)	No of persons per ~~acre~~ pl. (p 217. For 646 pl.)	No of total ~~persons per acre (computed)~~ acres per person (computed)	% of plantation land in crops. (p. 206)	% of plantation exps that went for fertilizer p. 202
Atl. C. Plain	56	43,919	78.5	785	294	$13.1t	$16.7	42	18.7	35	37.5	33.2
Upper P.	40	17,474	436.8	437	211	9.4	21.5	33	13.2	30	48.4	32.1
Black Belt A	112	87,904	785.	785	275	13.2	16.8	34	30.9	31	35.0	21.3
" " B	99	83,161	840	840	256	10.8	12.9	27	31.1	28	30.5	21.7
(" " total)												
Upper Delta	133	137,111	1,031	1,031	563	31.2	30.3	91	11.3	22	54.6	4.3
Lower "	50	57,319	1146	1,146	207	13.5	11.8	35	32.7	16	18.0	4.5
Muscle Shoals	22	12,200	555	555	225	15.2	27	25	22.2	33	40.5	6.8
Interior Plain	30	34,797	1160	1,160	523	38.4	33.1	58	20.0	38	45.1	5.2
Miss. Bluffs	47	36,930	786	786	378	17.1	21.8	57	13.8	24	48.1	12.2
Red R.	28	25,229	901	901	531	48.7	54.1	77	11.7	23	58.9	1.7
Ark. R.	29	49,938	1,722	1,722	998	66.6	38.7	143	12.0	24	57.9	2.4
Total	646	586,042	907	907 is correct 607 an error	385	21.7	23.9	55	16.5	25	42.4	9.7%

Crop acres per family p 207

"Enumerators were instructed to 'enter values at conservative mkt value, not low assessed value nor hi spec. value!"

S180

p. 197

Table 6. Sample of proprietorships, info taken from tax rolls. 1934

More conc. on better land

Size of prop-shp →	3-10	10-20	20-50	50-100	100-175	175-260	260-500	500 & up
Black Belt	7.4%	6.1	17.2	24.0	20.6	10.3	8.5	5.9
Delta	4.6	6.4	25.0	21.6	17.3	7.4	11.6	6.1
Upper Piedmont	3.3	5.4	24.4	31.2	20.4	7.9	5.0	2.4
Miss. Bluffs	3.8	4.2	30.7	24.2	19.1	7.6	8.1	2.3
Atl. Coast Plain	4.2	8.8	26.4	26.4	17.0	7.6	6.1	3.5

Note how much more dispersed is distrib. for Upper P. & Miss B, areas of poorer land. Medium on Atl C. P., medium land.

They give counties. Sometime get them, get op units, cf. distrib.

---

p. 191 Table 7 Op-rs owng other fms. Out of 646 "plantation" (over 260 a.) in sample, "op-rs" of them, 251 of op'rs owned other fms; & ~~owning~~ held 727 other fms in all, or 2.9 per op.

Figs understate conc., esp. on better land

Highest in upper delta area - 4.3 other fms per op.

Lowest in Muscle Shoals area - 1.8 " " " "

---

p 200, Table 10. Some small sample, show no. of absentees by region. Highest in Black belt & delta. "Absentee operators", (who live > 10 mi. from pl, & visit it less than once a week, & hire no overseer)

p. 201. Table 11. Value of land & bldgs, 1934, for 632 "plantations" thru South (> 260 a) Value per plantation:

Land,	$21,674
Bldgs	3,961
Animals	1,869
Mach.	1,185

Doubtless on smaller places more impr. per l.v.

But, p. xxxi, excludg owner's residence, commissary, & gin.

Larger hldgs on better land?

p. 35, Table 13: Use of land in 646 plantations and of total land in farms in 7 s.e. cotton states, (ala, ark, ga, la, miss, nc, & sc), 1934. 5180

Land Use	646 plantations	Total 7 states
Crops	42.4%	35.3
Pasture	17.8	24.5
Woodland	23.6	28.5
idle	7.0	6.3
waste	9.2	5.4

NB "..the plantations have a considerably higher % of crop land and a correspondingly lower % of land in woods & pasture."

"The% of crop land in the total acreage was highest in the plantations of the Upper Delta of the Miss & the bottom & bluff land of its tributaries, where it amounted to more than ½ the total acreage."

p. xvii Average yield of cotton, 1934, all farms in the 7 states, was 215 lbs / acre; but on enumerated planations was 257 lbs/acre. (authors vaguely attribute this to greater "efficiency" -- but no data. Obviously it means larger ones had better land.

5180

Small hldgs, mean land

p. xviii "The smaller farming units....are generally located on poorer cotton land."

Leg. S180 p. 1 1860 Census enumerated no. of slaves per owner; 1900 Census, no. of ~~tenantxperxfarm~~ "rented farms" per owner; 1910, special plantation inquiry, no. of rented farms per owner; and 1930, % of farmers who were tenants. All show conc. in gnrly the same areas. These are cotton lands, flat, low, rich lands: "the level lands of e-n n. Carolina, the Lower Piedmont and Upper Coastal Plain of SC, Ga & Ala, and the Delta and Loess Bluff regions of the Miss and its tributaries in the States of Miss, La & Ark are regions of heavy plantation concentration."

Tnncy on better land

Few tenants in "The rolling Upper Piedmont section.....the Muscle Shoals area, the Miss. Ridge, & the Interior Plain w of the Miss."

Conc. on better land

" These areas are characterized by a hi % of tnts, a hi degree of conc. of landownership ..." negroes, mobile pop p. 1, S180

pp 3-4, from text, s180

Regions	Soil	Tray	Conc. (Sample) (% of [illegible] over 260 acres)
Atl. Coast Plain			9.6 %
Black belt		hi	14.4
Upper Piedmont			7.4
Muscle Shoals			Low
Ridge or Hill			Low
Miss. Bluffs			10.1
Delta or Bottom	Rich, flat		17.7
Interior Plain, central La & Ark			Low

p. 202.

Crop expenditures per pl., $3,472 (646 pl.s)

p. 206

area of 646 pl.s, 586,042 acres

Ave., ~~[illegible]~~ 907 acres per pl.

42.4 % area cropped

7 % idle

17.8 % pasture

23.6 % woods

9.2 % waste.

p. xxxi Some of these landlords rented in other land. But no data on whether it was the larger or the smaller who did it, etc. And natch one would find some who found it ec. to rent in land, in this large group.

def., pl.
S180

p. xvii Present study defines plantation as "a tract with 5 or more resident families, including the landlord". And whether other families are tenants or wage earners. (1910 study counted only tenants)

p. 243 For present study, "plantation" was a sort of operating unit. -- "managed" as one unit, in sense that head man oversaw the tenants and to some extent planned their crops (tho not their actual hours of work, I'm sure) (And also he often made them buy at his commissary, bought seed & supplies in bulk -- thus the plantation was something of a self contained unit, which of course prevents urban growth, as it assumes functions of a city)

Sample technique
S180

Sample was weigh ed roughly according to number of plantations in each state -- i.e. that proportion of the sample was allotted to the state.

(Ala & Miss got c. 25% each; Ga, 17%; Ark 14%, La 11%, NC 7%)

Within states, sample was apportioned among regions by 2 factors: a, the no. of plantation cties in the region; b, the % of farmers who were tenants. (thus no wonder it showed hi % tncy. This softens conclusion that hi % tncy goes with large size)

Thus the sample was heavily weighted from certain regions: 32.6% sample came from Black Belt; 20.7% from Upper Delta. There is 53.3%

Leg.

1910, U.S. Census, Vol V, ch. XII, "Plantations in the South". A study of "tracts" with 5 or more tenant families.

Def., pl.
S180

A study of 646 Cotton County planations. A cotton cty was one with 40% or more of the gross farm income in 1930 from cotton.farms. Covered states ofNC, Ga, Ala, Miss, Ark & La. (Also used some of Banks old figures on SC)(but not, I presume, among the 646) A tract with 5 or more resident families, including the landlord, was considered a plantation.

p. 195, and p. xix: 1910, Vol V ch XII, Plantations in the south. Defined plantation thus:

def: pl.
S180

"A continuous tract of land of considerable area under the general supervision, or control, of a single individual or firm, all or a part of such tract being divided into at least 5 smaller tracts, which are leased to tenants." (note vagueness. "General supervision or control". That might often mean mere ownership, with no control beyond rent collect - ing.)

1910 Census enumerated 270 "plantation counties", with 33,908 plantations. In these counties were 653,607 tenants; plantations had 54.3% of them all, or355,186 tenants.

In addition, in non-plantation counties, there were 240,000 tenants.

In these 270 counties, selected for their large plantations, there were 946,693 farms, of which 653,607 were tenant operated, or 69%. An unusually high % of tenancy. -- esp. so in 1910, since when it has increased. (in above figures, each tenant tract is counted as one farm)

p. B20 '48 Census

5166

	Pop.	Urban	Rural
Bulacan	411,382	57,000	354,000
Ilocos:			
Norte	251,000	22,000	229,000
Sur	276,000	52,000	224,000
Philippines	19m	4.1m	15.1m
Pampanga	417,000	57,000	359,000

Hardie, 2

(As to mobility Ilokanos are major emigrant group, says my Phillipine friend) (Demetria Pajante)

p. C12. Mentions maldistrib of pop, Ilocos, suggests moving pop. thru land reform.

5166

5151 176. 1939 Over half farms are under 2 ha.; almost ¼ under 1 ha.

ch 3 Ilocos provinces, dense pop. (& poor land? NW strip Luzon is Ilocos)

p 186 Ilocos are "poor & ec-ly backward" Very small o-op. fms. - no large estates.
p 174 "Nutrition, density" much greater there, than for whole Phillipines.

ch 3. Cf. Bulacan province, just n. of Manila, & Ilocos Norte & Sur. 5151, etc

Pop.-Webst. ~~1934~~ 1948		area (Webst)	Pop (Rand McNally) 1953?	Pop/sq mi	"Farm area"	
249,000	Bulacan	1,007 sq m.	411,000	326	~~55,000 ha~~ 91,000 ha	p. 182: a few very large hold'gs; most fms are tnts.
	Ilocos N&S		251,000		97,000	
219,000	Norte	1,293	~~238,000~~		52,000	No tncy. Very small, poor farms
217,000	Sur	442 sq mi	~~272,000~~ 276,000		45,000	

Note that Bulacan, altho rich land, near Manila, has less pop. per unit of 'farm area'. Subtract urbam pop., get real comparisons.

Cities of Bulacan
Malalos 26,000 (W)

Cities of Ilocos N
Laoag 38,000 (W)

Ilocos Sur
Vigan 18,000 (W)

Chap 6: The Phillipines

p 174 Pop very uneven distrib, but not nec. accordg to my stereotype. Pampanga, 454/sq mi (distrib w/in Pampanga wd. be signif.: conc. on foothills of Mt. Mayon?) 5151

ch 3 Davao, 39/sq mi.

Don't use for ch. 3

loaned
~~Misc~~ mng. 8

"TVA, 1933-37"

(Inheritance is the only motive we have for keeping private individuals from depleting their capital in later life. Hence inheritance taxes are very bad.)

Ineffic. big holders

p. 67-8. The forest lands are owned by small farmers some & big operators some. The latter furnish far less employment, & are run down more.

Water xport averages 3-10 mph; rail, 5! counting delays in yards etc. 62

I take it TVA differs from Recl work in this, too: that govt paid all. Why, then, the great op osition? Must have been eastern taxpayers, not western landowners, who objected?

p189. To cultivate 1 ha. of rice land requires c. 300 hrs of man labor & 150 hrs of animal. So a tnt on 2 ha works c. 75 to 8 hr days a yr. Hence much underemployment. p. 190. Hard to find work in off season, they are idle. (maybe that's why they like it?) (How come for tnts? I thought just small o-op. were underempl.?)

5151

Principle:

The nearer the final consumer, the more labor intensive the work.

Because the more work has been done on a product, the more precious it becomes, the better handling it is worth giving it.

e.g. W-r mill, cf. basic & original cut vs plywood mill.

Thus smaller businesses serve final consumer. Larger ones mine, refine, etc.

S160
pp. 539 -

In Ger. the shift from country to city has been mainly a flight from the E. to the W. & Center, where most of the industrial resources are located.

(this formed basis for Ger. Settlement policy)

2 economists, von der Goltz and Sering traced the excessive migration to the predominace of large estates in the E. — this premise contested in '33 by P. Quante.

Industrialists in W. interested in having a cheap supply of unskilled labor.

1886 Bismarck founded Royal Prussian Settlement Commission for Ostent W. Prussia. Agency had funds for purchasing & settling large estates.

p. 540

This advantageous to landlords. Subdivision of an estate could take place only on application of owner, & the state extended administrative help & credit facilities. It thus enabled large landowners to rid themselves of over-indebted estates & generally of supporting estates prices.

Total acreage turned over to settlement was 639,552

Most of holdings between 12 - 60 acres. Holdings 12-60 acres more numerous than those 12 - 25 acres.

Attempts to tie agri. workers to soil thru ownership of small holdings failed. Workers didn't respond because supplement to their agri. wages to be derived from the holding was very small.

For subsequent policies see p. 540ff.

Check Johnson w 1940 Census for ~~value~~ class intervals.

1940, gnl rep't.

I don't find anything in Censes by value of products.

Where does he get this stuff?

Leg Cites Johnson, DG, "Contribution of Price Policy to the Income & Resource Problems ~~of~~ in Agriculture", JFE, Nov. '44. That mp of capital much higher in Georgia than Ia. 5173 p.303?

But there are no such figs in Johnson. (Johnson thanks Tetiche for some help)

J does cf. ENC states vs So. Atl. states. p. 647

p. 647. From 1940 Census, Farm characteristics by Value of Products

Region	Value Added per farm (Class limits not given)	Value of Land & bldgs per worker
ENC	$ 490	$2.6 t
	690	3.0
	994	3.4
	1410	4.2
	1825	5.2
	2570	6.4
	3970	8.5
	6142	10.6
	15 981	7.1

probly due to undervaluation of large hold'gs? Or fewer bld'gs?

~~Division~~

A small farmer simply must use his land completely, for his living depends on it. Larger can take luxury of not using often. Thus, due to imperfect cap. mkts., these two, living side by side, are in different economies. The one living in a ~~xxxxxx~~ land-rich ~~xxxxxx~~ economy, uses land with frontier lavishness; the other, in a coolie economy, uses labor lavishly, economizes on land.

Johnson, 2

So. Atl. Region	Value added	Value of land & bldgs per worker
	$.6 t	$.9 t
	.7	1.1
	1.0	1.2
	1.1	1.4
	1.9	1.8
	2.5 ~~+.9~~	2.0
	3.7 ~~2.5~~	2.4
	5.5 ~~3.7~~	3.2
	17.2 ~~5.5~~	2.8
	~~17.2~~	

Note contrast of regions, & within regions

$$17\overline{)11.000}\ \ .64$$
102
80

$$31\overline{)23.00}\ \ .74$$
217
130
124
60

$$92\overline{)65.000}\ \ .70$$
644
600

$$32\overline{)21.0}\ \ .65$$
192
180
160
200

$$44\overline{)30.0}\ \ .68$$
~~308~~
264
360
~~396~~
352
80

$$42\overline{)31.0}\ \ .73$$
294
160
126
340

$$42\overline{)32.0}\ \ .76$$
294
260
252
80

$$4\cancel{0}\overline{)29}\ \ 72$$

3 21

$$83\overline{)46.0}\ \ .55$$
415
450
415
350

$$146\overline{)64.0}\ \ .43$$
584
560

$$844\overline{)574.0}\ \ .68$$
5064
6760

$$16\overline{)11.0}\ \ .7$$
112

$$156\overline{)111.0}\ \ .71$$
1092
~~0~~180

$$184\overline{)129.}\ \ .7$$
1288
20

$$96\overline{)68.}\ \ .70$$
672
80

$$125\overline{)87.00}\ \ .7$$
875

$$22\overline{)14.4}\ \ .65$$
132
120
110
100

$$13\overline{)8.90}\ \ .68$$
78
110
104
60

$$154\overline{)10.200}\ \ .66$$
~~924~~
924
960
924
360

$$33\overline{)23.00}\ \ .69$$
198
320
297
230

$$13\overline{)8.00}\ \ .61$$
78
20

$$32\overline{)24.0}\ \ .75$$
224
160

$$103\overline{)78.00}\ \ .75$$
721
590
515
750

$$203\overline{)145.00}\ \ .71$$
1421
290

S41, p. 5

"... there is in America a large body of tenant farmers anxious to secure homes, few who had sufficient capital were willing to incur the hardships inseparable from ⊖ creation of irrigation in new areas. They bought improved farms in ⊖ older districts."

Low wages ~~cause~~ attribute of hi net yields.

Diff. imputed wages cause diff. rents
5105

p 19 Anti-Japs & SE Eur.s. 'Their willingness & ability to pay hi rents does not come so much frm betr methds of fmg, tho as a rule thy ar gd fmrs, bt bcs thy lv mr frglly thn ⊖ Am-n or ⊖ imgrnt frm n-n Eur.' In Eur., social pressure prevents selling or rent'g land to highest bidder often.

Japs use better
~~5105~~

As to how much better, consider:
1941, Japs op-d 3.9% fms in Cal, hrvstd 2.9% croplnd, & produced almost ½ ⊖ W. CST trck crps. Poli & Engstrand, 'Jap-se ag on ⊖ Pac Cost', 21 J&PAE p 357, 1945
Japs cm hr & prdc wlth, we trn wrath on them --- & cringe & fawn before Native Son lnd specs. But who is really a threat to our lvg stndrds? Who ⊖ real 'yellow menace'?

for the
HALF-MILLION TEXANS LIVING IN THE WEST!

Absolutely legal. Makes you a **real** Texas property owner. Each Warranty Deed individually signed, notarized with Notary Seal. Buy one—you'll want several as gifts for Xmas.
More than half of mail-order customers come back for more. Just $1 Each.
Texan or not, order yours direct from

HEART OF TEXAS LAND COMPANY
P. O. Box 13301, Houston 19, Texas
(Dealer Inquiries Invited)

YOU'RE LOOKING AT

an ad that is worth investigating if you are seeking a sound investment in real estate. We are selling some of the best income producing apartment houses in California. Oakland, Berkeley, Alameda and Los Angeles. For details write:

Western Loan and Building Company
363 - 15th St., Oakland, GL 1-2436
1005 South Hill St., Los Angeles, PR 7383

For ch. 5, on hi mr of settlers: "Farmers who had sufficient capital to develop a farm, usually purchased an interest in a farm that was already developed." p. 103, s159. Cited from Clyde E. Stewart, "Successful Irrigated Farm Development", Proceedings of the Western Farm Economics Ass., Pullman, Wash., 1950, pp. 108-17

5154

~~Chap 5~~ Used
So cap needs are for buying land

Cap not important element in getting yields from land: Hedges, 237. CP adopted policy in 1912 of selling only to settlers. Handpicked settlers. Wanted those with cap & farm experience. Rejected many with cap -- evidently farm experience more important. Holland land co same.

Ch. 5

p. 408-9. Age distrib. of owners & tnts. Little aging of owners since 1910.
(Shows inheritance has become major)

5131