The Jew and the land. Bulletin No. 7 May 1920

Madison, Wisconsin: [s.n.], May 1920

https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/67TQR4TVXX6JN9D

THE JEW AND THE LAND

BY

WILLIAM KIRSCH

with a Preface by

RICHARD T. ELY

and an Introduction by

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT

CONTENTS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MADISON

BULLETIN No. 7
MAY, 1920
Price 50 cents

THE JEW AND THE LAND

BY

WILLIAM KIRSCH

with a Preface by

RICHARD T. ELY

and an Introduction by

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT

CONTENTS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MADISON

BULLETIN No. 7
MAY, 1920
Price 50 cents

PREFACE

In our land settlement problems we must not fail to consider the people living in the country or territory to be investigated and their past history, especially with respect to their relations to the land. All human conditions and relations must be given the greatest weight in estimating the present and the desired future. We must always ask the question, what is the social, economic, political and racial stratification and composition of the population? We cannot have one land policy for the Irish, Scotch, Germans, English, Jews, Mexicans and negroes.

Let us take, for example, the negroes. Any rational land policy must consider them with respect to their past history, going back to the conditions of Africa and the traits displayed there. Those who attempt to frame a policy for the negroes will take account of the fact that thousands of years separate them in their characteristics from the West-Europeans and will recognize that we have a situation in their case which can only gradually be modified. Heredity, as well as environment, must be considered.

Let us take the case of the Mexican peons. Is their situation that which has been described to us by many writers who seem to look upon them as Yankees cramped, confined and oppressed by peonage? Do they find peonage objectionable? Do they desire to escape from it? If not, how create this desire? What should we do in the meantime?

What is here stated seems obvious enough, but it has been, as a rule, overlooked by people who have discussed problems of land settlement in our country, where policies have been framed with little respect to human differences and with inadequate attention even to physical variations. The present paper is noteworthy as an effort to consider the land settlement of the Jews and to bring it into relation to their psychical characteristics and the results of their past history as seen in their reactions to an agricultural environment. It is hoped that this correct method of procedure will be followed by other studies of land problems. If it leads those who are shaping our land policies to a more careful consideration of human as well as physical variations, it will bear excellent fruit.

RICHARD T. ELY.

Extract from Sir Horace Plunkett's letter to Dr. Charles McCarthy, dated April, 1919.

"I read with great interest and profit Mr. Kirsch's essay 'The Jew and the Land'. It has always been a great disappointment to me that a race with such a marvelous record of persistence and success should never, in recent times, have applied its energies and intelligence to the most important of all national industries. Mr. Kirsch shows that this is due to historical circumstances, and not to any anti-rural proclivities. I think his proposals for testing the fitness of the race for a career upon the land are extremely well thought out, and worthy of careful attention by all who are interested in rural reconstruction. It seems to me he gives a good lead to the philosophic social reformers, with whom the race is richly endowed."

PART I

THE JEW AND AGRICULTURE

Introduction

The object of this monograph is to investigate the fitness of the Jew for agriculture and to devise a constructive plan to facilitate the passage from city to farm life of those elements of the Jewish population who may want to choose farming as their profession.

There are great opportunities in farming at the present time. In fact, these opportunities are wider now than ever before although free land has practically disappeared. When the layman thinks of the high price of land, of the absence of an adequate system of credit, of the unsatisfactory returns which the farmer of today often receives for his work, he usually forgets or in many cases he does not know that in the days of free land conditions were much worse. Free land was there, of course, but the cost and effort to break it up and render it fit for cultivation was beyond the power of the average man. Although free, it was only within the reach of the pioneer type of man who himself, as well as his wife and children, was able to endure hardships beyond anything that the settler of today can imagine.* The returns from the farm were lower in those days than now. In fact, the average American farmer was not making money from the operation of his farm. When he did accumulate wealth it was as a result of the increasing value of land. The settler of today even in a new, rough, unbroken country has advantages which were absent in the days of the free land. The productivity of his land is greater because he has at his disposal all the latest scientific data which are handed to him gratuitously by institutions like the Agricultural Experiment Stations, the Farmers Institutes, and he can always turn for advice to the County Agricultural Agents. Moreover, the numerous inexpensive agricultural periodicals serve as a Bureau of Information on any subject pertaining to practical farming. These are only a few examples which confirm the statement made above, but they could easily be multiplied. With all these advantages the settler can within a comparatively short time repay the capital which he may have to borrow to pay for the land and to equip his farm.

It must be borne in mind that these advantages refer to the time when the settler is actually on the land. The acquisition of land, however, presents obstacles. In other words, there are great opportunities in farming but the road to these opportunities is hidden. Generally speaking, the access to the land is conditioned by three difficulties which can be removed by the establishment of a land policy whose chief aims should be (1) to provide the means by which the prospective settler can borrow the necessary capital on easy terms of repayment; (2) to open new lands for settlement;

*Hamlin Garland, "A Son of the Middle Border."

and (3) in the case of people without previous farming experience to establish means through which they can prepare themselves for farm life and work.

The first two difficulties are general; that is, they concern all the prospective settlers. The third difficulty is special and concerns only one group of would-be settlers, namely those who do not have any previous farming experience. Accordingly, the problem of land settlement must be considered from two angles and must be divided in two parts. The group of settlers belonging to the farming class, such as tenants, farm laborers, etc., is concerned only with that aspect of the problem which refers to the degree of accessibility to the land. On the other hand, from the standpoint of the prospective settlers without any previous agricultural experience, the third difficulty is of paramount importance.

Those elements of the Jewish population who may at one time or another dream of an agricultural career belong almost exclusively to the second group of settlers and therefore the problem of adaptation to farm life and work must take precedence with them over the problem of accessibility to the land. Although the question of the facility with which land may be acquired affects them too, it is of minor importance in comparison with that of their adaptation to farm life and work. While, therefore, the general problem of access to the land is discussed in this monograph, the most prominent place is devoted to the consideration of the process of adaptation and to the discussion of a constructive plan to facilitate this process.

The pivot of the discussion,—its ultima ratio,—is the individual Jew, such as he is, the product of urban civilization, with all the inherited racial characteristics and historically acquired psychical traits. He is taken at the moment when he wants to undertake a new step, and exchange his city life for farm life. He labors under the delusion common to all those who are not acquainted with farm life, that such a change involves mostly a change in the work and presupposes only the knowledge of farming operations. The object of the first part of the monograph is to show that farming is not only a distinct form of work but that it is a distinct mode of life which requires on the part of the individual a definite psychical make-up. The various qualities of the average Jew are discussed with the purpose of drawing attention to those of his psychical characteristics which are fundamental to a successful agricultural career.

But the relation of the Jew to agriculture is conditioned by his relation to the land. How important this relation to the land is and to what extent it determines the success of all the other activities of farm life is best illustrated by the relation of the European farmer to the land. The superiority of the various branches of agricultural activities in Europe is not the result of any moral or intellectual superiority of the European farmer as compared with the American farmer, but is largely the outcome of the psychical

relation existing between the European farmer and the land. The second part of this monograph is devoted to the discussion of this peculiar connection of the European farmer and his land and work and a program is devised by means of which it is proposed to create a similar relation between the prospective Jewish settler in this country and his new mode of life, this program to be a systematic educational training for adaptation to farm life. This training is to constitute the bridge which will allow the Jew to pass into that group of settlers who are to be given facilities to acquire land by the socialization of certain existing institutions such as the credit system.

It must be borne in mind that no attempt is made to urge a migration of the Jew to the land. On the contrary, a barrier is placed between him and farming in the form of a compulsory educational process of adaptation to which he will have to submit if he ever intends to claim the same advantages in regard to the proposed facilities to acquire land as the prospective settler who has a long record of farming.

While this monograph deals solely with the Jewish aspect of the land problem it can be with certain modifications applied to a prospective settler of other nationalities who lacks a knowledge of farm life and work. This problem is well worth serious consideration on the part of those who propose to open lands and throw into a new, unknown life thousands of men of various types and races and who until now have known of farming only by hearsay.

I

FARMING—A MODE OF LIFE

Isaac Rosenblum came to America several years ago from Russia. In his native country he belonged to the so-called "Lumpen Proletariat," that is, he was making or rather trying to make a living by working at various petty occupations; in turn he was a driver, a peddler, the keeper of a wayside inn or a water carrier. He came to New York, learned how to sew buttons and went to work in a large clothing manufacturing concern. The division of labor in this industry is carried to an extreme, each man performing hour after hour, day after day, the same kind of work. All day long Rosenblum was sewing. The pay was not high, the employment not always regular, but the great advantage of this work over all his previous occupations was that the greater part of the year Rosenblum could sleep quietly knowing that at the end of the week he would get his pay envelope, containing a few dollars. All Rosenblum had to worry about was to go to the factory at seven in the morning, sit down and sew as fast as his fingers could move. He did not have to worry about the other work in the shop being in good shape, this was the business of the foreman; he did not have

to worry about the clerks making the right entries in the books and figuring correctly the profit and loss,—this was left to the head bookkeeper; he did not have to think of selling the manufactured products,—this was the business of the manager of the concern. Rosenblum became a machine and adapted himself to his routine work. A few years passed by. Rosenblum saved some money. But gradually, he became dissatisfied. Life in New York was burdensome; there was no prospect of arriving at anything substantial; moreover, he revolted against the necessity of always being subjected to factory regulations; to the orders of the foreman. His thoughts began to turn to farming and he decided to try it, taking as his motto that it is better to earn $10 a month and be his own master than to earn $40 and be somebody's slave. With the few hundred dollars he saved he made a payment on a farm and began cultivating the land.

"Now," said Rosenblum, "I am saved. With a few years of hard work I will build up a farm and lead an independent life." But he failed to take into account not only his inexperience but his acquired characteristics of mind and of work as well. Until now he had been a human machine, performing mechanically one kind of work; from now on he must become an independent producer and rely upon himself in the management of his farm.

There is nothing harder, however, for a man used to routine work than to take up a diversified occupation like farming. The man, who for a number of years has been used to receiving directions and working at one thing all the time, loses himself completely when called upon to show initiative, and to manage an enterprise consisting of many operations. Until now, Rosenblum had thought of work in terms of so many buttons an hour, so many dollars a week. But now his mind is occupied with dozens of pressing duties which have to be accomplished in a certain limit of time. It is entirely different from the mechanical sewing. He has to attend to the clearing of land, plowing, disking, harrowing, planting, cultivating and harvesting. He has to milk, feed cows and horses, repair buildings and fences, sell his products, come into competition with others, figure the cost and proceeds of everything produced, and use a great deal of independent judgment. Accustomed, as he is, to perform one kind of work, he loses himself. Although he is now his own master, he feels the difference between his former regular though monotonous occupation and his new work, to the detriment of the latter.

But there is more than that. He lives a solitary life, his nearest neighbor is a mile or so away. All the things which he, as a Jew valued so much in life,—religious gatherings, libraries and reading rooms, the heart to heart talks and discussions with people whose ideals are the same as his,—these are absent and the new life seems to him more colorless than the former one.

This short sketch is significant as illustrating a predominant characteristic of farming which ought to be taken as the basis of

any plan of rural settlement. The story of the trials and tribulations of the imaginary Isaac Rosenblum makes farming appear not only as a profession or a vocation, but as a distinct mode of life. This fundamental difference between farming and urban occupations renders the problem of settlement on land of city elements exceedingly complicated, and the failure to give this problem full consideration is responsible for many mistakes on the part of the mass as well as on the part of the leaders. When, therefore, a group of individuals decide to devote themselves to agriculture, they must assure themselves that work in the new field of their activities will be so arranged that their yearning for the social, religious and educational activities will find in this new life a complete satisfaction. But, above all, even more important than the knowledge of actual farming operations, must they possess the ability necessary to manage an independent enterprise like a farm with its manifold problems of production, marketing and financing. These individuals have developed marked psychical characteristics and aptitudes. Since farming is a distinct mode of life it is important, in any consideration of the land settlement question, to determine which of these characteristics would be necessary to success in farm life and work or would lessen the friction incidental to the passage from city to farm life. An analysis of the peculiarities of agricultural life and farming industry is a prerequisite to a discussion of land settlement problems.

II

DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FARMING INDUSTRY IN AMERICA

Among the men and women engaged in industry, business or professional life, two distinct types can be discerned. The basis of classification of these two types is the presence or absence of managerial abilities independently of the amount of wealth they possess or the extent of their business activities. While this classification is by no means a rigorous one and while there are gradations within each type, it is safe to state that the psychical make-up of these two types is distinctly different. Thus, on one hand, we have the wage earners and, on the other, the independent business men. From the point of view of adaptation of city elements to farm life the importance of this distinction is of inestimable value owing to the predominant economic form of agricultural production in America.

Development of Diversified Farming

American agriculture is gradually evolving towards the diversified system of farming of which the raising of cattle and hogs is the dominant feature. With the exception of the cotton growing regions of the South and the wheat and fruit growing states of the West, the rest of the country population is engaged in this type

of farming. It is safe to assume that in the future it will become the dominant type of agriculture in this country. The chief reasons for the development of diversified farming are that it makes possible the rotation of crops, furnishes natural fertiliser as a result of the raising of cattle, has a beneficient effect on the texture of the soil, tends to prevent acidity and has a good effect on the eradication of weeds. It tends to restore to its former fertility the soil which was exhausted by the growing of a single crop. A typical example of this development of diversified farming is Wisconsin. This state, which forty years ago ranked among the first wheat growing states in the Union, has now entirely abandoned the single crop system and has adopted diversified farming to such an extent that it is considered the leading dairy state in the country. The exhaustion of the soil through the growing of a single crop is already acting as a powerful stimulus to the change from exclusive wheat growing to diversified farming in many of our western states as is witnessed by the reports of the United States Department of Agriculture for the years 1900 and 1910. Another reason for this change besides those above mentioned is that in the case of diversified farming the farmer runs less risk from possible failure of crops because if one crop should fail the others compensate for it in many cases.

The economic form of production in diversified farming is the individual homestead system. In other words each farm is a small independent enterprise managed by one man with the help of a limited number of farmhands or with no help at all. The corporate method of production which characterizes our other industries is generally absent in the agricultural industry in the East and Middle West,—the regions of diversified farming. The reason for this is that the division of labor, to which large scale industry owes its existence, cannot be carried on in diversified farming and even if it could be made possible by the incorporation of several farms into one it would be undesirable both from an economic and social point of view. From the social point of view, independent ownership of land is desirable because it tends to develop individuality, stimulate initiative and works towards a higher type of man. From the economic point of view it is most conducive to efficiency because in farming, unlike industry, one has to deal with living things such as cattle and plants and variable factors like the soil. These various elements of farming can have the best care and attention only when farming operations are under the close guidance and supervision of the man who is directly interested in the success of the farm. Although it is possible to devise uniform and standard methods for the care of cattle, for example, still each animal requires a certain amount of individual attention. At certain periods, such as freshening, breeding or in case of sickness, the animal requires exclusive individual attention. Although plants do not exactly require individual attention, still their planting and cultivation varies with reference to the soil which in a majority of cases is not uniform

throughout any farm and which would still be less uniform in the case of a large farm. The maximum of care and attention in these and similar cases cannot be given, except by a man who is directly interested in the welfare of his farm and whose holding is small enough to be under his constant supervision. A large working force employed on a wage basis as would be the case on a large farm operating under a single management would necessarily lack the stimulus impelling it to give a whole-hearted and disinterested care and attention to the work. Since, moreover, in this case the work would have to be done on a large area, close supervision by the manager or foreman is well nigh impossible. On the other hand, coöperative enterprises in the operation of farms generally fail* because a coöperative undertaking in production to be successful must be based on a rigorous division of labor. This is impossible in the operation of a general farm because of the uncertainty of climatic conditions, the fact that the character of farm work changes from season to season, and that the factors of production are extremely variable. This naturally speaks in favor of the small sized farm rather than a combination of farms under a corporate form corresponding to the large scale urban industry. These various reasons explain the fact cited above, that American agriculture is evolving towards the diversified system of farming with its natural consequence, namely, smaller holdings.

The farmer, then, as a result of the economic form of his occupation is an independent enterpreneur besides being a workingman. The difference between him and his fellow workingman in the city rests upon the fact that the farmer is a man who is used to consider things pertaining to his business in their entirety, is working along various lines and is required in his daily work so to combine the various activities in the management of a modern farm as to make them work efficiently towards the desired end. A city workingman, on the other hand, is accustomed to work under direct guidance and supervision. The habit of performing the same task day after day and year after year converts him into an automaton. It would take time and effort to convert him into an efficient manager even of a small farm. He would have to change fundamentally and acquire a psychical make-up which is foreign to him. This difference between the farmer and the city workman cannot be too strongly emphasized in a scheme of land settlement by city people. In any such scheme it is essential to select those elements which easily and readily adapt themselves to the process of independent management of an undertaking which, like the modern farm, is a combination and coördination of varied phases of human activity.

While on the production side the individualistic homestead form of farming is the most desirable and most usual in this country, on

*The writer does not refer to coöperation in certain forms of production on a farm such as threshing, silo-filling and shredding of corn.

its business side farming is gradually evolving towards the coöperative form. And, indeed, organization through coöperation in the marketing of farm products is necessary for two reasons. One reason is that individual farmers have neither time nor opportunity to market their goods most efficiently and can do it best by establishing coöperative organizations which take care of the marketing end of farming. The other reason is that through coöperative organizations farmers can deal as equals with the powerful and highly organized industrial and business corporations. European farmers have achieved wonders because of their organization. In some countries, like Denmark and Ireland, farmers' selling and buying societies have regenerated the agricultural industry. The American farmer, however, is slow in adopting the coöperative system in his business transactions. He is a strong individualist. The West was conquered not by a concerted action and planning but by settlers who were pushing their way ahead individually* The homestead system of American farming strengthened their individualistic tendencies. These tendencies constitute an obstacle to the introduction of the coöperative principle into business transactions of the American farming population. The isolation in which each farmer lives and the variety of nationalities in a farming community add to this obstacle.

From what has been said in these two chapters, we can state that farming, being a distinct mode of life, differs from urban life in the following characteristics:

(a) The method of the work itself, in other words the technique of production.

(b) The economic form of production which in American farming is individualistic in contradistinction to the urban industry whose form of production is corporate.

(c) The economic form of distribution (marketing) which is gradually evolving towards the coöperative type. The same applies to financing.

(d) The social life which is marked by backwardness, caused by isolation and which it is desirable to develop for two reasons:

(1) To make farming more attractive, and (2) To promote those conditions which facilitate the development of a coöperative spirit among American farmers prerequisite to the establishment of a higher degree of efficiency in the business of marketing of farm products and the buying of farm supplies.

Qualities Necessary for Successful Farming

While it is not within the province of the present discussion to consider the relative value of each one of these elements of farm life, it is highly important to bear them in mind in the planning of a system of land settlement by city elements, both for the sake of the prospective settler as well as for the development of a higher

*T. Roosevelt, "Winning of the West."

type of agriculture. The first prerequisite, therefore, of a sound land settlement scheme is to determine the potentiality of the would-be farmer in reference to the requirements of the various phases of agricultural life and work. This potentiality must be considered from the point of view of the qualities possessed by the prospective settler, whether active or latent, which will guarantee that the process of his adaptation to farm life and work will proceed with as little friction as possible. These qualities are: the ability to manage and control an independent enterprise, a strong desire to lead the independent life of a home and land owner, and a well-developed power of association and coöperation. If these qualities are present the matters of technical experience and muscular exertion reduce themselves to questions of proper training.

Among the racial elements which crowd our large cities, the Jews are usually considered as the least fitted to adapt themselves to agriculture. For the last twenty years much work has been done in America and a great deal of money spent to help the Jews settle on land. The question of their success at farming so far remains problematic as will be seen from one of the subsequent chapters. In view, however, of the probable colonization of Palestine as well as of the beneficent effects which an increase of the farm population of America may have on the welfare of the country it is of importance to make an inquiry into the fitness of the Jew to take up farming as a profession. And indeed, a preliminary inquiry along these lines reveals certain psychical characteristics common to all the Jews and which, if given an opportunity for development will facilitate the process of adaptation of those whose thoughts turn to farming.

III

THE JEW AS A POTENTIAL AMERICAN FARMER

Several years ago a writer on the Jewish labor movement in America made the following statement referring to the Jewish labor in the needle industry:

"* * * This Jewish laboring class was made possible by the constant immigration. But this laboring class is not a constant one. The Jew rarely remains a workingman. If he does, it is against his will, and he always considers it a temporary condition. He seeks to improve his condition individually not as a member of a class. To remain 'ein Arbeiter' is to be more or less disgraced in his estimation. He never teaches his children his own trade. They go into business or professions. The movement of Jewish workers into professions, and their establishment as merchants and manufacturers is still going on. But the enormous inflow of new immigrants constantly recruits and increases the army of Jewish workers. The Jew, then, has not formed a permanent laboring element in our population in the sense that his station has been fixed as a workingman. There have always been new arrivals to take his

place when he moved into other classes. The Jewish working class has been permanent since about 1880, but its personnel has been constantly changing."*

Since the time this was written the economic status of the Jewish mass has been undergoing a change. The Jewish working class, as the result of the irresistable play of economic laws, has become permanent. Although statistics to that effect are not available, observers and students of the Jewish labor movement agree that this change is noticeable in the needle industry of the large Eastern cities. This process may have a considerable influence on the psychical make-up of the average Jew and result in the disappearance of certain tendencies of his character which are of importance to the discussion of the potentialities of the Jew in agriculture.

Where an outsider comes in contact for any length of time with the Jewish mass, he is struck by two things: (1) a certain aversion to occupations involving purely manual labor, and (2) the longing of each Jew, no matter how poor and helpless he may be, towards having his own commercial or manufacturing etsablishment or to embrace some independent profession. If this outsider happens to have an analytical mind and wishes to use it in this particular case, he will soon see that the average Jew's aversion to manual labor is not an aversion to physical exertion, but is due to the belief that an occupation which consists of manual labor will result in his working for somebody else or under some other persons's orders. This is one of the reasons why, until lately, there were so few Jews among hand workers, whether skilled mechanics or unskilled laborers. It is obvious that this aversion to manual labor has the same foundation as his striving towards an independent occupation.

These individualistic characteristics of the Jew are the product of historical conditions. The turning point in Jewish history came during the Middle Ages. Until then the Jews were like all other nations so far as diversity of occupations was concerned. They were merchants, artisans, agriculturists, etc. In many places they even predominated as craftsmen. In Sicily, for example, before their expulsion, nearly all the artisans were Jews.* The long and cruel oppression of the Jews in the Middle Ages changed their economic status and slowly molded them into a nation of small merchants, tradesmen, usurers and people supporting themselves by various petty occupations.

And, indeed, "at first the opposition of the mediaeval guilds compelled the Jews to abandon handicrafts in favor of retail trade in second hand goods or peddling. When later the edicts of popes and kings legally excluded them from professional careers and honorable trades, they were forced to become usurers, though at first fully conscious of the obloquy attached to a traffic banned by

*W. M. Leiserson, "The Jewish Labor Movement in America, 1908."
*Abrahams, "Jewish Life in the Middle Ages."

the Church and despised by the man of honor of all people in all ages."† Later on when, beginning with the French Revolution, various liberating movements freed the laboring classes of Western Europe from political slavery, they did not affect the great majority of Jews, who at that time had already settled in Russia, Galicia, and Roumania. In Russia and Roumania until very lately, mediaeval restrictions against the Jews barred them from handicrafts, liberal professions, (in this case indirectly through inaccessibility to higher education), and agriculture (Jews not having been allowed to own land or even live in the country), and left them only retail trade, usury and odd jobs as a means of subsistence.

Hence the industrial change which was responsible for the formation of the modern wage-earning class did not touch the Jew at all. This new class was recruited from the small peasant proprietors, who, from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century had been expropriated and driven to the cities by the spoliation of the Church's property, the alienation of the state domains, the inclosure of the common lands and the usurpation of feudal clan property.* Or it was recruited from the journeymen who, from the fifteenth century on, had been excluded from guild organizations.† Neither of these two groups of population had contained any Jews, these being legally excluded from them. The result was that up to the recent formation of a permanent Jewish working class in the needle industry the great mass of the Jewish people were small merchants, tradesmen and petty shopkeepers. These occupations tend to develop qualities necessary to the conduct of independent enterprises, and the repugnance with which the Jewish workingman enters large industrial enterprises proves that he is reluctant to abandon occupations where he is independent and where he can give expression to his own individuality.

Combined with these individualistic tendencies, the Jew has, to a high degree, developed in him the power to associate with others. In order to understand the influence this quality has on the Jewish life, we have to trace its development to the Middle Ages. Apart from direct persecution, the oppression of Jews in the Middle Ages assumed the form of ostracism. This ostracism resulted in (1) their exclusion from certain trades and occupations, and (2) the establishment of Ghettos. The influence of the first form of ostracism on the Jewish character has already been described. The other form of ostracism, the confining of Jews in Ghettos also played an important part in the molding of certain sides of the Jewish character.

When the different states and municipalities banished the Jews to the Ghettos they severed all the relations with individual Jews and began to deal from that time with Jews en masse. This pos-

†Ibid.

*K. Marx, "Capital," Chapter on the Expropriation of Agricultural Laborers.

†Hobson, "Evolution of Modern Capitalism."

ition of the mediaeval governments towards the Jews is substantiated by the fact that these governments exacted the taxes in a lump sum from the Jewish community leaving the collection of this sum to the officials of the Synogogue. The mediaeval governments did not care how this sum was collected, whether each one had to pay an equal share or not. The regulation of each was left to the judgment of the community itself. In the same way the matter of regulating other relations among the Jews was left to the Jewish community. It is true that the same relationships within a community marked certain periods in American history. But while the town meetings in New England in the early days of American history did not materially change the inherent Anglo-Saxon individualism the same phenomena had a profound effect on the development of the community spirit which distinguishes the Jew and which is quite often mistaken by outsiders as a clannish spirit. The historical reasons which were responsible for the cementing of this spirit was the constant oppression and ostracism.

To quote from Abrahams: "The Jews needed to present something like a united front if they were to face the storms which raged around their homes and lives, and the Jewish rabbinical synods were honorably distinguished by the spirit of unselfishness which they introduced into the Jewish community. Burdens were to be shared, not shirked."

According to the same authority: "In 1416 a synod held in Bologna created an alliance for internal communal purposes between the Jewish congregations of Rome, Padua, Farrara, Bologna and the Romagna and Toscana districts. In the sixteenth century in Poland an alliance for communal purposes was formed. At its head was an elective president, and the tribunal over which he ruled had even criminal jurisdiction. But this alliance had no control over the details of communal life; each congregation retained its own Rabbi and its own court. The Rabbis claimed local allegiance but they were removable from their posts."

If one has observed the life of the Jewish communities in Russian Poland and Galicia before the World War one has been struck by the fact that these communities formed self-governing bodies within the gentile community. Of course, the old relation between the government and the Jews as a mass was largely eliminated and the Jews were individually responsible to the governments of those countries for the payment of taxes and other duties. But still the Jews did all they could to settle their own difficulties among themselves and preferred to demand justice from tribunals of their own choosing rather than from the Russian and Rumanian courts.

These associative qualities of the Jew do not contradict what has been said about his individualism. The Jew is an individualist only in so far as he does not want to merge his individuality among others. He wants to be independent and manage his own enterprise. But he has been compelled to learn how good it is to associate when circumstances demand cooperation. In the light of

what has been said in the previous chapter of the essential requirements for success in agriculture, the peculiarities of the Jewish character, as revealed by this brief analysis, guarantee a certain degree of success in agricultural life. With the right kind of training for farm work they will prove to be of an inestimable value for successful land settlement.

Attempts at settling the Jews on farms have been made in various parts of America for the last twenty years. It is extremely difficult, however, to decide whether the Jew has made a success at farming in this country because of the absence of the necessary data. In order to form an adequate judgment of the progress of the Jews in agriculture, the following data are essential:

1. The *exact* number of those Jewish farmers who had farming experience before they came to America and what this experience consisted of.
2. The *exact* number of Jewish farmers who derive their income exclusively from farming and the number of those who derive their income from other sources, as the keeping of summer boarders.
3. Statistics showing whether there is a progress among the latter group in devoting themselves exclusively to farming.
4. Figures showing whether the ability to repay loans advanced by Jewish agricultural agencies is due to profits made exclusively by farming.
5. In the case of agricultural laborers, *exact* figures of how many Jewish young men placed by the Jewish agricultural agencies remained on the farms for a considerable length of time and *facts* as to the progress they have made.

All these data cannot be found in the existing literature on the Jewish Agricultural activities in America, and because of that, analysis of the progress of Jewish farming in this country is well nigh impossible. One fact, however, stands out clearly: that the progress of Jewish farming is hindered by the comparative inaccessibility of the land.* Jewish farming is conditioned by the adoption of a land policy which would make land more accessible. The relation of Jewish land settlement to the conditions of land settlement which prevail in America and the discussion of the particular Jewish problem in agriculture, form the subject of the second part of this monograph.

PART II

THE JEW AND THE LAND

I

Some Aspects of the Land Problem in America

The object of this monograph is the study of the relation of the Jew to American agriculture. His possibilities in agriculture and

*See the Report of the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society for 1918 quoted in the next chapter.

his potentiality as an American farmer have been discussed in the previous chapters. His relation to agriculture is, determined primarily by his relation to the land. The Jew has stood, until now outside of the agricultural life and it is his faculties of adaptation to the land that will determine his success in farm life and work. For example, it has been shown that the Jew possesses certain qualities, which are invaluable for success in farming. These qualities will not produce the desired results unless his adaptation to farm life and work has been complete and, as will be shown below, this question of adaptation is the most important part of the problem of Jewish Land Settlement in America. The Jew forms an integral part of the country of which he is a citizen, and because of that his life is affected by the conditions existing in that country. His opportunities in agriculture are the same as those of his fellow-citizens, or, taking a particular phase of these opportunities, namely, the accessibility to the land, are in his case the same as in the case of the other groups of population. The degree of accessibility to the land, forms an essential condition of the process of adaptation. It is, therefore, necessary to deviate for a while from the treatment of the particular Jewish problem and to discuss the general conditions of land settlement in America.

These are very few questions of a public interest in regard to which there is such meager understanding among the general public as the question of land settlement. It is impossible to undertake an exhaustive analysis of this problem within the limits of this monograph. It is proposed in this chapter to discuss certain of its phases, as they relate to the prices of land and the existence of uncultivated arable land, and to endeavor to arrive at a justification of a national land policy.

High Cost of Farm Lands

According to the annual report of the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society for the year 1911 "most of the failures recorded against Jews as farmers, either individually or in groups, are due largely to the initial, and sometimes irretrievable blunders made in the selection of the farms on which they located." These blunders refer either to poor selection of the soil or selection of locality. According to the same report, the reason for the poor selection of farms is that the demand for farms is becoming more and more insistent and that the finding of farms is becoming increasingly difficult. Farm values are on the up-grade and even with the means and machinery at the command of the Society, it finds itself at a loss to secure farms that will come within the means of its applicants. The annual report of the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society for the year 1918 says: "The choice of a farm for the Jewish Settler is becoming increasingly difficult. Farms are advancing in price continually, and good paying farms are becoming more expensive and out of reach of the general Jewish farm buyer."

A corroborative proof of the increased difficulties with which the Jewish Agricultural Aid Society meets in its land settlement activities is found in the statement made by its former general manager, Leonard G. Robinson, before the Congressional Committee on Labor in May, 1916, during the hearings on the Crosser bill: "on the whole, we would not feel warranted in advising any man to buy a farm unless he had a minimum capital of $1,000. Even then he will need our assistance. Without it $1,500 to $2,000 is little enough. The same holds goods in homesteading on government land where land costs nothing."

The most important obstacle which the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society finds in its efforts to settle on the land the Jewish applicants is the high and continually rising price of land. And indeed, how considerable this rising price of land is can be seen from the figures given by the monthly Crop Report of the U. S. Department of Agriculture for April 15, 1916. This report states: "The value of farm lands of the United States is estimated at $45.55 per acre as compared with $40.85 a year ago, $40.31 two years ago, and $38.10 three years ago. The Census reported the value of farm lands in 1910 at $32.40, and 1900 at $15.57 per acre."

In other words the selling price of farm lands has on the average trebled in 16 years. Another cause of the necessity of a high outlay of initial capital required for the buying of a farm is the cost of equipment. According to the Secretary of State of Utah* it requires from $2,000 to $3,000 capital to get fairly established on even freeland, and more than this amount when water must be purchased for irrigation.

Available Arable Land

Side by side with this high priced land we have extensive areas of land which remain uncultivated.** "In the northern sections of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and along the North Pacific Coast, there is much forest and cut-over land which can be and is being made into farms, but at great expenditure of labor. In the South, from Virginia and the Carolinas to central Texas, a vast amount of cut-over land and woodland is being redeemed gradually for agriculture. It may be estimated that about 200,000,000 acres of forest, "cut-over" land and woodland in the United States, including that in farms, could be used for crops after clearing, or more than one-tenth of the land area of the country."

"The next greatest undeveloped agricultural resources of the country is to be found in the swamps and other wet lands susceptible of drainage. It has been estimated that there are some 60,000,000 acres of such land suitable for the production of crops after reclamation, or enough to make 1,000,000 farms of 60 acres each of improved land. This land is located largely in the Missis-

*Quoted by Mr. Marsh, Secretary of N. Y. Congestion Committee before the Congressional Committee on Labor, May, 1916.

**"Arable Land in the U. S." by O. E. Baker and H. M. Strong, office of Farm Management, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

sippi River bottoms and other river bottoms of the Coastal Plain of the South, and in the peat bogs and muck lands of the glaciated Lake States and Northeastern States. It is for the most part potentially fertile land."

"The third opportunity for the expansion of our agricultural area is found in the potentially irrigable land awaiting development in the Western States, estimated at 30,000,000 acres if all available sources of water supply were fully utilized. This is double the present area of irrigated land, and would provide 340,000 farms averaging 87 acres in size, which is the average acreage per farm of irrigated land as shown by the Census of 1910."

Although there is such an extensive area of unoccupied irrigable land, it does not benefit the men without means who want to settle on land; ". . . another effect of the increased cost of a water supply is to limit the class of persons to be drawn upon as settlers of new lands brought under irrigation. Persons with little or no capital who might have settled on irrigated lands under the old conditions, cannot do so under the new conditions and the opportunity of settling such lands is practically limited to the well-to-do, unless some plan is devised to extend the time of payment over a long series of years, and perhaps extend some help to settlers during their first few years on the land."*

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON LAND SETTLEMENT IN VARIOUS STATES

All these statements and data show that there are serious defects in our land policy or rather there is an entire absence of a land policy. On the one hand, according to the testimony of the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society, it is difficult to find land for would-be settlers, on the other hand, there are millions of acres of arable land which can be made into farms only at a tremendrous expenditure of labor. The existence of this abnormal situation is attested by the fact that demands for the adoption of a national and state land policy are widespread throughout the country. Thus, outside of the Federal Land Settlement Bill sponsored by Secretary Lane and which he intends to push energetically to its final success,† there are land settlement bills before most of the state legislatures whose sessions occurred last year. Among these, the legislatures of Alabama, Idaho, Montana and Wyoming already have passed land settlement acts providing for co-operation with the Federal Government. In twenty-nine other states bills to that effect have been introduced, in some of them several bills at a time. The money asked for the carrying into effect of these bills testifies to the earnestness of their authors if magnitude of figures may be taken as the barometer of earnestness. Thus Senator Breed's bill introdueed in the legislature of California asked for a bond issue of $10,000,000 to carry into execution a land settlement bill.

*Census Report U. S. D. A. 1910.
†Official Bulletin, March 15, 1919.

Another bill introduced by the same senator asked for a direct appropriation of $750,000.* Some of the other bills were Illinois, $1,250,000, Oregon $3,000,000, South Dakota a bond issue of $1,000,000 for co-operation with the Federal Government, Utah an appropriation of $25,000 and a bond issue of $2,000,000. In this case the bill asking for the bond issue was prepared by the committees of agriculture of both houses. The state of Washington had a bill prepared by the state Attorney General and supported by the Washington Reconstruction Congress, providing for a tax of one-half of one mill annually until 1928 to be put into a revolving fund, which will eventually attain a total of $5,000,000. The bill also proposed an appropriation of $3,000,000 from such fund. These are only a few examples of the bills introduced in the various legislatures during the last two years.

Lack of Definite Data on Land Settlement Policy

There seems to be a demand for a land settlement policy. But the great variety of the legislative bills and programs points to a fundamental divergance of views among the authors of these programs. A perusal, even a superficial one, of the current literature on land settlement shows that divergence of views and uncertainty of opinion on this subject are general throughout the country. There is, for instance, the question of legislation. Is it advisable to leave the land settlement activities to private companies or would it be desirable for the state to undertake the colonization of land? Many of our states cannot engage in these activities because of constitutional provisions forbidding them to lend funds for enterprises of a private character or to exceed a certain debt limit. The question comes up whether it would be advisable to change these constitutional provisions. The cut-over lands present another important aspect of the land settlement problem. While we have fairly accurate statistics as to the acreage of our idle lands, we still lack sufficient information as to their value for cultivation. Then we have the delicate problem of the tenant of the South. The question of lands now in the hands of real estate and railroad companies calls also for a careful consideration. Then we have the problem of rural schools and centers and above all the problem of the organization of the business side of agriculture. These are some of the problems we shall have to deal with in our efforts to build up a constructive program for the solution of our land problems. We have to know the opinion and attitude of the people towards the land and the opinion and attitude of the leading public spirited citizens, economists, business men and state officials. We have to know all these facts and be able to correlate the data in such a way as to clearly formulate our problem. This could be done by a National Land Commission whose purpose would be to investigate these facts and whose work should be closely connected with

*Official Bulletin, March 15, 1919.

and supplemented by the activities of various states in the field of land settlement.

Is an Immediate Opening of Uncultivated Land Justified?

The magnitude of the task of gathering the data and drawing conclusions is so considerable, however, that it will take years of widespread investigation and patient research to arrive at a rational land policy. On the other hand, several states are hampered in their attempts at land settlement by their constitutional provisions which delay their activities in this field. But there is a feeling in the country that something must be done in the field of land settlement at once. Where does this felling come from? Undoubtedly it is due to the following reasons: the high cost of farm products, the increasing difficulty of making a living in the cities, and the presence of idle land susceptible of cultivation. Would these several factors be sufficient to justify the adoption of a land settlement policy? To the average mind the problem is simple. "The prices of farm products are high, that shows that they are scarce. On the other hand, there are thousands of acres of land which if put to cultivation could increase the amount of farm products, thus making them cheaper. Hence the necessity of a government policy to open uncultivated lands for settlement in order to increase the number of producers. The whole question of land settlement appears thus in a virginal simplicity.

But even a superficial examination reveals that this problem is more complicated than it would seem at first sight. In the first place it has not yet been determined to what extent the high cost of living is due to decreased production, the absence of an efficient marketing system or to other causes. In the case, that it is the result of other causes the increase of agricultural production such as planned by legislators, social workers, and newspaper men will result in a dangerous fall in the prices of farm products which will not reduce the cost to the consumer and will have the effect of discouraging the farmers and compelling them to reduce their production. Amateur agriculturists, however, treat the subject lightly or dismiss it with the remark that because of the European situation, it is the duty of American farmers to feed the world and that because of the decrease of production in Europe, our farm products will always find a ready market. It may be objected that this philanthropic feeling will be also shared by Argentina and Canada which are able to throw upon the world's market as many farm products as the United States, if not more. Moreover, the distress in European countries is the result not only of a decreased productivity but also of the depreciation of currency and the breakdown of the transportation system. Unless currency in European countries is reestablished and the transportation system built up, an increase of production in America of the primary necessities of life will not relieve the European situation. But even if there is truth in the statement that the greatest need of the day is an in-

creased agricultural production, this increase can be made through other channels than the appropriations of millions of dollars and the building up of expensive federal and state machineries for the purpose of settling on the land inexperienced men, an expense of funds and energy which would not be justified in view of the present uncertainty of a guiding principle. Thus, according to O. E. Baker and H. M. Strong of the office of Farm Management,* "there is a type of land, in our eastern farms classified in the census reports as 'unimproved land other than woodland.' This land consists largely of unused fields, stony upland pastures in hilly regions, and parcels of waste land, and includes in all about 50,000,000 acres in our humid Eastern states. Some of this land has been in crops in the past and if prices of farm products continue high and farm labor again becomes comparatively cheap, a portion of this land will undoubtedly be put into crops, though probably never more than two-thirds or 35,000,000 acres." In other words, the utilization of these 35,000,000 acres would increase agricultural products to the same extent as 218,750 farms of the size of 160 acres.

Other means which will indirectly help to increase agricultural production within the present farming area without a recourse to an artificial increase in agricultural population are the improvement of marketing facilities, and the elimination of certain agencies which cause an artificial rise in the prices of farm products without benefitting the farmer. This will tend to increase prices for the farmer and will act as a stimulus to increased production on his part. Another potential factor in the increase of agricultural production will be th eestablishment of adequate credit facilities such as the short term agricultural credit for the financing of farm operations. It is well worth remembering the impetus which was given to agricultural production during the World War by agencies like the billion dollar wheat committee which was lending money to farmers at a low rate of interest. From an economic point of view the adoption of a countrywide policy for the opening of lands and the arbitrary increase of our farming population seems then unjustified. But the seeming simplicity of the relation between the high cost of the primary necessities of life and the existence of idle arable land causes an uncomfortable contradiction which is still further intensified by the general social uneasiness.

Increase of Opportunities a Justification for Adoption of an Immediate Land Policy

Whatever the causes of this uneasiness, in the discussion at hand, we are concerned only with one and that is that American life is gradually losing its elasticity. The relations into which men are put in respect to society as well as to each other are gradually be-

*"Arable Land in the U. S.," by O. E. Baker and H. M. Strong, Office of Farm Management, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

coming rigid. That possibility of passing from one class of society to another, of changing occupation for a more congenial one, which has made America famous as the land of opportunity is disappearing from our life, and it is this rigidity in our relations which is to a large extent responsible for the social unrest. And indeed, an average individual is ready to reconcile himself for a long time even to material discomfort and physical suffering if he has the feeling that his life is not necessarily bound forever into one narrow lane from which he cannot deviate without the risk of ruining his life and that of his family. It is this rigidity in the relation of life which is responsible for the gloom and the despair which permeates those groups of our population which constitutes the lower strata of society. And the proof lies in the fact that parallel with the struggle the working classes are making for higher wages, they are demanding reforms and institutions whose real aim is to create an elasticity of social relations. The schemes of vocational education, of an easier access to higher education, the fight for a basic eight hour law which would give the workingman the necessary leisure to educate himself, all have that common end in view. It is obvious that a policy whose object is to give the individual the opportunity to settle on the land and become an independent farmer and landowner will add a most potent factor to the general scheme of making our life more elastic in the sense described above. By the simple fact of its existence and accessibility to all with its promises of a healthy and fruitful life it will act as a powerfully regenerating stimulus to many elements of our urban population.

We have thus arrived at a contradiction. The immediate opening to cultivation of idle lands is not justified on the grounds referred to above, but it is imperative if considered from the point of view of social equilibrium. The problem before us is then to determine what policy to follow in order to comply with our basic task which is the creation of an elasticity in social relations, otherwise the creation of new opportunities.

II

THE PSYCHICAL RELATION BBETWEEN THE MAN AND THE SOIL

It was said in the introduction that the problem of creating new opportunities must be considered in reference to land settlement from two points of view: First, from the point of view of people with a previous farming record, such as tenants, farm laborers, etc., and, second, from the point of view of people without any farming record. Since the great majority of the possible Jewish settlers belong to the second group, the subject-matter of this chapter is discussed from the point of view of that group.

The need for the creation of facilities as discussed in the previous chapter is only an abstract ideal, and as such, does not yet constitute

a justification for a corresponding reform. There must be a demand for it. It was pointed out above that there seems to be a demand for an immediate, practical systematic settlement of land. The important question is whether this demand comes from those who expect to become bona fide farmers and not from social workers, reformers, politicians and owners of large areas of uncultivated land. Moreover, the evidence of this demand on the part of future bona fide settlers must be based not on an abstractly expressed desire but on concrete proofs of the degree of earnestness of this demand. This demand must further be determined as nearly quantitatively as possible. A test then, must be devised and its nature will become evident from the further discussion.

The Human Factor

A land settlement policy will eventually be translated into well-defined laws and institutions and as such will gather its strength from the same sources and depend for its efficacy upon the same causes as other laws and institutions. Laws an dinstitutions would be dead had they not back of them determined organizations capable of supporting them and rendering them effective. Organizations, however, ultimately depend upon and receive their vitality from the individuals composing them. Since the individual is a product of many forces acting through time and space, an organization is consequently the resultant of the action of historical and geographical forces with the human factor as the motor power. Carrying the reasoning further it can be stated that the existence of satisfactory laws and institutions is unthinkable if they do not correspond to the temperament, in other words, to the sum total of the psychical characteristics of the people. As Taine has expressed it in his "History of English Literature": "Nothing exists except through some individual man; it is this individual man with whom we must become acquainted. When we have established the parentage of dogmas; or the classification of poems, or the progress of constitutions, or the modification of idioms, we have only cleared the soil; genuine history is brought into existence only when the historian begins to unravel across the lapse of time, the living man, toiling, impassioned, entrenched in his customs . . " These statements and quotations may sound as truisms in view of the fact that modern scientific thought has come to the point where it gives the human factor a preponderance in the explaination of social phenomena. It is of the utmost importance, however, to emphasize this factor in a discussion of agricultural problems of today. We are very fond of devising plans, programs, legislative bills to solve the various problems of agricultural life and industry. But the great majority of our plans of this sort lack either partly or totally any mention of the importance of this human factor. Some of our laws and legislative bills are masterpieces of the art of legal drafting. Administrative and legislative provisions, legal and other safeguards are combined in a masterful way and all the details are

taken into consideration. The human factor, however, is seldom if at all, taken into consideration. Thus, in a discussion of a proposed co-operative law, the fact that John Smith or Oswald Hanson are beings with certain distinct psychical characteristics which are handicaps to effective co-operation, is seldom taken into consideration by our law-makers. Law, a product, a mere symbol, acquires the importance of a cause able to generate and call into being the most marvelous institutions. Absurd as this conception is when applied to intended reforms within the agricultural industry it may become criminal in its results when applied to land settlement laws for the reason that these laws have as their object the transplanting of human beings from one mode of life to an entirely different one. It is obvious that if there is any branch of social or legislative activity where the human factor is to be taken as a foundation and a cornerstone it is a land settlement policy. The conception of a distinct mode of life, moreover, implies the idea of the presence either in a latent or an active state, of certain qualifications prerequisite to this new life. What these qualifications are as well as the method of their determination has been treated in one of the previous chapters. In these two ideas, the mode of life and the qualifications for the adaptation to this life, we have two opposing elements; the individual versus the environment. The problem of land settlement by city elements is still further reduced to the task of bringing the individual into harmony with his new environment and this task consists in creating and strengthening the ties that will bind him to his new life.

The Psychical Difference Between the European and the American Farming Population

A clear understanding of the nature of these ties can be gained through a study of the relation of the European farmer to his environment.

The essential difference between the European countries and America is that in Europe there is an agricultural class which was formed long ago and whose numbers do not increase from the outside. This class has identified itself with the soil and it considers itself by tradition its rightful occupant, while in America the farmer as a class has no traditional ties binding him to the soil. It is true that in some European countries there is a drift from the farm to the city, but there is hardly, if at all, any tendency on the part of the other classes of population to take up farming and settle on the land. If some members of the middle or higher classes do think of "going back to the soil," they invariably choose to emigrate either to America or to the colonies. One of the results of this centuries-long occupation of the land by the peasant is that he feels attached to the soil and to his neighbors by ties of a higher order than the economic one. He, and in many cases his ancestors, as well as those of his neighbors had always lived near one another and had frequently suffered a common oppression together. The

idealistic feeling with which he views the soil and his work form the strongest connection between him and his environment. Michelet in speaking of this attachment of the French peasant to his soil says: ". . . he covets his land with wistful passionate eyes on his Sundays, when he has to abstain from working on it; in going off he turns around to throw at his mistress a look full of passion." The Russian peasant on the other hand is not so much attached to the land as to the mode of life which the land allows him to live. Says Stepniak: "It is not exactly the land, the given concrete piece of land, which a moujik loves, it is the mode of life which the possession of the land allows him to live, and which blends into one inseparable whole both the work and the men in whose company he is accustomed to toil" . . "A Russian moujik probably feels much more grieved and downhearted at being separated from his furrow than does a husbandman of any other nationality."*

Uspensky, a great Russian novelist, shows us in his "Ivan Afanasieff" a peasant in whom this feeling is developed to an almost morbid intensity: "Ivan Afanasieff, a peasant of Slepoe Litvinovo, in the province of Novgorod, is a sterling example of a genuine husbandman indissolubly bound to the soil both in mind and in heart. The land was in his conception his real foster-mother and benefactress, the source of all his joys and sorrows, and the object of his daily prayers and thanksgiving to God."

"Agricultural work, with its cares, anxieties, and pleasures, was so congenial to him, and filled up his inner life so completely as to exclude even the idea that husbandry might be exchanged for something else, for another and more profitable employment. Though Ivan Afanassieff is by no means enamoured with the land, as the reader might have concluded, he is yet so closely united to it, and to all the mutations which the land undergoes in the course of the same year, that he and the land are almost living as parts of the same whole.

"Nevertheless, Ivan Afanasieff does not feel in the least like a bondsman, chained to the soil; on the contrary, the union between the man and the object of his cares has nothing compulsory in it. It is free and pure because springing spontaneously from the unmixed and evident good, the land is bestowing on the man. Quite independently of any selfish incentive, the man begins to feel convinced that for this good received he must repay the land, his benefactress, with care and labor."

These illustrations should have given the reader a conception of the real problem which lies at the bottom of any work on land settlement, and while it is of importance in the case of any settlers without previous farming experience, its magnitude cannot be overemphasized in the discussion of Jewish land settlement problems because of the almost total lack of previous agricultural, experience in Jewish life. The problem is the creation of relations be-

*Stepniak: "Russian Peasantry," p. 244–45.

tween the individual and the soil and it is upon the degree of strength of these new relations that the success of any land settlement plan will depend. In this conception of the creation of new relations it is the human factor, the individual with his complex psychical nature who must be the center of our study and the cornerstone of our activities, and it is upon the degree of responsiveness of this individual that will depend the problem of land settlement.

We have reached the point where we can take up the discussion of the test to be applied to determine both qualitatively and quantitavely the demand which exists among the desirable elements for the establishment of land settlement facilities. It is obvious that this test must bear on the creation of such relations between the settler from the city and his new life as to establish a psychical bond between him and the soil. Before devising the test itself it is important to discuss the prerequisites on which it must be based.

Any test must have as its first prerequisite the inducement to undergo it. The inducement in this case will be the establishment of facilities to buy the land for those prospective settlers who are willing to submit to this test. Since we have come to the conclusion that the state cannot engage on a large scale in the work of throwing open idle lands to settlers immediately, the access to the land must take the form of the establishment of credit facilities both for the purchase of farm and equipment. This could be done by the establishment of an institution similar to the Federal Farm Land Bank. The question arises where would people desiring to go on the land buy farms since an opening of uncultivated lands is not contemplated immediately. The solution of this difficulty is connected with the test and the answer to this question will be clearer after the test itself is discussed. In view of the present uncertainty as to methods of land settlement this provision would be the only inducement that could be offered by the state. The inducement of this kind will have two great merits. First, it will put the relations of the would-be settler to the state on a purely business basis, and second, the demands which will be made upon this institution of credit will serve as an exact barometer of the actual bona fide desire on the part of certain elements of our population to migrate to the land.

The Danish System

The granting of credit to prospective settlers, in order to be thoroughly business-like, must be based on the consideration of the ability of the prospective settler to use the loan to the best advantage and of his ability to repay it. The first guarantee of this kind is the ability to perform the work on a farm and the degree of efficiency attained in it. The proof of this guarantee ought to be the one required in Denmark, namely, the stipulation that no one is to be allowed to benefit by the credit facilities for the buying of a farm unless he has spent several years in actual work on a farm.

But while the simplicity of this test is sufficient for Denmark it will not be sufficient in America. Indeed, the agricultural population in European countries does not receive any elements from the outside. Those who want to buy farms are either sons of farmers or those farmers who want to settle in some other locality or who have been tenants or farm laborers and want to acquire farms of their own. If people among other classes of the population want to become farmers they emigrate either to America or to the colonies. The problem in Denmark is simple, because those who are the prospective buyers of farms belong to the farming class and are not foreign to the farm atmosphere. The provision of three years' work on a farm is made to show good faith and serves as a kind of guarantee that the capital lent will eventually be used to advantage. Outside of this plan the Danish government provides for technical instructors and an experiment station through whose medium the farmers are taught the best methods of cultivation.

In America, however, the problem of land settlement is fundamentally different. The probability that many elements from the city without any previous farming experience and understanding of farm life may at one time or another turn their thoughts to farming, presents a difficulty unknown in European countries, namely, the creation of new relations between those elements and their new mode of life. The proof of guarantee for the best use of the capital lent to acquire a farm resolves itself, into the proof of fitness to farm life outside of the simple proof of the ability to do the work. The test of the proof of fitness for agricultural life must be based on prerequisites which refer to the conception of farming as a distinct mode of life, to the necessity for the right type of settlers and to the degree of intensity which the prospective settler can attain in establishing an indissoluble bond with his future environment, a bond in which the psychical factor will play an important part. With these prerequisites in view we must bear in mind that the test has to be performed on human beings and that because of the intangible object it has in view it must of necessity be based on intangible methods.

If we adopt the Danish system alone the test will apply only to the ability to perform the work and would easily lend itself to tangible methods of testing. But since the Danish system is insufficient for reasons discussed above, the corresponding test will be incomplete because it will apply only to one phase of the problem. It is obvious that there can be no tangible methods to test the degree of adaptation of a prospective settler from the city to farm life. Still the proof of adaptation must be there before the loan is granted, and this proof, as will be seen later, will be based on a system of educational training. The test is to be at the same time a preparation for farm life.

In this chapter we have been largely dealing with generalities which at first sight seem to be digressions from the subject at hand but which are intimately connected with it. The object of this

monograph is to endeavor to arrive at a constructive program of settlement on land by those elements among the Jews who want to choose farming as their occupation. With this object in view on analysis was made of the particular Jewish characteristics which would fit them to take a place in American farming. The Jew is a psychical paradox who combines highly associative qualities with a strongly developed individualism. The combination of these two characteristics in the prospective settler being of fundamental importance to successful farming, makes it possible for the Jew to take a place in American agriculture.

There stands, however, between the Jew and farming the necessity to adapt himself to a new mode of life. This mode of life in reference to farming as was shown in the case of the French and Russian country population consists in a complete blending of the man and the soil. It is not expected that in the case of the new settlers in this country their identification with farm life will be as thorough and complete as in the case of European farmers. The important thing to bear in mind is that outside of the possession of an initial capital, the knowledg of farming operations and the presence of desirable qualities there must be a higher, purely psychical bond between the man and farm work otherwise he will fail utterly.

The life of a settler is easier now than in the days of free land. But farming is not and never will be a sinecure. It is only the presence of a higher interest in his new life than the purely material one which will enable the new settler from the city to overcome all the inconveniences of farm life. It is because of the existence of that higher bond that the European farmer is so attached to the soil nothwithstanding all the oppression which he had to suffer in many countries, in Russia for example. In the opinion of the writer the foremost consideration in the question of Jewish land settlement is the creation of this bond. The writer has met at one time or another many Jewish students in our Colleges of Agriculture. He has had a good opportunity to study the relation to farm life of the average Jewish young man, while trying to organize a group of boys for work on farms during the labor shortage occasioned by the World War. He has watchedf and studied the efforts to rebuild Palestine. And he has come to one conclusion: That before we undertake anything in this field, before we build up cooperative agricultural colonies, before we argue about the desirability of single tax or its undesirability and other theories in the colonization of Palestine, it is of fundamental importance to build up a class of Jewish young men whose identification with the soil is complete and thorough enough to serve as a guarantee of a successful farm life.

This task can be accomplished only through the medium of an educational training. It has been proposed in this chapter to provide credit facilities for prospective settlers in order to enable them to buy land and equipment conditioned by the passing of a test to

prove their fitness for farm life. The next step is to provide an opportunity for the would-be settlers to prepare themselves for the test and this opportunity will take the form of a system of educational training. The agency through which this training for the adaptation to farm life is to be conducted should be a Farm Labor Bureau whose work will consist of placing the individual on the farm as a farmhand and building around him an atmosphere which will of necessity generate the psychical bond between him and the soil. The Farm Labor Bureau will be the center of an organization of men working on neighboring farms as farmhands. The training of these farmhands will be in charge of an instructor or extension worker who will supervise and conduct the processes of adaptation on the principles explained in the next chapter.

III

THE PROCESS OF ADAPTATION

We have brought down the whole problem of a constructive program of adaptation to the land to the question of a change in environment. Connected with the question of environment we also have the question of racial characteristics. In order to have the bridge connecting the man's past environment with his new one constructed in the right way and on a lasting basis, we have to analyze the individual. Before doing this, let us consider in a general way the main prerequisites which will determine the degree of rapidity with which the individual will adapt himself to his new work.

It is obvious that the degree of satisfaction which he will experience will play the most important part in this process of adaptation. It is the degree of satisfaction which he will experience at every moment of his life, and the degree of satisfaction which he will get from his new work that will stimulate him to further efforts. It is essential that he have something that will arouse his energies and make them work to the fullest extent. It is essential that in his moments of discouragement with the probability of failure staring at him that he still find a loophole through which he could go into the broad highway of opportunity. Everything must be done so as to surround him with possibilities for success without in the least intruding upon his initiative and self effort. An interesting and instructive parallel to the establishment of psychical relations to the soil can be found in the process of "Americanization" of newly arrived immigrants.

The life of the average European immigrant in this country is not very enviable, at least during the first few years. Even if he is proficient at some trade or occupation and is able to satisfy his material wants, he is subject at intervals to attacks of melancholy. Everything is strange to him and even if he is able to earn high wages, he is unable to enjoy his new life fully. There are two factors which hamper him in his efforts to find pleasure and satisfaction in his new life. These are his relations to his new country-

men and his relations to the surroundings. So far as his new countrymen are concerned they not only speak a different language but their ideas and ideals are totally different. These have been moulded and are the product of an entirely different training and primary education both of which are as unlike as the history of the new country. Then there is no connection between him and the things surrounding him; the country, the landscape. No reminescences of his childhood days tie him to the new place and the result may be an intense melancholy which will result in a less rapid degree of adaptation to his new surroundings.

There are on the New York East Side agencies to take care of the immigrants whose purpose is to try to adapt him to his new life outside of his work. Some of these agencies are private, others are state agencies. Whatever we may think of the methods they use, a close analysis will show that they start from the right conception of human nature. To an average European immigrant America is the traditional land of freedom. Besides the purely materialistic purpose which brings him over here the humblest and most ignorant among the Eastern European peasants unconsciously expects that in this country he will be free of the tyranny of uniformed officials and of an outrageous Administrative red tape. His first few years in this country are rather disappointng, especially if he settles in New York, Chicago or some other industrial center. The immigrant Americanizing agencies step in then to remedy the situation. By arranging evening classes, by lectures and other activities they teach the immigrant the language of the country, thus bringing him closer to his new countrymen. They moreover, bring him into close acquaintance with the noblest events of American history; with the War of Liberation and the War of Emancipation of the negroes. They point out to him the wide opportunities which exist or are supposed to exist in this country and which they claim are accessible to any man if he makes an effort to attain them. The writer knows from his own experience what an influence evening lectures of the People's Institute in New York have had in changing his attitude towards life in this country. These agencies try gradually to change the state of mind of an individual from an unfavorable to a favorable one acting to a great extent on the idealistic side of his nature. Whether they succeed or not is not essential to this discussion. In fact in a great majority of cases they do not, but this is due to the fact that one of the factors which enter into this state of mind, namely the economic one, is hard to remedy as far as work in cities is concerned. In agriculture, this factor can be made present through the establishment of facilities for the acquiring of land as a stimulus to this process of adaptation.

If this phase of the immigrant's life is dwelt on at some length, it is because it is important to bear in mind the psychical factors which enter into it as well as the purely economic one.

For this discussion we have to consider the state of mind of the individual during his work as a farm laborer, because it is on the

state of mind that depends the satisfaction which he will get from his work and the degree of efficiency which he will attain. Hence the fundamental principle which must be laid as the basis of the work of the Farm Labor Bureau involves a consideration of this state of mind. This state of mind varies with individuals; some are very sensitive about the comforts they will get from their new life, others worry more about the material advantages. Taking into consideration the characteristics of the Jews as pointed out in various places of this article, it is safe to conclude that on the average this state of mind in regard to the new life of farming depends, so far as the Jew is concerned on the presence of the following factors:

(1) The ability gradually to improve in his new work.
(2) The possibility of seeing the higher meaning of the work.
(3) The outlook for the future.

Upon the ability to improve gradually in his new work depends a great deal of the success which the man will achieve. Every Jew carries with him an unconscious belief that farm labor is the least suitable occupation for a Jew. This belief is strengthened by the general opinion prevailing everywhere that the Jews are unfit to take up farming. From the point of view of manual labor, this belief is unfounded. There is no aversion among Jews to manual labor as a physical exertion. An important thing is to start the man in a season when work is not very hard and thus give him an opportunity gradually to adapt himself to his new occupation.

Let us take a concrete illustration of how the work could be arranged so as to give the man a chance to adapt himself to his new work gradually and let us select as an example a dairy farm.

The work on a general farm where dairying is the main feature can be roughly divided into three seasons. The first starts in November and continues until late in March—this is the winter season. The second season starts in March and continues until the beginning of June—this is the spring season. The third starts in June and cintinues until November. This season consists of summer work and fall work. The fall work, however is identical with the summer work because it consists of cutting corn and shredding corn, both processes being similar to the harvesting of grain.

The man ought to be made to go out on the farm in November. There is a certain disadvantage in this because he cannot expect to earn during the first few months more than his board and clothes. The advantage, however, lies in the fact that by the time spring comes, he will be able to earn higher wages than would be the case if he did not spend the winter on the farm. If a man, does not feel like spending so much time on a farm without earning anything, he might go out in January, and this will give him enough time to harden his muscles before the beginning of the real hard work. Winter work on a general dairy farm consists in milking, feeding stock and cutting wood. The ability to milk is the hardest thing to acquire on a farm. It requires patience and long and

persistent effort. The winter season is the most suitable to learn milking because the men as a rule are not rushed with work and are able to spend a little more time in the barn than would be allowed in the rush season. The ability to feed the cattle is very easy to acquire. The interest which any city-bred man takes in this kind of work will hasten the process of learning it. The cutting of wood is really the only thing that requires exercise of muscles, but winter not being a rush season will give the man enough time to acquire the necessary experience and strength and gradually decrease the number of times he will strike his own toes and increase the number of times he will hit the wood. In following this plan of work, the man will have acquired the fundamental knowledge necessary for spring work. He will have acquired the necessary experience of handling horses and milking cows, but above all he will have adapted himself to the farm atmosphere and thus he will be in a position to acquire more rapidly the technique of spring work.

Spring work consists of plowing (most of the plowing, however, is or should be done, in the fall), pulverizing the land, harrowing and rolling it, and sowing and planting. The most important requirement for this work is the ability to handle horses, the rest depends on common sense. Some of the hardest of all farm work is done in summer, but even here not very much muscular strength is required. The cutting and harvesting of hay consists mainly in mowing it, and storing it in the hay-mow. The mowing is done by a machine and again the ability to handle horses and machinery is the main requirement. The ability to handle horses, however, is most important. The leading of hay and spreading it on the mow is the hardest and most trying experience the novice will have to undergo. But if we consider the total number of days which he will have to put in at this kind of work, the thing will not seem terrifying. On a 160-acre, for example, not over 40 acres are usually devoted to hay. On some farms there are two cuttings each summer for clover and three cuttings for alfalfa. Altogether they do not take up more than three weeks' work; these three weeks are usually broken up, one week for the first cutting, one week for the second and one week for the third. The intervals between these periods are taken up by the cultivation of corn and give the man an opportunity to recuperate and gather strength for the next period of hay harvesting. The harvesting of the small grain consists of cutting it which is also done by a machine driven by horses, and shocking it in the field. The shocking of the small grain is a simple process and requires little muscular strength. All it requires is a persistent effort to continue the work which is rather painful at first because of the hot weather. But after a day or two of shocking the grain, the man will be very little inconvenienced by the hot weather. The threshing of small grain is done by crews, where each man performs a simple process. The inexperienced man is usually given in such cases the simplest work and this af-

fords him a chance to adapt himself to it. The cutting of corn is similar in its general aspects to the cutting of small grain. Silo filling and later on corn shredding are both done by crews and in this operation the inexperienced man is again given a simple kind of work.

Between the filling of silos and the shredding of corn, the fields are plowed. By this time the man has acquired enough ability to drive horses and a few instructions will make him a satisfactory plowman. In this work he will be helped especially by the novelty of the experience and the grandeur which this work assumes in the eyes of city-bred people. Towards the end of November the plowing is almost completed. Then winter will come and the man will feel assimulated to his new life which from now on will seem much easier because of the knowledge and experience acquired.

The possibility of seeing the higher meaning of the work determines also to a great extent the state of mind of the apprentice in farming. As already mentioned, the great disadvantages of farm life is its isolation and the consequent absence of social and educational advantages. It is possible to devise a plan which will remedy this disadvantage and this plan must be based on the peculiar characteristics of the Jew and the possibility which the ooccupation of agriculture offers to satisfy the desires which are the consequences of these characteristics.

A human being is a complex product of various factors. Although the economic factor is very important and determines to a great extent the actions of the individual, still there are many other factors which are usually called idealistic and which at one time or another play an important role and are responsible for the deviations which the course of life will take from the direction it would follow if it were left to the influence of the economic factor alone. This is especially true in the case of the Jews. The average Jew down below some of his negative traits possesses a most idealistic soul. Centuries long oppression, banishing from him the prospect of sharing the power and pleasure of the earthly world, stimulated him to think; oppression made him unconsciously analyze himself and the world, and developed in him the power of contemplation which is a sign of the sensitiveness and elasticity of his feelings. These high qualities are present in every Jew but are hidden under many negative traits which are the product of the abnormal conditions under which he has lived and still lives.

A very careful consideration must be paid to this side of the Jewish character in order to strengthen in the Jew the desire to remain in agriculture. The important thing in this case is to stimulate the natural power for abstract thinking which is inherent in the Jew and get him interested in his daily work by connecting each phase and detail of it with some general scientific theory. This statement might seem phantastic and visionary to some so-called practical men. But if we are to build up an efficient class

of Jewish farm Laborers as a stepping stone to Jewish land ownership, we must do the utmost to strengthen the ties that will bind him to farming; and this in his case will be done by utilizing the idealistic trait in his character. Labor, according to Dr. Gustav Cohn*. in its economic aspects, whether mental or physical has its basis not in nature, but in civilization; it does not depend on physiological but on psychological reasons. Moreover, this plan will contribute to the building up of a higher type of farm laborer which will result in a higher type of agriculture. The beginning in this direction is made already by the formation of various clubs for the competitive raising of pedigreed corn, wheat, oats, etc. The plan which the writer would propose differs from the above in that it will explain the general principles underlying the various farm operations. In short, it proposes to take over the academic part of the curriculum of our colleges of agriculture, simplify it and hand it over to the men who in their daily work are witnesses of all the concrete illustrations of the general scientific theories.

Generally speaking, the farm operations on a dairy farm can be divided into the following groups: feeding, breeding, soils, and business transactions. The feeding, and breeding are connected in their theoretical aspects with theories which at this moment claim the attention of the scientific world and which promise to make the twentieth century the greatest epoch so far as the explanation of certain mysterious processes of nature is concerned. The underlying principles of feeding connect this art with the general theory of the explanation of biological processes by chemical transformations.

They have to deal with the most mysterious phenomena that Nature has in her keeping. If we are ever to solve this mystery, the greatest step in cililization will be made: disease to a great extent will be eliminated, our energies by a rational regulation of our diet will increase greatly, and the application of these discoveries to the feeding of our domestic animals will considerably augment our agricultural production. By attracting the attention of the apprentice in practical farming to all these things, by showing him how in his daily work he comes constantly in touch with these great problems his interest will be stimulated. He will train himself into thinking in terms of principles rather than in terms of narrow practical results and by this he will contribute to the formation of the highest type of agricultural laborer known in the world; he will force the adoption of an equitable and rational land policy and will see that it is applied fairly and justly. The same method should be followed in all the other farm operations. The art of breeding is connected with the general theories of heredity and natural selection. In a simple way the apprentice can be shown the history of these theories, their importance in the explanation

*"A History of Political Economy" by Dr. Gustav Cohn, Translated by Adna Hill, Philadelphia, 1894, (Supplement to the Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. and Soc. Sci., Mairch, 1894) pp 87–88.

of natural phenomena and their usefulness when applied to the raising of the highest type producing stock. The business side of a farm has to do with the general theories of economics and sociology. In this field the novice in agriculture will find a great opportunity in which to exercise his thinking power.

Agriculture is entering into a new phase of its evolution. The problems of marketing and rural credits claim the attention of all the thinking and intellectually honest economists of our time. The attention of the man must be called to the fact that the present methods of marketing and financing are wasteful; it must be pointed out to him that these methods are lessening the beneficient effects of scientific discoveries. He must be shown that all these questions and problems are the signs of changes taking place in the industry of farming. He ought to be made to see that urban industry has passed through these changes years ago and that by a right application of the things we have learned from industrial evolution we can easily avoid certain mistakes by inaugurating the new agriculture, the agriculture of organization and solidarity according to well-laid principles. He must have it thoroughly explained and must feel the great difference between the principles of European co-öperation and those of the American co-öperation.

This plan seems at first sight impractical and visionary. Some would consider it useless. The objections to such plans as being impractical and useless usually come from people who consider that only those results are practical which produce something tangible, something which everybody can feel, see or hear immediately. They lose sight of the fact that the only practical thing that ever amounts to anything is the laying down of a principle, whether this principle will bring immediate concrete results or whether its consequences will not be felt until years later. In the case of adaptation to farming of our apprentices the thing to do is to show them their new work in its entirety, show them how the practical and the theoretical interlace and are bound together, and how the right understanding of principles gives a better perspective of the whole field and the relation of the details to each other. The plan proposed above is calculated to give the apprentices the vision which it is necessary to have in order to perform any kind of work to perfection.

Especially will a training of this kind be valuable when we reach a period of introducing reforms in agriculture. What our farming population (as well as our urban) suffers most from is the misunderstanding of laws and legislation. We generally rely too much on the prestige and power of legislation. We think that in order to remedy an evil all that is necessary is to devise a law and appoint inspectors to enforce it. What we lack in this case is the understanding of principles of legislation, the understanding that laws, in order to have any effect must be based on something tangible. As noted in the preceding chapter, no legislation will ever be effective if we have no organization; no organization is possible

if our farmers are too narrow to look beyond their immediate needs and profits. A preliminary training of the kind outlined above will pave the way towards the formation of an intelligent class of small land owners, who, besides being initiated into the technical processes of agricultural production, will have acquired a broad vision which is an important prerequisite for the introduction of reforms based on a lasting foundation. Such a training will supply the missing link in our agriculture; the tradition which binds the man to the soil and to his neighbors. As we have seen it is this tradition, this feeling of love towards the soil and feeling of solidarity towards his neighbors which furnishes the European peasant with the idealism which has enabled him to establish true co-öperation. The kind of training proposed will remedy this lack of tradition; it will enable him to understand that his real interests lie in a loyal and faithful co-öperation with his neighbors and not in a solitary struggle for immediate profits.

Some Possible Objections to This Plan

The objection might be repeated that this plan is visionary and will not result in anything. This objection would be valid if the program outlined were purely theoretical. But it has its basis in the daily work of the apprentices, it is a synthesis of the facts which the apprentice observes. A system of training of this kind will give him a better understanding of the technique of farming and will help him acquire this technique in a shorter and more efficient way. Another objection might be that the apprentice would not take to abstract theories. But in all the experiences the writer has had in talking over similar things with workingmen, farm laborers and very young university students, it takes very little to awaken their interest in the general theories and make them see their relation to their work. The whole secret lies in the methods of getting at these explanations. It resolves itself into the question of the personality of the leader, which presupposes the right kind of training for leadership. This part of the extension work will be facilitated in the case of Jewish young men because of their natural tendency towards abstract reasoning.

There were in the last few years, during the war especially, several attempts to form groups of young men from the city, to place them on farms and to teach them the principles of agriculture in connection with their daily work. These attempts succeeded in a few instances as temporary measures only to remedy the farm labor situation. They did not and could not prove a lasting success in the sense of awakening in the city boys an earnest and determined desire to devote themselves to farming because of the lack of two of the three factors, namely, the outlook for the future and the possibility of seeing the higher meaning of the work, in other words, the total absence of an attempt to create a psychical bond with the farm life.

VII

THE FARM LABOR BUREAU

The consideration of the structure of the Farm Labor Bureaus which are to carry out this program of adaptation to the land must start out from certain fundamental principles and be based on facts. The principles on which they must rest are: first, the existence of every institution is justified only by the demand for it. The Farm Labor Bureau does not seek apprentices but is created only when there is sufficient demand for it; second, the process of training is to be, to as great an extent as possible, a reproduction of that which awaits the apprentice in his life as an independent farmer.

The first principle flows directly out of the conception of the land settlement problem as discussed in a previous chapter. Since the adoption of a land policy must be based on a quantitavely determined demand for it, and since migration to the land implies a change in the mode of life, no influence must be brought to bear on the individual which could in any way act as the slightest inducement for him to take up farming. This provision is of great importance since many land companies exaggerate the attractions of a constant "communion with nature." Several states have been guilty of the same mistake in an attempt to attract settlers.

The second principle is the logical result of the conception of the Farm Labor Bureau as a test of the demand based on preparation and adaptability to farm life. In order to live up to this principle the structure of the Farm Labor Bureau must be simple. The nucleus of the whole must be a small organization of men sent out to work on farms. The central administration will come into contact with these organizations and with the apprentices through the medium of extension workers. For the success of the scheme, the co-öperation of the Colleges of Agriculture will be essential. It would be idle to attempt to construct a detailed plan of the structure of this Farm Labor Bureau because of the variability of factors and the material out of which the apprentices are to be recruited. Having these considerations in mind, the best plan would be to build up a small organization of apprentices and start the work with it. The building up of a larger organization will be conditioned by the progress of this small unit as well as by the demand for it. The exact relation of the central administration to the various units as well as its policies will be shaped accordingly and will be the result of observation made of the work of the nucleus of the Bureau.

Having established these principles it is important to determine whether farmers will be willing to hire the men the Bureau will send them. While this question cannot be answered affirmatively, certain facts characteristic of the farming industry in America will justify us in saying that generally the farmers will be willing to take in men on this basis.

One of these facts is the peculiarity of the relations of the hired man to his farmer-employer. The hired man working on a farm must, in order to be efficient, be in an entirely different relation to his employer than the workingman in a large factory. In a large factory the division of labor is carried to an extreme. Each man performs a simple operation. The arrangement in the factory, because of this extreme division of labor, is such that a system of watching the workman do his work efficiently can be easily devised. The workingman does not necessarily need to take a very strong interest in his work because the work is purely mechanical and because he can be easily watched. The case of the farm hand is entirely different. The man working on a farm has many different things to do. The greatest part of his work will keep him out in the fields away from the farmstead. He is out of the reach of his employer most of the time. Besides, there are many operations in farming where the employer will have to rely upon the loyalty of his man to do the work right even though it is performed in the precincts of the farm home, for instance, treating the cattle gently, not overworking the horses, etc. It is clear then, that the hired man's relation to the farm if he wants to have his work worth anything, must be that of loyalty. And it is this quality that should be most frequently found in young men who go out on the farm to learn as well as to work, because in their desire to learn, they will acquire an interest in their work and try to perform it with as much skill as possible.

A further stimulus to good work and good will on the part of the hired man will be the prospect of acquiring a farm on the terms stipulated above after a successful period of apprenticeship.

The good will which an inexperienced man will develop under these conditions combined with a system of training in practical farming will be of sufficient inducement to farmers to cooperate with the Farm Labor Bureau, especially, and this is an important consideration, in view of the scarcity of farm labor prevailing in the country.

The question of wages is important. As a rule,* a man cannot expect to earn more than his board and clothes the first winter. Sometimes, however, the farmer will give him even during the first winter, five or ten dollars a month besides. But when spring comes there is no reason why an average man should not be able to earn at least $20 a month. In summer he might earn as high as $25. The second winter he should be in most cases able to find work on a large dairy farm and earn twenty, twenty-five and even thirty dollars a month. The second spring and summer he ought to be able to earn $30 to $35 a month. If in some cases it is impossible to find work in winter, he might find work in some industry connected with farming such as cheese factories or creameries. In the

*The figures of wages are those of normal pre-war times. The wages have risen considerably since the World War.

extreme case he could go out for the winter to the city and work in some industry which is busy at that particular season. In this case he will spend later on a few more months in spring and summer on a farm to complete his three years requirements. The objection may be made that few men will be willing to go out on these wages in view of the present high wages in cities, but it is again well to point out at this juncture that the only men who are wanted in the Farm Labor Bureau are those who have a real and earnest desire to leave their present occupation and to seek new opportunities at the risk of some immediate sacrifices.

Another condition which will furnish the Farm Labor Bureau with a working basis is the characteristics of the dairy farm industry. The dairy farms are especially adapted for such kind of work because of various reasons. The work is varied and thus can be made more interesting. There is a longer season of work and with the gradual introduction of winter dairying it will be made still longer. Moreover dairy farming is gradually extending its area and in the future will afford the greatest opportunity for profitable enterprises on a small scale.

When we come to the consideration of the difficulties which may hamper the work of the Farm Labor Bureau the chief ones are, in the opinion of the writer, possible misunderstandings between the farmer and the apprentice. And, indeed, the relations of the farmer to his hired man are not purely the relations of an employer to an employee. They are, to a great extent, patriarchal. The hired man, when working for a farmer, is placed in the position of hired man and a member of the farmer's family at the same time. Even as a workingman, he is bound to be more loyal to his employer than an average factory employee. Farming is an industry which cannot be strictly regulated according to hours and time clocks; sometimes a man has to put in a few more hours; often when rain is predicted for the next day he has to remain in the field until 9 or 10 o'clock in the evening to cover up hay so as to protect it until it can be hauled to the barn. Imagine how a man would take this who was working in a factory for a number of years and was used to regular hours. The misunderstandings between the hired man and his employer will arise on this basis. It will seem to him continually that he is treated unjustly, while in fact he is fulfilling the fundamental prerequisites of the average farm hand. Another misunderstanding which comes up quite often between the farmer and his hired man results from the fact that the employer is the manager as well as the co-worker of his employees, and when once in a while he has to attend to some of the work alone, the hired man will consider it a personal insult and will start grumbling. This state of mind grows crescendo because the employer and his man have to live in close contact. In the observation of the writer most of the serious clashes between farmers and their hired men usually start from such trifling incidents which because of constant contact

after working hours assume a disproportionate magnitude. The only way to obviate this difficulty which may be considered fundamental is through the mediation of a third person who in this case ought to be an extension worker.

It may be safely stated that there is no scheme of social reform and no plan of organization of a new institution which will ever come out true to specifications. In any practical application of a scheme of that order many currents will be encountered whose existence the author of the scheme cannot foresee and which by their action will tend to divert from its course the process of application of an ideal program to life. In the subject under consideration these currents may be safely assumed to be of a nature which might not only hamper the work of adaptation but destroy it at the very incept because of the numerous psychic factors which a change in the mode of life of purely urban people, as the Jews are, involves. The task of steering safely the process of adaptation through these currents will be the duty of the instructor or extension worker. It must be remembered that the work of this Bureau will have to be tested by observing the work of the first small organization which will be formed. This initial step will naturally be the hardest and its success will hinge to a very large extent on the personality of the extension worker whose duty it will be to supervise the training of the apprentice on the plan outlined above. From what has been said in this chapter it is easy to see that efficient leadership will depend on a knowledge of actual farming operations and on an intimate understanding of the men with whom the instructor will have to deal. It will depend largely on the power to observe how certain characteristics of the men conflict with their new work and environment and the ability to mould these characteristics so as to make them contribute to the process of adaptation. This knowledge can be developed in an instructor only by contact with the actual farm life which means that a future leader in this work must have gone through the same process as the men who will be under his charge. He must understand the peculiarities of farm life, the racial characteristics and the psychical make-up of the farming population. It is a combination of these qualities which will enable the extension worker to facilitate the process of adaptation to farm life with a minimum of friction.

The real source, however, from which the apprentice in farming will be expected to gather the strength necessary to overcome all the difficulties of the process of adaptation is his own will and determination to become a farmer. Outside of the difficulties mentioned above there is another one namely the comparative isolation of farms in America, which will be an obstacle to the work of the Farm Labor Bureau. But this and other obstacles can be overcome only when the apprentices have the same attitude towards the land as had the pioneers who in the early history of Western Expansion broke up the land, fought the Indians, faced danger and went through innumerable hardships with only one ideal in mind,—

to live on the land. Jewish young men who are willing to undergo this process of adaptation are expected to be pioneers of a Jewish farming class. They have at their disposal opportunities of which the old pioneers of American farming never dreamt. If their desire to become farmers is not strong enough to help them overcome the inconveniences and difficulties of the process of adaptation with all the opportunities that are offered to them they do not form a desirable class of settlers.

It is important to consider the question raised in a previous chapter as to how these men will get to the land, since an opening of uncultivated land on a large scale is not contemplated immediately. Because of the nature of the preparation it is evident the demand for land in this case will not be sudden, but will be gradual. There is the additional advantage in that it can be foreseen a long time ahead and therefore this demand for land can be satisfied by the existing offer of sale of farms or by the opening to cultivation of idle lands on a small scale. Because it will be gradual it will obviate the danger of a sudden rise in prices of land, which would necessarily be the result of a sudden demand for it. Another important thing to take into consideration is that so far as the majority of applicants for land from cities are concerned, it is more desirable for them to buy ready made farms than to migrate to newly opened lands on which they are liable to make a failure because of pioneer conditions of life and work.

V

TENANCY AS A STAGE IN THE PROCESS OF ADAPTATION

Let us now consider a man who has completed a period of apprenticeship according to the plan outlined in this monograph. He is found fit for farming for two reasons: (a) He is assimilated to farm life. (b) He is capable of performing the various farm operations. The question arises, is he capable of independently managing a farm?

As a farmhand he has not had the opportunity to test his managerial abilities. Although a farmhand is to a certain extent a partner of his employer in the working of a farm, still he performs his duties under supervision and does not have the responsibility in planning the work on a farm, in buying the necessary supplies and marketing the farm products. It happens very often that a farmhand, although very efficient in his work, is helpless when left in charge of a farm even for a short time. It is obvious that a farm representing a considerable investment requires not only a knowledge of the various phases of farm work but the ability to manage it in such a manner as to make it yield a profit both on the capital invested and the managerial services rendered without injury to the soil, the buildings and the improvements. In order to complete

the process of training for farm work it is important to offer the inexperienced man an opportunity to test and to develop managerial abilities after he has completed the period of apprenticeship as a farm laborer. In other words those men who are found to be wanting in managerial abilities ought to go through a supplementary period of training during which they will be placed in a position where they could exercise initiative but where the responsibility for the conduct of the farm will be shared with an experienced man who is directly interested in the welfare of the farm. This opportunity can best be realized if the men are placed on the status of tenants. As a tenant the man inexperienced in farm management, will have an opportunity to exercise initiative and develop managerial abilities and at the same time he will have the benefit of the advice of the owner of the farm.

The question of tenancy is too complicated to be discussed in this chapter. Broadly speaking, the discussion of it revolves around the following points:

(a) The undesirability of a permanent class of tenants from the point of view of the good of agriculture.

(b) Its undesirability from the point of view of the good of the rural community.

(c) Its desirability from the point of view of the profits to the tenant as compared with his profits if he were an independent farmer.

(d) Its necessity from the point of view of a certain group of people who are very good farmers but who lack the managerial abilities necessary for the independent conduct of a farm.

(e) Its importance as a stage in the educational training for farm ownership.

(f) Its importance as a rung in the agricultural ladder.

Since the subject matter of this paper is the study of the educational training for farm life, we are concerned only with the educational aspect of tenancy. The other sides of tenancy are to a great extent connected with the educational side, and they will be considered in this discussion only in so far as they have any relation to the educational value of tenancy. It must be borne in mind that only share tenancy is considered in this discussion.

The most serious objections to tenancy are that rented farms are not kept up as well as farms worked by the owners and that tenancy has a negative effect on the life of the rural community. These defects are due to the fact that the tenant works a farm which he does not own and that he generally remains in the community only for a limited period of time. This attitude of the tenant towards the farm he rents and towards the community in which he lives can be corrected by creating the feeling of *good will* in the tenant. Before discussing this subject, however, a digression is necessary.

As was said above, a movement from the city to the farm is not avocated in this paper. The writer does not agree with the state-

ments made repeatedly that the increase of the agricultural population is a condition sine qua non of the remedy of the high cost of living. This has yet to be proven. But it is essential to create opportunities of access to the land. These opportunities, however, must be compatible with the good of agriculture. Therefore, men must be willing to make certain immediate sacrifices if they want to prove themselves worthy to benefit by the opportunities offered them in farming. After all, everything is a question of value. The sacrifice to be demanded of the city people who want to turn to farming will exactly determine the value they attach to farm life and it consists in the willingness to go through a period of apprenticeship. During this period the prospective farmer, by coming into contact with actual farm life will have an opportunity to judge the relative value of the two modes of life. The presence of this consciousness of the higher value, to him personally, of farm life must be borne in mind in discussing the means to instill in the tenant an attitude of good will toward his work.

And indeed, if a man is earnestly intent upon devoting himself to farming his aim will be to own a farm some day. This fact is especially true of the Jew. As was shown in Chapter III of the first part of this monograph, the distinguishing characteristic of the Jew is his tendency to live an independent life and to manage an enterprise of his own. Even admitting that as a tenant he will make more money than as a landowning farmer, it is hard to conceive of a Jew, in the observation of the writer, who had no desire to become ultimately an independent farmer. In view of the present absence of facilities to settle on land, this tendency towards landownership will result in the striving on the part of the Jewish tenant-farmer after an immediate maximum profit to the deteriment of the rented farm in order to save as much money as possible to buy a farm. This tendency can be corrected by establishing facilities for the buying of land coupled with an educational supervision during the period of tenancy.

Generally speaking, the state of mind of the tenant is determined by a desire for quick financial returns. This is also true of tenancy considered from an educational point of view. As a farmhand the inexperienced man was willing to work for somewhat lower wages, but as a tenant, although still passing through a stage in the process of adaptation, he considers himself entitled to all the compensation he can claim.

It is true that he has acquired a definite economic status but he must remember that if he is to make a success as a farm owner he must develop the peculiar means to check the desire of maximum results to himself which leads to the detriment of the farm he temporarily occupies. In other words, the financial gain he *ought* to expect is less than the gain he *would* make were he to follow the natural tendency towards maximum results with the minimum of effort. This margin between what the tenant *would* get as an exploiter and what he *does* get through the proper conduct of the

farm must be filled by some rewards and upon the value of these rewards will depend the good will he puts into the management of the farm he rents. It is proposed that the rewards should consist in:

(1) The right to apply, upon proof of satisfactory management, for credit to be advanced by the state to buy a farm and to repay it on the basis of a long time gradual amortization plan.

(2) The training he will get in farm management under proper supervision.

(3) The opportunity to adapt himself to the life of the rural community.

The right to use the credit of the state will be the result of the fulfillment of an agreement which should stipulate that if the tenant follows the prescribed rotation of crops, destroys noxious weeds, takes care of fences and buildings, and sells the products in accordance with the prerequisites of good agriculture he will be allowed to take advantage of the credit facilities, the establishment of which was advocated in another part of this monograph. The hope of getting a farm will act as a stimulus to do satisfactory work for fear of forfeiting the reward.

This arrangement, will have two important psychological effects on the state of mind of the tenant as compared with his state of mind under a system where no such prospects appear. One of these effects is the good influence generally produced by the promise of a reward for satisfactory fulfillment of an agreement, rather than dread of loss for the non-execution of a contract. The other effect will be the influence produced by the consciousness that opportunity is waiting for him. And indeed a tenant at the present time has a tendency to assume a somewhat morbid attitude to the farm he rents. The price of land is high and the initial investment, which he will need in order to acquire a farm of his own, is considerable. With these considerations in mind he naturally tends to disregard the good of the rented farm. On the other hand, being assured of an opportunity to buy a farm on easy terms, his state of mind will tend to be more cheerful which will beneficently react on his attitude towards the farm he temporarily occupies.

The purpose is, then, to awaken in the tenant a proper attitude towards his work by offering a reward. But, still, even in this case there is a certain feeling of compulsion: he must do something in order to be rewarded with something. The aim should be larger. It ought to consist in creating the strongest possible ties between the tenant and his work.

In the farm labor apprenticeship stage these bonds were the result of the understanding of the higher meaning of farm work. In the tenancy stage these bonds will be built upon the significance of his efficiency as a tenant in the light of his own future advantage as a landowning farmer. It will consist in making him see that certain sacrifices of immediate profits will be more than compensated

in the future by the increase of knowledge and experience which he will gain.

A few examples will make this statement clear. One of the results of the expectation of high financial returns is the tendency on the part of the tenant to raise crops which are most profitable per acre rather than crops which are most valuable to the soil. Thus a tenant would overlook the importance of clover in the rotation of crops and plant corn, which is the most profitable crop per acre, or grain which is more profitable than clover. To check this tendency the landlord usually furnishes the tenant with clover seed. Other tendencies of similar nature are: the raising of cash crops like tobacco or potatoes rather than crops which would benefit the soil, selling all of the grain rather than using most of it for feed which would return to the soil a part of the elements under form of manure, keeping an insufficient number of live stock per acre, and not buying any feeds. Some of these tendencies can be checked by supervision and inspection; others, however, do not lend themselves to control. It is easy to control the rotation of crops or the raising of the crops most beneficial to the soil. It is, a more complicated matter to determine whether the tenant uses the correct amount of grain for sale or for feeding. Another difficult thing to control is the care of manure and its distribution over the fields. It is obvious that the tenant must have a consciousness of personal advantage in order faithfully to perform these tasks with a view to the greater benefit of the farm.

This consciousness will rest upon the same principle which determines men to sacrifice several years of their life to acquire an education which will enable them in the future to reap more than they sacrificed. It must be driven home to the tenant that his future success as a farmer will be conditioned by the training and experience which he will acquire in conscientiously managing the farm he rents. He must be made to understand that the knowledge and understanding alone of farm management is not sufficient and that only by practicing the correct theories on the farm he rents will he acquire the necessary experience and the habits which will be of an invaluable advantage to him in the future. In other words, he must convert the farm he rents into a laboratory for the application of the correct principles of farm management.

To illustrate, let us take the examples given above. The correct arrangement of a crop rotation, the rational use of the grain produced, a good care of the manure and all the other tasks of farm management, require intelligent reasoning and calculating. Is there any better training for prospective independent farming than the correct application of the decisions arrived at in this case? It is just such an opportunity for training that ought to be offered the tenant. With the particular type of tenant we deal with in this monograph this proceedure will be facilitated, because in the previous stage of apprenticeship he has acquired an intelligent under-

standing of farm work and is able to look far enough ahead not to be concerned only with large immediate returns.

It is evident that the financial gain of the tenant will be smaller when he practices this good will towards the farm he rents than in a contrary case. At the same time, the margin between what he *would* and what he *ought* to get is filled by a compensation. This compensation consists, (a) in the promise of a reward, (b) in the experience and knowledge gained in farm management. It is through the psychological effect on the tenant that this method will be invaluable. The important thing is to make him see and feel these effects and this depends upon leadership and organization.

So far, only the relation of the tenant to the technique of farming has been considered. There remains another important phase to consider, namely, the adaptation of the tenant to the social life of the community. His efficiency as a farmer will depend largely on the relations he is able to maintain with his neighbors. This is as true of business relations, such as the participation in coöperative organizations, as it is of relations of a purely social character. It would not be an exaggeration to state that the greatest educational value of tenancy for the Jew is the possibility to test how well he can adapt himself to the life of a rural community before he decides to enter into permanent and close relations with it as an independent farmer. In this case the proof of his adaptability to the life of a rural community will be a guarantee that he is capable of an independent life in that community. Here again the educational agency will have an important function to perform: the steering of the tenant through difficult situations and the straightening of the misunderstandings that may arise between him and his neighbors owing to his ignorance of the life of a rural community.

As in the case of the educational Farm Labor Bureau, it would be useless to attempt to devise a plan of administrative machinery for this educational agency. The form of organization will depend upon many variable factors such as locality, type of farming and so on. All that can be said at this time is that the organization of the work should be simple. As heretofore the landlord will deal directly with the tenant, and an outside agency of an educational character will undertake to supervise the work of the tenant and to instill in him good will towards the farm he rents, by means of extension workers following a plan of training and education on the principles explained in this chapter. Above all, it is important that this agency have a thorough understanding of these principles and be able to furnish efficient and expert leadership.

CONCLUSION

The plan of education for farm work advocated in this monograph may be considered too rigid. It is, however, consistent with the object the writer had in view.

In any proposed reform, we must balance the good of the indi-

vidual against the benefit of society. So far as land settlement schemes are concerned, the benefit of society lies in the preservation of that share of the nation's wealth which is represented by our agricultural resources. The good of the individual must find its limit in that. The problem reduces itself to the following statement: To give the individual an opportunity to settle on the land with a guarantee that our agricultural resources shall not suffer. This opportunity is to be given the individual by means of a system of practical educational training which will include not only the teaching of farm work, but the adaptation to farm life as well.

With these considerations in mind, the task of the Jewish agricultural agencies in America is quite simple. In its general aspects the problem of the Jewish settler does not differ from that of the settler of any other racial group in America. The conditions which determine accessibility to the land are the same for both Jews and non-Jews. Because of that the Jewish agricultural agencies will do well to abandon all attempts at settling Jews on the land either by lending the prospective settlers their credit or buying farms for them. In place of these activities, they will find it more useful and more fruitful of results to co-operate with the Federal and State Governments and with other agencies to make land more accessible to the man with small means. The problem of training for farm life and work, on the other hand, depends upon differences in racial characteristics. In the case of the Jews, this problem is especially complicated because of the absence of an agricultural past, the absence of any considerable number of Jewish farmers and the uncertain status of these farmers. This problem of training for farm life ought to absorb all the energies of the existing Jewish agricultural agencies.

It is of the utmost importance, moreover, to bear in mind that the best education for farm work can be gained only if a man is trained while he works on a farm in a farm atmosphere, and not on a farm training school which, no matter how efficient, can in no way reproduce the actual conditions as they obtain on a farm; and that the success of the educational farm training depends upon an easy access to the land.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

1. Private Colonization of Land.....Richard T. Ely
2. Papers on Tenancy—
   The Agricultural Ladder.....W. J. Spillman
   II Tenancy in an Ideal System of Land Ownership..
   .....Richard T. Ely and Charles J. Galpin
   III Discussion .....
   .....W. J. Spillman and Charles L. Stewart
3. Rural, Social and Economic Problems of the United States..
   .....Charles J. Galpin and Alonzo B. Cox
4. Study Program, A. A. A. L. .....Alonzo B. Cox
5. Presidential Address, Chicago, Dec., 1919.....L. H. Bailey
6. Proceedings, American Association for Agricultural Legislation
   Social Aspects of Tenancy, C. V. Gregory.....
   Division of Income Between Landlord and Tenant,
   J. D. Black .....
   Discussion .....
   Collective Bargaining in Agriculture, James E. Boyle....
   Discussion .....
   Collective Sale of Live Stock, Henry A. Wallace .....
   Discussion .....
   Status of Agr. Leg. in the States, J. Clyde Marquis.....
   Status of Agr. Leg. in Congress, Edward Wiest.....
   Committee Reports .....
   Report of the Secretary, Richard T. Ely.....
   Business Meeting .....

The American Association for Agricultural Legislation

The AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION is a body of public spirited men and women consisting of farmers, business men, educators, investigators, and legislators in all parts of the country who are alive to the need of promoting our national interests by constructive agricultural legislation.

The work of the Association is directed along the following lines:

1. Scientific investigation of facts, careful studies of existing laws, consultation with those practically affected, followed by recommendations so carefully worked out that they will command the respect and attention of legislative bodies.
2. The organization of a central bureau to which individuals and organizations may come for assistance in the formulation and promotion of needed agricultural legislation and obtain the benefits of the broadest practical, historical, and theoretical knowledge of problems of production, and also of the larger social and economic problems involving both rural and urban people.
3. Promotion by publicity and education of such legislation as the results of the investigation indicate.

Committees are working in the following fields: food production, consumption and price; land settlement; education and improvement of rural life; marketing; taxation; rural credits; roads and transportation; agricultural extension.

Membership. There are no restrictions on membership. All those interested in the work of the association are invited to send a fee for the membership which they desire to the Secretary, Richard T. Ely, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Minimum Membership Fee	$2.00
Association Membership Fee	$5.00 to $25.00
Contributing Membership Fee	$25.00 to $100.00
Sustaining Membership Fee	$100 or more
Founders Giving	$500 or more

Address,

RICHARD T. ELY, Secretary,

Madison, Wisconsin.