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## CHAPTER XI

## SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE TOTAL NET INCOME

The figures presented in Tables XXXIX, XL, and XLI are final totals based on the estimates covered in detail in the preceding chapters. Altogether, over fifty items entering into the income of the American people were handled separately in making the distribution by States. The final totals, then, represent the combination for each State of these numerous component parts making up the total income. As may be surmised, and as pointed out in connection with the various items, the material upon which the estimates were based was not all of uniform quality. For some of the items the data were highly reliable; for others, however, the data were deficient.

Fortunately, the weakness of some few of the items entering into our estimates is not a measure of the relative accuracy of the final results. The separate items are not linked together in the form of a chain, where the weakest link practically represents the strength of the whole, but the combination is rather in the form of a cable where every additional strand adds strength to the whole. An error in any one item becomes of less significance when the item is included in the entire total. It may also be suggested that the use of many separately computed items in arriving at the final totals offers a distinct advantage on account of the probability of errors cancelling each other.

Another important merit of the method involving the calculation of separate estimates for a large number of component items lies in the fact that, as more data become available, and with the further development of the method, the accuracy of the final totals may be improved progressively by correcting individual items.

## The Total Net Income.

Table XLII gives a comparison between the amounts of total net income received by the inhabitants of each State in each of the
-)
:s:

TABLE XLII.-TOTAL INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES RECEIVED BY INDIVIDUALS IN EACH STATE, 1919-1920-1921

Dollars ( 000 's Omitted)

| State $\underset{\substack{\text { and Geographic } \\ \text { Division }}}{\substack{\text { and }}}$ | Current Purchabing Value |  |  | 1913 Purchabing Value |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 | $\downarrow 919$ | 1920 | 1921 |
| Continental United States | 66,195,700 | 72,380,365 | 84,426,667 | 36,994,672 | 35,283,751 | 49,007,859 |
| New England | 5,355,117 | 5,855,167 | 8,129,278 | 2,995,442 | 2,867,410 | 4,013,344 |
| Maine | 427,580 | 472,572 | 616,055 | 237,281 | 228,959 | 356,101 |
| New Hampsh | 260,759 | 291,804 | 389,944 | 144,465 | 141,584 | 220,557 |
| Vermont. | 175,578 | 236,472 | 261,569 | 97,598 | 114,403 | 154,592 |
| Massachuset | 3,057,076 | 3,353,710 | 4,688,916 | 1,713,608 | 1,647,205 | 2,650,603 |
| Rhode Islan | 454,983 979,141 | 460,061 $1,040,548$ | 733,091 1.439 | 255,178 547,312 | 226,185 509074 | 413,942 |
| Middle Atlantic | 17,509,177 | 19,072,103 | 26,496,647 | 9,844,815 | 9,385,330 | 15,088,897 |
| New York | 9,241,601 | 9,649,309 | 14,802,057 | 5,221,244 | 4,772,161 | 8,453,488 |
| New Jersey | 2,377,239 | 2,659,669 | 3,403,385 | 1,331,041 | 1,304,399 | 1,927,172 |
| Pennsylvan | 5,890,337 | 6,763,125 | 8,291,205 | 3,292,530 | 3,308,770 | 4,708,237 |
| East North Central. | 14,596,747 | 16,395,804 | 17,821,653 | 8,152,065 | 7,993,931 | 10,326,399 |
| Ohio. | 3,989,379 | 4,093,695 | 4,653,438 | 2,213,862 | 1,986,266 | 2,660,628 |
| Indiana | 1,780,646 | 1,813,639 | 1,721,832 | 989,248 | 878,276 | 1,006,331 |
| Illinois | 4,989,044 | 5,420,874 | 6,579,785 | 2,805,987 | 2,665,130 | 3,780,199 |
| Michigan | 2,407,180 | 3,092,700 | 2,990,032 | 1,347,805 | 1,511,584 | 1,735,364 |
| Wisconsin | 1,430,498 | 1,974,896 | 1,876,566 | 795,163 | 952,675 | 1,133,877 |
| West North | 7,971,594 | 8,471,843 | 7,020,690 | 4,445,221 | 4,104,906 | 4,176,806 |
| Minnesota | 1,510,046 | 1,770,205 | 1,592,231 | 839,381 | 856,413 | 941,035 |
| Iowa. | 1,818,461 | 1,419,038 | 1,058,327 | 1,017,036 | 689,858 | 634,869 |
| Missouri | 1,900,781 | 2,117,708 | 2,134,004 | 1,064,863 | 1,034,037 | 1,252,350 |
| North Dakots | 240,332 | 4681,635 | $\stackrel{233,698}{ }$ | 133,074 | ${ }^{220,772}$ | 170,635 |
| South Dakota | 576,122 | 483,850 | 201,737 | 320,602 | 232,620 | 126,086 |
| Nebraska | 994,081 | 783,552 | 727,072 | 553,189 | 378,894 | 435,112 |
| Kansas. | 931,771 | 1,435,855 | 1,033,621 | 517,076 | 692,312 | 616,719 |
| South Atlant | 6,310,287 | 6,336,442 | 7,091,482 | 3,511,345 | 3,067,107 | 4,187,388 |
| Delaware. | 154,257 | 131,746 | 202,483 | 86,759 | 64,772 | 116,638 |
|  | 955,090 | 1,021,707 | 1,348,076 | 535,965 | 501,082 | 775,202 |
| Dist, of Columbia | 437,608 | -444,319 | 702,520 | 240,308 | 215,689 | 393,128 |
| Virginia. | 913,918 | 1,074,823 | 1,091,827 | 506,326 | 518,487 | $\stackrel{644,907}{ }$ |
| West Virginia | 640,929 | 861,901 | 886,882 | 354,496 | 416,176 | 512,352 |
| North Carolin | 981,805 | 919,973 | 981,324 | 547,882 | 444,002 | 606,879 |
| South C | 733,866 $1,113,237$ | 499,409 870,656 | 404,883 923,159 | 408,611 618,122 | 240,216 418.788 | 253,052 563,589 |
| Florida | -379,577 | 511,908 | 550,328 | 210,876 | 247,807 | 321,641 |
| East South | 2,998,710 | 2,804,167 | 3,380,325 | 1,669,205 | 1,353, ¢84 | 2.045,250 |
| Kentucky | 831,353 | 843,942 | 1,103,548 | 462,634 | 408 (96 | 659,622 |
| Tennessee | 765,691 | 883,568 | 958,765 | 426,094 | 427:257 | 573,081 |
| Alabama | 766,338 | 724,602 | 801,028 | 425,743 |  | 489,028 |
| Mississippi. | 635,328 | 352,055 | 516,984 | 354,734 | 169,889 | 323,519 |
| West South Central | 5,271,687 | 5,233,444 | 5,169,189 | 2,939,052 | 2,530,471 | 3,134,039 |
| Arkansas. | 577,951 | 564,597 | 551,934 | 322,158 | 272 f20 | 337,574 |
| Louisiana | 817,520 | 742,918 | 893,168 | ${ }^{456,970}$ | 3611311 | 529,756 |
| Oklahoma | 1,178,630 | 1,200,800 | 968,289 | $\begin{array}{r}656,253 \\ 1,503 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 580,658 | 581,206 $1,685,503$ |
| Texas. | 2,697,586 | 2,725,129 | 2,755,798 | 1,503,671 | 1,315,852 | 1,685,503 |
| Mountain. | 1,816,791 | 2,501,335 | 2,419,148 | 1,006 947 | 1,204.694 | 1,442,760 |
| Monta | 177,105 | 336,561 | 325,544 | 97,632 | 161.498 | 191,609 |
| Idaho. | 321,897 107,566 | 311,359 156,891 | 266,721 194,189 | 178,040 59,759 | 1.90 .047 | 164,338 118.553 |
| Colorad | 576,339 | 817,918 | 823,172 | 320,188 | 396,086. | 481.106 |
| New Mexi | 129,402 | 200,925 | 188,314 | 71,453 | 96.275 | 113,374 |
| Arizona | 240,596 | 306,897 | 254,923 | 133,664 | 147,760 | 155,821 |
| Utah. <br> Nevada | $\begin{array}{r} 219,918 \\ 43,968 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 291,996 \\ 78,788 \end{array}$ | 293,545 $\mathbf{7 2 , 7 4 0}$ | 121,973 $\mathbf{2 4 , 2 3 8}$ | 140.721 37,806 | 175,146 42,813 |
| Pacific | 4,365,590 | 5,710,060 | 6,898,255 | 2,430,580 | 2,776,018 | 3,992,976 |
| Washingto | 1,044,184 | 1,086,081 | 1,316,189 | 578,8117 | 524,930 | 769,251 |
| Oregon | 590,566 | 700,560 | 677,473 | 320,557 | 339,090 | 409:845 |
| California | 2,730,840 | 3,923,419 | 4,904,593 | 1,522,207 | 1,911,998 | 2,813,880 |

three years - 1919, 1920, and 1921. On account of the great advances between the beginning and the end of the year in the values of inventories as measured in terms of consumption goods, the total net income for 1921 is shown to be the highest of the three years for most of the States. Exceptions to this condition are presented by the agricultural States, where the heavy losses in agriculture outweigh the inventory gains on non-agricultural property. States where the total income in 1921, including inventory gains, was lower than in 1919 follow: Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Idaho. In some of these States the reduction in the total income in 1921 was startling. In South Dakota, for instance, the 1921 income represented only 39 per cent of the amount received by the population in 1919. In Iowa, and in South Carolina, the 1921 income amounted to 62 per cent of that in 1919. These figures become even more striking when we consider that, for the country as a whole, the income in 1921 , including inventory gains, was 1.33 times as great as in 1919, and that in New York the ratio of the 1921 total to that of 1919 was 1.62 . In other words, taking as a base conditions in 1919, the income of the people of South Dakota suffered a reduction of about 61 per cent, while the income of the people of the entire United States increased 33 per cent, and that of the people of New York rose 62 per cent.

The opposite movement of agricultural and non-agricultural inventory values in 1921 is also responsible, to a large extent, for the radical redistribution of income in that year as compared with 1919. The share in the total national income received by the people of New York in 1919 was a little more than 14 per cent; in 1920 it was about 13.5 per cent, but in 1921 it represented 17.2 per cent. Pennsylvania's relative share also increased considerably, and the same was true in the case of Massachusetts and most of the other industrial States, excepting Ohio and Michigan. The agricultural States, however, invariably show a great reduction in the percentage of the total income received by their inhabitants in 1921 as compared with 1919.

## Adjustment for Purchasing Value.

Comparison usually involves one important requirement, and that is that the quantities compared be represented in the same
units. It is rather difficult to compare two distances if one is expressed in yards and the other in meters unless they are both converted to a common unit. In comparing income we also must have values expressed in terms of the same unit of measurement. The unit used in measuring income is the dollar, which, unfortunately, is not a fixed quantity. Its value may fluctuate and in recent years has fluctuated rather violently, and it can hardly be accepted as true that the value of $\$ 100$ at one time or place is necessarily twice as great as that of $\$ 50$ in another time or place. With a variable dollar, it is obvious that, in order to have fair comparisons of income, we must adjust our totals.

While it is impracticable to make adjustments for the differences in the value of a dollar in different places, it is possible to do so for the changes taking place from time to time. In the last three columns of Table XLII, we have the total income from all sources expressed in terms of dollars of 1913 purchasing power. To obtain these figures, the totals presented in the first three columns of the table, which are in terms of dollars of current purchasing power, were divided by yearly indices representing average prices of consumption goods purchased by the various classes of the population. The indices used were calculated separately for each State by combining the following four yearly price indices ${ }^{1}$ in accordance with weights based upon the estimated total income in each State of the classes of consumers indicated:

1. Index of prices of goods consumed by farmers.
2. Index of prices of goods consumed by urban employees.
3. Index of prices of goods consumed by families spending $\$ 5,000$ annually on consumption goods.
4. Index of prices of goods consumed by families spending $\$ 25,000$ annually on consumption goods.

The effect of converting the totals for each year into dollars of the same purchasing power is quite apparent. Although, when measured in current dollars, the income received by the people in the various States seems to be higher in 1920 than in 1919, the opposite is really the case. In terms of purchasing power, the 1920 income was only a little over 95 per cent of that in 1919.

[^0]
## The Net Total Income from All Sources on a Per Capita Basis.

When dealing with geographic units of various sizes, such as our States, the total income received by the population contained in each area offers only a limited scope of comparative information. Even in comparing the income for the same States in different years we are likely to be comparing States of different size, as the population does not remain stationary. The economic welfare of the inhabitants cannot be measured by the total income received by those residing within a geographic area, but by the amount of income there is per unit of population. In order to eliminate the population variable from our figures, the total income for each State has been converted to a per capita basis. ${ }^{1}$ These per capita incomes, expressed in dollars of current as well as 1913 purchasing value, are shown in Table XLIV. It seems to be the distinction of the District of Columbia to have had the highest per capita income in two of the three years under consideration, 1919 and 1921. This holds true both when we measure the income in terms of current dollars and when we measure it in 1913 dollars. Owing to large gains in surplus and inventory values, and also to the reduction of the population, the per capita income of the District in 1921 was, in terms of 1913 purchasing value, 75 per cent higher than in 1919 and over 90 per cent higher than in 1920. In 1920 the list was headed by California, which showed a per capita total net income of $\$ 1,127$ of current purchasing value. This amount was 65 per cent above the average per capita total income for the entire country, and 5.7 times as great as the lowest per capita income (Mississippi) in that year.

When measured in current dollars, the per capita income of the people of South Dakota in 1919 was, next to that of the District of Columbia, higher than in any other State. In 1913 purchasing value, however, the New York per capita income for that year was apparently as high as in South Dakota, so that both States may lay claim to second place in this respect. The reason for the purchasing value of the per capita income in the two States being

[^1]TABLE XLIII.-TOTAL POPULATION IN EACH STATE AT THE MIDDLE OF EACH YEAR, 1919-1920-1921

| State and Geograpeic Divieion | All Popdlation ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Non-Farm Population ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 |  |
| Continental United States. | 105,007 | 106,422 | 108,370 | 73,393 | 74,808 | 76,756 | 31,614 |
| New England. | 7,357 | 7,446 | 7,566 | 6,731 | 6,820 | 6,940 | 626 |
| Maine. | 767 | 769 | 772 | 569 | 571 | 574 | 198 |
| New Hampshire | 442 | 444 | 445 | 366 | 368 | 369 | 76 |
| Vermont. | 353 | 352 | 352 | 228 | 227 | 227 | 125 |
| Massachusetts | 3,827 | 3,878 | 3,947 | 3,708 | 3,759 | 3,828 | 119 |
| Rhode Island | 601 | 608 | 616 | 586 | 593 | 601 | 15 |
| Connecticut. | 1,367 | 1,395 | 1,434 | 1,274 | 1,302 | 1,341 | 93 |
| Middle Atlantic. | 22,108 | 22,417 | 22,845 | 20,215 | 20,524 | 20,952 | 1,893 |
| New York. | 10,319 | 10,453 | 10,637 | 9,518 | 9,652 | 9,836 | 801 |
| New Jersey. | 3,124 | 3,188 | 3,280 | 2,980 | 3,044 | 3,136 | 144 |
| Pennsylvania | 8,665 | 8,776 | 8,928 | 7,717 | 7,828 | 7,980 | 948 |
| East North Central. | 21,306 | 21,646 | 22,116 | 16,393 | 16,733 | 17,203 | 4,913 |
| Ohio. | 5,707 | 5,812 | 5,959 | 4,568 | 4,673 | 4,820 | 1,139 |
| Indiana | 2,918 | 2,942 | 2,973 | 2,011 | 2,035 | 2,066 | 907 |
| Illinois. | 6,441 | 6,530 | 6,653 | 5,343 | 5,432 | 5,555 | 1,098 |
| Michigan. | 3,624 | 3,714 | 3,842 | 2,775 | 2,865 | 2,993 | 849 |
| Wisconsin | 2,616 | 2,648 | 2,689 | 1,696 | 1,728 | 1,769 | 920 |

Table XLIII.-Total Population in Each State at the Middle of Eiach Year, 1919-1920-1921 - Continued

| State and Geographic Division | All Population ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Non-Farm Population ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  | Farm PopulaTION ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 |  |
| West North Central. | 12,497 | 12,591 | 12,714 | 7,325 | 7,419 | 7,542 | 5,172 |
| Minnesota | 2,371 | 2,403 | 2,448 | 1,474 | 1,506 | 1,551 | 897 |
| Iowa. | 2,395 | 2,413 | 2,437 | 1,410 | 1,428 | 1,452 | 985 |
| Missouri. | 3,398 | 3,410 | 3,422 | 2,187 | 2,199 | 2,211 | 1,211 |
| North Dakota. | 643 | 651 | 660 | 248 | 256 | 265 | +395 |
| South Dakota. | 634 | 639 | 647 | 272 | 277 | 285 | 362 |
| Nebraska. | 1,291 | 1,302 | 1,316 | 707 | 718 | 732 | 584 |
| Kansas. | 1,765 | 1,773 | 1,784 | 1,027 | 1,035 | 1,046 | 738 |
| South Atlantic. | 13,910 | 14,073 | 14,297 | 7,493 | 7,656 | 7,880 |  |
| Delaware. | 222 | 224 | 226 | 171 | 173 | 175 | 51 |
| Maryland. | 1,442 | 1,458 | 1,480 | 1,163 | 1,179 | 1,201 | 279 |
| District of Columbia | 445 | 431 | 412 | 444 | 430 | 411 | 1 |
| Virginia. | 2,296 | 2,322 | 2,357 | 1,231 | 1,257 | 1,292 | 1,065 |
| West Virginia. | 1,451 | 1,476 | 1,512 | 973 | 998 | 1,034 | 478 |
| North Carolina. | 2,541 | 2,578 | 2,629 | 1,040 | 1,077 | 1,128 | 1,501 |
| South Carolina | 1,675 | 1,693 | 1,717 | 600 | 618 | 642 | 1,075 |
| Georgia. | 2,881 | 2,911 | 2,952 | 1,196 | 1,226 | 1,267 | 1,685 |
| Florida. | 957 | 980 | 1,012 | 675 | 698 | 730 | 282 |



TABLE XLIV.-PER CAPITA TOTAL INDIVIDUAL INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES IN EACH STATE, 1919-1920-1921

| State and Geographic Divibion | Dollars of Current Purchasing Valde |  |  | Dollars of 1913 <br> Purchasing Value |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 |
| Continental United States | 630 | 680 | 779 | 352 | 332 | 452 |
| New England |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maine. . . . . . . | 557 | 615 | 798 | 309 | 298 | 461 |
| New Hampshire. | 590 | 657 | 876 | 327 | 319 | 496 |
| Vermont. . . . . . | 497 | 672 | 743 | 276 | 325 | 439 |
| Massachusetts | 799 | 865 | 1,188 | 448 | 425 | 672 |
| Rhode Island. | 757 | 757 | 1,190 | 425 | 372 | 672 |
| Connecticut. | 716 | 746 | 1,004 | 400 | 365 | 570 |
| Middle Atlantic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York. . | 896 | 923 | 1,392 | 506 | 457 | 795 |
| New Jersey... . . . . . | 761 | 834 | 1,038 | 426 | 409 | 588 |
| Pennsylvania. . . . . . | 680 | 771 | 929 | 380 | 377 | 527 |
| East North Central |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ohio... | 699 | 704 | 781 | 388 | 342 | 446 |
| Indiana. | 610 | 616 | 579 | 339 | 299 | 338 |
| Illinois. | 775 | 830 | 989 | 436 | 408 | 570 |
| Michigan. | 664 | 833 | 778 | 372 | 407. | 452 |
| Wisconsin. | 547 | 746 | 698 | 304 | 360 | 422 |
| West North Central |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota. . . . . . | 637 | 737 | 650 | 354 | 356 | 384 |
| Iowa. . | 759 | 588 | 434 | 425 | 286 | 261 |
| Missouri | 559 | 621 | 624 | 313 | 303 | 366 |
| North Dakota. | 374 | 709 | 415 | 207 | 339 | 299 |
| South Dakota. | 909 | 757 | 312 | 506 | 364 | 195 |
| Nebraska. . | 770 | 602 | 552 | 428 | 291 | 331 |
| Kansas. . | 528 | 810 | 579 | 293 | 390 | 346 |
| South Atlantic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware. . | 695 | 588 | 896 | 391 | 289 | 516 |
| Maryland. . . . . . . . . | 662 | 701 | 911 | 372 | 344 | 524 |
| Dist. of Columbia.. | 983 | 1,031 | 1,705 | 545 | 500 | 954 |
| Virginis. . . | 398 | 463 | 463 | 221 | 223 | 274 |
| West Virginia. | 442 | 584 | 587 | 244 | 282 | 339 |
| North Carolina. | 386 | 357 | 373 | 216 | 172 | 231 |
| South Carolina. | 438 | 295 | 236 | 244 | 142 | 147 |
| Georgia. . | 386 | 299 | 313 | 215 | 144 | 191 |
| Florida. | 397 | 522 | 544 | 220 | 253 | 318 |
| East South Central |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky.... | 345 | 348 | 452 | 192 | 197 | 270 |
| Tennessee. | 329 | 377 | 405 | 183 | 182 | 242 |
| Alabama. | 328 | 307 | 336 | 182 | 148 | 205 |
| Mississippi . . . . . . . . | 355 | 197 | 289 | 198 | 95 | 181 |
| West South Central |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas. | 332 | 320 | 309 489 | 185 | 155 | 189 |
| Oklahoma. | 587 | 586 | 461 | 327 | 284 | 277 |
| Texas.............. | 584 | 579 | 572 | 325 | 280 | 350 |
| Mountain |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Montana. . . . . . . . . | 328 | 603 | 557 | 181 | 289 | 328 |
| Idaho... . . . . . . . . . | 756 | 712 | 589 | 418. | 341 | 363 |
| Wyoming . . . . . . . . | 560 | 796 | 947 | 311 | 383 | 578 |
| Colorado. | 618 | 864 | 850 | 344 | 418 | 497 |
| New Mexico. | 360 | 555 | 515 | 199 | 266 | 310 |
| Arizona. . | 736 | 900 | 706 | 409 | 433 | 432 |
| Utah. | 494 | 645 | 633 | 274 | 311 | . 377 |
| Nevada. . . . . . . . . . | 564 | 1,023 | 945 | 311 | 491 | 556 |
| Pacific |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Washington | 776 | 794 | 941 | 430 | 384 | 550 |
| Oregon. . . . . . . . . . . | 759 | 888 | 841 | 424 | 430 | 508 |
| California . . . . . . . . | 810 | 1,127 | 1,347 | 451 | 549 | 773 |

the same, while the current value in dollars was different, lies in the difference in the composition of the population of the two States and, consequently, in the difference in the average prices of the consumption goods purchased with the income in the respective States.

It is interesting to note that in 1921 the per capita total income of South Dakota was practically at the bottom of the list, showing a drop in the purchasing value of the income of over 61 per cent from 1919.

The range of the per capita net total incomes of the different States was quite great in each of the three years. The greatest range, however, was in 1921, and the smallest in 1919. In terms of percentages of the lowest per capita income among the States for each year, the ranges or "spreads" between the lowest and the highest per capita incomes were as follows:

| $1919 \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ | $200 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $1920 \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ | $480 \%$ |
| $1921 \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ | $550 \%$ |

Logically, we should expect the "normal" year to have a minimum spread in per capita income for the various States, and it would therefore seem that, of the three years, 1919 was actually the most nearly normal.

The wide variations among the different States in the per capita estimates of total income are apparently due chiefly to the fluctuations in the value of inventories. If the income due to inventory changes is taken out of the totals, the per capita figures for the various States fall within narrower margins.
The Share of the Farm Population in the Total Net Income.
If income were distributed equally on the basis of population, the farm population of the United States would get $\$ 3$ out of every $\$ 10$ received by the entire American people. In Rhode Island, the farm population would get $25 ¢$, in Oklahoma $\$ 5$, and in Arkansas $\$ 6.50$ out of every $\$ 10$ of income received by the people in their respective States. Do actual conditions come anywhere near such a distribution? In accordance with this hypothetical distribution, i.e., that based upon the number of people, the share of the entire farm population in 1921 should have been over $\$ 25,000,000,000$.

In Arkansas, the farm population should have received about $\$ 360,000,000$, and in Oklahoma, about $\$ 484,000,000$. How near do these amounts come to the actual income of the farm population?
It is not easy to separate with any degree of precision the income received by the farm population from that received by the nonfarm population in each State. Table XLV merely presents the results of a very rough analysis. The share of the farm population, as shown in this table, is composed of the following items:

1. The income of farmers from agriculture, including gains or losses in the value of inventories.
2. A rough estimate of the income of farmers from non-agricultural sources, such as the return on outside investments, etc.
3. The rental value of farmers' homes.
4. The estimated imputed interest on investment in durable consumption goods. ${ }^{1}$

The great disparity between the total income of the farm population and that of the non-farm population, as shown in the table, is due to the fact that farm prices are used in estimating the value of that large proportion of the farmer's income consisting of commodities grown on the farm itself. Non-farmers, when purchasing similar commodities, pay considerably higher than farm prices. In the main, however, the differences in the size of the incomes of the farm and non-farm population in the various States are real.

It is worth noting that the income of the farm population, being chiefly entrepreneurial in character, is subject to greater fluctuations than is that of the non-farm population. The income of the nonfarm population is steadied by the presence of a large amount of wages and salaries which have a more even distribution in time than have entrepreneurial gains. The diversity of industry also helps to steady the non-farm income. The two factors then, namely, the predominance of entrepreneurial activity and the lack of diversity of industry, - are mainly responsible for the fact that

[^2]TABIE XLV.-SHARES OF THE TOTAL INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES RECEIVED BY FARM AND NON-FARM POPULATION IN EACH STATE, 1919-1920-1921
Dollars ( 000 's Omitted)

| State and. Geographic | 1919 |  | 1920 |  | 1921 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Farm Population | Non-Farm Population | Farm <br> Population | Non-Farm <br> Population | $\begin{gathered} \text { Farm } \\ \text { Population } \end{gathered}$ | Non-Farm Population |
| Continental United States | 10,477,031 | 55,718,669 | 11,704,105 | 60,676,260 | 5,008,862 | 79,417,805 |
| New England. | 191,862 | 5,163,255 | 367,069 | 5,488,098 | 360,540 | 7,768,738 |
| Maine..... | 69,381 | 358,199 | 75,438 | 397,134 | 85,862 | 530,193 |
| New Hampshire | 14,084 | 246,675 | -29,419 | 262,385 | 45,340 | 344,604 |
| Vermont. | 32,212 | 143,366 | 80,849 | 155,623 | 57.008 | 204,561 |
| Massachusetts | 41,815 5,967 | $3,015,261$ 449,016 | 100,089 11,709 | $3,253,621$ 448,352 | 88,167 9,782 | 4,600,749 . 723.309 . |
| Connecticut. | 28,403 | 950,738 | 69,565 | 970,983 | 74,381 | 1,365,322 |
| Middle Atlantic | 634,940 | 16,874,237 | 1,253,319 | 17,818,784 | 787,882 | 25,708,765 |
| New York. | 326,523 | 8,915,078 2 218,293 | 658,864 | $8,99,0445$ <br> 2,533 | 442,058 | 14,359,999 |
| New Jersey. | -549,471 | 2,640,866 | 1258,888 <br> 68 | 6,294,558 | 68,862 $\mathbf{2 7 6 , 9 6 2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{3 , 3 3 4 , 5 2 3} \\ & 8,014,243 \end{aligned}$ |
| East North Central. | 1,827,746 | 12,769,001 | 2,136,344 | 14,259,460 | 798,769 | 17,022,884 |
|  | 432,898 | 3,556,481 | 278,576 | 3,815,119 | 219,450 | 4,433,988 |
| Indiana | 381,477 | 1,399,169 | 181,714 | 1,631,925 | - 256 | 1,722,088 |
| Illinois | 480,606 | 4,508,438 | 482,894 | 4,937,980 | 54,143 | 6,525,642 |
| Michigan | 203.203 | 2,203,977 | 501,099 | 2,591,601 | 191,558 | 2,798,474 |
| Wisconsin | 329,562 | 1,100,936 | 692,061 | 1,282,835 | 333,874 | 1,542,692 |
| West North Central. | 2,580,276 | 5,391,318 | 2,433,770 | 6,038,073 | 144,680 | 6,876,010 |
| Minnesota | 431,145 | 1,078,901 | 554,815 | 1,215,390 | 106,437 | 1,485,794 |
| Iowa. | 703,691 | 1,114,770 | 298,760 | 1,120,278 | -91,177 | 1,149,504 |
| Missouri. | 358,874 | 1,541,907 | 384,535 | 1,733,173 | -56,910 | 2,190,914 |
| North Dakota | 122,613 | 117,719 | 262,153 | 199,482 | 74,284 | 199,414 |
| South Dak | 324,229 | 251,893 | 233,639 | 250,211 | - 2,481 | 204,218 |
| Nebraska. | 392,701 | 601,380 | 207,801 | 575,751 | 31,045 | 696,027 |
| Kansas. | 247,023 | 684,748 | 492,067 | 943,788 | 83,482 | 950,139 |
| South Atlantic | 1,548,808 | 4,761,479 | 1,360,148 | 4,976,294 | 680,911 | 6,410,571 |
| Delaware. | 14,744 | 139,513 | 16,686 | 115,060 | 8,948 | 193,535 |
| Maryland. | 68,341 | 886,749 | 89,470 | 932,237 | 61,275 | 1,286,801 |
| Dist. of Columbia. | 254 | 437,354 | 497 | 443,822 | 391 | 702,129 |
| Virginia | 165,176 | 748,742 | 278,909 | 795,914 | 106,300 | 985,527 |
| West Virginia | 65,135 | 575,794 | 130,134 | 731,767 | 65,891 | 820,991 |
| North Carolina. | 412,586 | 569,219 | 328,603 | 591,370 | 245,493 | 735,831 |
| South Carolina | 351,029 | 382,837 | 171,799 | 327,610 | 43,341 | 361,542 |
| Georgia | 418,247 | 694,990 | 211,103 | 659,553 | 91,614 | 831,545 |
| Florida. | 53,296 | 326,281 | 132,947 | 378,961 | 57,658 | 492,670 |
| East South Central. | 933,881 | 2,064,829 | 619,306 | 2,184,861 | 558,148 | 2,822,177 |
| Kentucky. | 183,583 | 647,770 | 103,083 | 740,859 | 125,151 | 978,397 |
| Tennessee. | 183,062 | 582,629 | 223,859 | 659,709 | 131,928 | 826,837 |
| Alabama | 248,972 | 517,366 | 164,972 | 259,630 2 | 155,457 14512 | 645,571 371,372 |
| Mississippi. | 318,264 | 317,064 | 127,392 | 224,663 | 145,612 | 371,372 |
| West South Central. | 1,802,028 | 3,469,659 | 1,450,127 | 3,783,317 | 640,954 | 4,528,235 |
| Arkansas. | 238,633 | 339,318. | 209,884 | 354,715 | 121,757 | 430,177 |
| Louisiana. | 212,239 | 605,281. | 104,145 | 638,773 | 76,862 | 816,306 |
| Oklahom | 413,233 | 765,397. | 348,750 | - 852,050 | 98,786 | 869,503 |
| Texas.. | 937,923 | 1,759,663 | 787,348 | 1,937,781 | 343,549 | 2,412,249 |
| Mountain. | 319,048 | 1,497,743 | 729,970 | 1,771,365 | 300,706 | 2,118,442 |
| Montana | -50,423 | 227,528 | 67,752 | 268,809 | 19,760 | 305,784 |
| Idaho. | 153,305 | 168,592 | 140,918 | 170,441 | 85,059 | 201,662 |
| Wyoming | 11,928 | 95,638 | 32,613 | 124,278 | 24,566 | 169,623 |
| Colorado | 99,907 | 476,432 | 250,155 | 567,763 | 80,722 | 742,450 |
| New Mexi | 24,442 | 104,960 | 71,576 | 129,349 | 34,131 | 154,183 |
| Arizona | 48,559 | 192,037 | 75,916 | 230,981 | 36,131 | 218,792 |
| Utah. | 33,425 $-2,095$ | $\begin{array}{r} 186,493 \\ 46,063 \end{array}$ | 77,242 13,798 | 214,754 64,990 | 38,050 2,287 | 255,495 70,453 |
| Pacific | 638,442 | 3,727,148 | 1,354,052 | 4,356,008 | 736,272 | 6,161,983 |
| Washingto | 190,081 | 854,103 | 220,202 | 865,879 | 149,385 | 1,166,804 |
| Oregon. | 136,598 | 453,968 | 218,400 | 482,160 | 92,986 | 584,487 |
| Californ | 311,763 | 2,419,077 | 915,450 | 3,007,969 | 493,901 | 4,410,692 |

TABLE XLVI.- DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL CURRENTa INCOME BY FARM AND NON-FARM POPULATION IN EACH STATE, 1919

| State and Geographic Division | Total Amount Dollars (000's Omitted) |  |  |  | Per Capita or per family (Dollars) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entire Population | Non-FarmPopulation | Farm Population |  | Per Capita $\underset{\text { Entire }}{\text { Eopulation }}$ | Per Capita Non-FarmPopulation | Per Capita $\underset{\text { Population }}{\text { Farm }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per Farmer } \\ & \text { (amidy) } \\ & \text { Family } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $\underset{\text { (and }}{\text { Farmers }}$ <br> Families) | Agri${ }_{\text {Employees }}^{\text {cultural }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Continental United States. | 64,514,671 | 53,075,634 | 9,948,326 | 1,490,711 | 614 | 723 | 362 | 1,559 |
| New England | 5,260,058 | 5,006,091 | 192,364 | ${ }^{61,603}$ | 715 | 744 | 406 | 1,268 |
| Maine. | 414,381 | 336,934 | 66,525 | 10,922 | 540 | 592 | 392 | 1,402 |
| New Hampshire | 255,379 | 232,886 | 17,152 | 5,341 | 578 | 636 | 296 | , 858 |
| Vermont. | 179,603 | 137,201 | 33,778 | 8,624 | 509 | 602 | 339 | 1,184 |
| Massachusetts | 3,002,722 | 2,942,313 | 41,159 | 19,250 | 785 | 794 | 510 | 1,355 |
| Rhode Island | 441,225 966748 | 433,343 923,414 | $\begin{array}{r}5,448 \\ \hline 28\end{array}$ | 2,434 | 734 | 739 | 521 | 1,404 |
| Connecticut | 966,748 | 923,414 | 28,302 | 15,032 | 707 | 725 | 464 | 1,311 |
| Middle Atlantic | 17,264,769 | 16,404,687 | 718,919 | 141,163 | 781 | 812 | 507 | 1,731 |
| New York. | 9,258,694 | 8,828,445 | 357,725 | 72,524 | 897 | 928 | 537 | 1,892 |
| New Jersey | 2,271,831 | 2,190,608 | 61,179 | 20,044 | 727 | 735 | 565 | 2,130 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,734,244 | 5,385,634 | 300,015 | 48,595 | 662 | 698 | 368 | 1,517 |
| East North Central. | 14,260,618 | 12,160,436 | 1,835,449 | 264,733 | 669 | 742 | 427 | 1,713 |
| Ohio. | 3,802,534 | 3,370,548 | -379,897 | 52,089 | 666 | 738 | 379 | 1,497 |
| Indiana | 1,599,921 | 1,263,284 | 299,860 | 36,777 | 548 | 628 | 371 | 1,479 |
| Illinois. | 4,991,251 | 4,394,227 | 510,129 | 86,895 | 775 | 822 | 544 | 2,182 |
| Michigan. | 2,405,624 | 2,097,144 | 272,367 | 36,113 | 664 | 756 | 363 | 1,403 |
| Wisconsin | 1,461,288 | 1,035,233 | 373,196 | 52,859 | 559 | 610 | 463 | 1,997 |
| West North Central. | 7,267,946 | 4,875,477 | 2,024,133 | 368,336 | 582 | 666 | 463 | 1,864 |
| Minnesota | 1,352,021 | 987,854 | 310,478 | 53,689 | 570 | 670 | 406 | 1,755 |
| Iowa.... | 1,477,907 | 927,022 | 474,486 | 76,399 | 617 | 657 | 559 | 2,249 |
| Missouri. ${ }^{\text {North Dakota }}$ | 1,857,876 | 1,465,567 | 348,059 | 44,250 | 547 | 670 | 324 | 1,335 |
| North Dakota | 332,550 | 131,330 | 161,705 | 39,515 | 517 | 529 | 510 | 2,105 |
| South Dakot | 435,034 | 192,550 | 208,516 | 33,968 | 686 | 708 | 669 | 2,823 |
| Nebraska. | 772,514 | 490,356 | 234,048 | 48,110 | 598 | 694 | 483 | 1,901 |
| Kansas. | 1,040,044 | 680,798 | 286,841 | 72,405 | 589 | 663 | 487 | 1,751 |


TABLE XLVII.-DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL CURRENT INCOME a BY FARM AND NON-FARM POPULATION



|  | NNかなe |  |  NㅓㅇㅓNNN <br>  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\text { To }{ }^{\circ}{ }_{N}^{\infty}$ |  | NOWN ㅇ్ㅈ్NN |  <br>  | Nonํ |
|  NNOGNNNHON | 엉Nㅋㅇ |  | N○耳 Mnoige <br>  | 능ํํ송 がNO |
|  | N ल్ల్ల స్ |  |  Y 0 | ON NOO がN゙ロ |
| BNWNN祭豕ON －NONNDONFN ヘ్తి |  |  |  <br>  <br>  |  |
| － <br> NNNNMOOOT $\underset{\sim}{n}$ |  K№． 0 ท－${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ 수억잉 |  |  <br>  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |  | サNロがあがロN゚ いけ <br>  <br>  |  |
|  | サペかに Hico － 0 <br>  N |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE XLVIII.-DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL CURRENT ${ }^{a}$ INCOME BY FARM AND NON-FARM POPULATION IN EACH STATE, 1921

| State and Geographic Division. | Total Amount Dollars (000's Omitted) |  |  |  | Per Capita or per Family |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entire Population | Non-Farm Population | Farm Population |  | Per Capita Entire <br> Population | Per Capita Non-Farm Population | Per Capita Farin Population | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per Farmer } \\ & \text { (and } \\ & \text { Family) } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Farmers } \\ & \text { (and } \\ & \text { Families) } \end{aligned}$ | Agricultural Employees |  |  |  |  |
| Continental United States. | 59,720,695 | 53,837,177 | 4,475,942 | 1,407,576 | 551 | 701 | 186 | 701 |
| New England | 5,321,273 | 5,047,814 | 203,679 | 69,780 | 703 | 727 | 437 | 1,342 |
| Maine.... | 421,522 | 354,240 | 55,670 | 11,612 | 546 | 617 | 341 | 1,173 |
| New Hampshire | 257,565 | 228,789 | 22,888 | 5,888 | 579 | 620 | 379 | 1,145 |
| Vermont. | 181,373 | 132,842 | 39,460 | 9,071 | 515 | 585 | 387 | 1,384 |
| Massachusetts | 3,084,579 | 3,016,587 | 45,448 | 22,544 | 781 | 788 | 574 | 1,496 |
| Rhode Island. | 463,963 | 456,271 | 4,896 | 2,796 | 753 | 759 | 508 | 1,262 |
| Connecticut | 912,271 | 859,085 | 35,317 | 17,869 | 636 | 641 | 570 | 1,636 |
| Middle Atlantic | 17,693,699 | 16,995,337 | 539,382 | 158,980 | 775 | 811 | 422 | 1,299 |
| New York | 9,796,835 | 9,420,405 | 292,973 | 83,457 | 921 | 958 | 470 | 1,552 |
| New Jersey | 2,270,664 | 2,210,416 | 38,125 | 22,123 | 692 | 705 | 419 | 1,327 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,626,200 | 5,364,516 | 208,284 | 53,400 | 630 | 672 | 276 | 1,053 |
| East North Central | 12,773,714 | 11,705,693 | 803,658 | 264,363 | 578 | 680 | 217 | 750 |
| Ohio . . . . . . . . . | 3,232,299 | 3,016,111 | 165,411 | 50,777 | 542 | 626 | 190 | 652 |
| Indiana | 1,382,270 | 1,259,977 | 86,955 | 35,338 | 465 | 610 | 135 | 429 |
| Illinois. | 4,706,273 | 4,523,962 | 93,966 | 88,345 | 707 | 814 | 166 | 402 |
| Michigan | 2,097,538 | 1,880,889 | 180,384 | 36,265 | 546 | 628 | 255 | 929 |
| Wisconsin | 1,355,334 | 1,024,754 | 276,942 | 53,638 | 504 | 579 | 359 | 1,482 |
| West North Central. | 5,675,507 | 4,940,160 | 414,424 | 320,923 | 446 | 655 | 142 | 382 |
| Minnesota...... | 1,130,129 | 1,002,873 | 81,838 | 45,418 | 462 | 647 | 142 | 463 |
| Iowa. | 1,036,307 | 1,901,313 | 66,424 | 68,570 | 425 | 621 | 137 | 315 |
| Missouri | 1,715,593 | 1,565,940 | 106,056 | 43,597 | 501 | 708 | 124 | 407 |
| North Dakota. | 209,362 | 135,679 | 39,515 | 34,168 | 317 | 512 | 187 | 514 |
| South Dakota. | 216,613 | 162,164 | 28,317 | 26,132 | 335 | 569 | 150 | 383 |
| Nebraska. | 548,182 | 490,299 | 21,035 | 36,848 | 417 | 670 | 99 | 171 |
| Kansas. | 819,321 | 681,892 | 71,239 | 66,190 | 459 | 652 | 186 | 435 |



## THE PER CENT OF

THE TOTAL CURRENT NATIONAL INCOME GOING TO THE INHABITANTS OF EACH STATE 1919-1920-1921
states arrayed on the basis of the 1919 percentages


Chart 9

## THE PER CAPITA CURRENT INCOME IN EACH STATE ENTIRE POPULATION

1919-1920-1921
STATES ARRAYED ACCORDING TO THE SIZE OF PER CAPITA CURRENT INCOME IN 1919

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Bank } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { state } \\ 1919 \end{gathered}$ | Por capt ta Curzent Income (Dallapa) |  |  | 8tate | Par capite Currant Income 1919 and 1921 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 |  | $\$ 500$ |
| 1 | 955 | 1.093 | 1,174 | Diat. of Columbis |  |
| 2 | 897 | 1.012 | 221 | New York | - |
| 3 | 872 | 944 | 805 | Hevada |  |
| 4 | 864 | 864 | 749 | Hzoming |  |
| 5 | 839 | 989 | 898 | California |  |
| 6 | 75 | 939 | 781 | Massadhusetts |  |
| 7 | 275 | 810 | 207 | Illinois |  |
| 8 | 143 | 669 | 557 | Delavare |  |
| 9 | 734 | 862 | 753 | Phode Island |  |
| 10 | 727 | 816 | 692 | New Jercoy |  |
| 11 | 722 | 716 | 618 | Oragon. |  |
| 12 | 218 | 732 | 679 | Tahingtion |  |
| 13 | 707 | 830 | 636 | connactiant. |  |
| 14 | 689 | 726 | 504 | Arisona |  |
| 15 | 686 | 479 | 335 | 8outh Dakots |  |
| 16 | 677 | 715 | 619 | colorade |  |
| 12 | 666 | 743 | 548 | Oh1o |  |
| 18 | 664 | 767 | 546 | Michigen |  |
| 19 | 662 | 769 | 630 | Penneylvania |  |
| 30 | 657 | 732 | 613 | Maryland |  |
| 21 | 620 | 608 | 492 | Moptana |  |
| 22 | 617 | 530 | 425 | lowa |  |
| 23 | 613 | 577 | 458 | Idaho | browermerromer |
| 24 | 598 | 534 | 417 | Hobraska |  |
| 25 | 589 | 591 | 459 | Kanaes | - 1 - |
| 26 | 578 | 679 | 579 | How Happshire |  |
| 27 | 570 | 559 | 462 | Minuesote |  |
| 28 | 559: | 622 | 504 | Misconsin |  |
| 29 | 548 | 606 | 465 | Indiana | [0.00200000000 |
| 30 | 547 | 578 | 501 | Mhasouri |  |
| 12 | 540 | 621 | 546 | Haine | 7005005000000008 |
| 52 | 537 | 554 | 451 | Utah | -107000000000 |
| 38 | 517 | 444 | 317 | Forth Daxota |  |
| 38 | 515 | 544 | 433 | Teras | . 2001000001080 |
| 35 | 515 | 518 | 366 | Oklahoma | -8-0r-r-r- |
| 36 | 509 | 607 | 515 | Yexpent | 20700000000000 |
| 37 | 462 | 469 | 403 | How textoo | - |
| 38 | 446 | 556 | 431 | Vegt Yinginia | [0000001000 |
| 39 | 412 | 420 | 154 | Loulsiama | 7107007000 |
| 40 | 408 | 428 | 370 | Frorida | 5-10-1-70 |
| 41 | 402 | 425 | 346 | V1ERinds | -0000000 |
| 12 | 390 | 321 | 226 | South carolina | -2000- |
| 43 | 379 | 332 | 257 | Oapagia. | -000007 |
| 4 | 378 | 399 | 340 | Kentucky |  |
| 45 | 367 | 345 | 274 | Horth Carolina |  |
| 46 | 352 | 314 | 252 | Arkaneae |  |
| 47 | 246 | 352 | 310 | Tennessea | 60000000 |
| 48 | 328 | 253 | 207 | IIsai anippi | \%-10707 |
| 49 | 321 | 302 | 250 | Alabama | -10000- |

in 1921 the total income of the farm population in some States actually fell below zero.

## THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE CURRENT INCOME

So far in our analysis, we have given attention to the distribution of the total income received by the American people from all sources. The complete accounting for all the items making up income, of course, increases the precision of the totals in measuring conditions between specified dates, and is for many purposes the only significant way of measuring income. As already noted, however, there are certain comparisons which can better be made if changes in business surpluses or in the value of inventories are entirely ignored. For example, a great gain may occur in the wealth of a given class of people without having a corresponding effect on their demand for merchandise. In 1921, owing to relative changes in the value of securities and real estate as compared to consumption goods, the people of the nation gained nearly $\$ 22,-$ $000,000,000$. Only a fraction of this amount, however, was realized through sales; hence it is highly erroneous to assume that the demand for new goods increased by $\$ 22,000,000,000$. That major proportion of the property of the people of the country which did not change hands during the year probably affected but little the consumption of the owners. People do not vary their expenditures promptly with fluctuations in their income but rather spend in accordance with their habitually realized income, especially when declines or increases in their total income represent merely book and not realized losses or gains.

In addition to the fact that the volume of merchandise purchases is not affected proportionately by changes in the values of inventories, there is also the consideration that a large part of the population is not affected by such property gains or losses. The majority of the people of the United States receive the bulk of their income currently (chiefly as wages and salaries), and the distribution of property holders, especially those with large holdings, is not the same throughout the country. Hence, the inclusion of changes in the value of property introduces a variable which makes the data for the several States less representative of typical conditions with respect to the bulk of the population.

In the following and concluding sections of the analysis, current income will be used in all comparisons. The current income will represent roughly the amount that the people have to spend or to save currently; in other words; the amount that is, so to speak, disbursed to them during the year in the form of actual money, commodities, or services on which a pecuniary value is ordinarily placed. In the following tables, in addition to the surplus and inventory gains, the imputed interest on the value of consumption goods in the hands of consumers has also been eliminated from the totals.

## The Total Current Income by States.

Chart 8 shows graphically the distribution by the different States of the total current income in 1919 and 1921. In addition to the graphic presentation, the chart also contains the numerical data in the form of percentages of the national totals for 1919, 1920, and 1921. This chart shows in a striking manner the relative unimportance of the income of some of the smaller States as compared with that of the few larger States. The people of New York receive about 15 per cent of the total current income of the country; the people of Nevada only one-tenth of 1 per cent. The seven States at the top of the list in 1919, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Massachusetts, California, and Michigan, account for 50 per cent of the total national current income. The seven States at the bottom receive scarcely 2 per cent.

The division of the total current income of the people in each State between the farm and non-farm population is shown in Tables XLVI, XLVII, and XLVIII. In these tables we also have the per capita current incomes in the different States. The per capita figures are here given for four groups of the population, namely, the entire population, the non-farm population, the farm population, and farmers. In computing these per capita incomes, the population figures shown in Table XLIII were used. It will be noticed that the figures representing the farm population were assumed not to have changed in the three years from those reported in the 1920 Census of Agriculture. The number of farmers in each State is also based on the figures of the 1920 Census. From the total number of farms in each State was subtracted the number of


farms operated by managers. The difference presumably gives the number of farmer entrepreneurs. In this case too, the same figures have been used for each of the three years.

## The Per Capita Current Income of the Entire Population.

Chart 9 shows a comparison for different States of the per capita current income received in each State by the entire population. As has been the practice in connection with previous analyses, 1919 is used as the most nearly normal of the three years, and, consequently, the States are arrayed in accordance with the values for that year. The District of Columbia, with the largest proportion of persons gainfully employed, ${ }^{1}$ leads the list in each of the three years. Nevada, which in Chart 8, showing the per cent of total income, was at the bottom of the list, is found to be third highest with regard to per capita current income in 1919. As in the case of average earnings per employee, the southern States appear at the bottom of the array, Mississippi and Alabama being last.

Although the figures represented are in terms of dollars of current purchasing power, the difference in the lengths between the solid black and the shaded bars in the diagram of Chart 9 shows distinctly the effect of the 1921 depression upon the income of the people in the several States. ${ }^{2}$ The agricultural States, as we have already learned, show the greatest decrease in 1921. The most noteworthy feature which appears from the present chart is that, in a few districts, the per capita current income in 1921 was greater than in 1919. The District of Columbia, New York, California, and Rhode Island are instances of this phenomenon.

The change in the per capita current income between 1919 and 1921 in the different sections of the country is disclosed with particular force in Charts 10 and 11. In these outline maps of the United States the shading from white to black indicates gradations in per capita incomes from $\$ 800$ and over down to $\$ 400$ and below. In 1919 the black area was confined to eight States in the southeastern part of the United States. In 1921, however, the area of lowest per capita income spread to comprise twelve States in the

[^3]South and also the two Dakotas. Most of the other States also shifted to darker shadings, indicating a marked decrease in income.

## The Per Capita Current Income of the Non-farm Population.

The composition of the population being widely different in the various States, comparisons of averages or other generalizations referring to all the inhabitants can only be of limited significance. The purchasing value of the dollar is considerably higher on the farm than in the city and, consequently, the per capita income of the farm population may well be somewhat lower than that of the city population without indicating any particular difference in the economic well-being between the two classes of people. It therefore follows that to compare two States with different proportions of farm population would be somewhat misleading, particularly if we are interested in learning the relative economic status of the people in the two States.

Chart 12 gives a comparison of the current per capita incomes of the non-farm populations in the different States. Although the per capita figures still represent heterogeneous classes of society in each State, the elimination of the farm population greatly adds to the significance of the comparison. It will be noticed that the differences, both relative and absolute, between the per capita current incomes in the highest and lowest States are smaller for non-farm population than are those found in Chart 9 , for the entire population. In other words, there appears to be greater uniformity throughout the country in the per capita income of the non-farm population than in that for the entire population. The highest per capita income of the non-farm population in 1919 (District of Columbia) was about twice as great as the lowest. However, for the entire population, as shown in Chart 9, the highest per capita in 1919 was three times as great as the lowest. The same is found to be the case in the other two years when the highest per capita incomes expressed as percentages of the lowest were 217 per cent and 260 per cent for non-farm population, as compared with 432 per cent and 567 per cent for the entire population. Not only do we find greater uniformity in the income of the non-farm population than in that of the entire population when we consider all the States in one year, but this is also true when we compare

CHART 12

## THE PER CAPITA CURRENT INCOME IN EACH STATE NON-FARM POPULATION <br> 1919-1920-1921

states arrayed according to size of
PER CAPITA CURRENT INCOME IN 1919

| Rank <br> of <br> ofete <br> ple <br> 1919 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Por Coplen } \\ \text { Current Incose } \\ \text { (Doll mre) } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Btate | Per capita current incose 1919 and 1921 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1919 | 1920 | 2921 |  | $\$$ |
| 1 | 956 | 2.095 | 1.276 | Diat. of columbia | -0, |
| 2 | 928 | 1.045 | 958 | Hew Yoric |  |
| 3 | 861 | 778 | 667 | Delamare |  |
| 4 | 825 | 977 | 926 | california |  |
| 5 | 822 | 898 | 814 | 1212010 |  |
| 6 | 820 | 972 | 850 | Nevada |  |
| 7 | 811 | 923 | 874 | fyoming |  |
| 8 | 794 | 949 | 788 | Hasbachusetts |  |
| 9 | 259 | 760 | 612 | \%optana | - |
| 19 | 756 | 752 | 678 | Oreson |  |
| 12 | 756 | 881 | 628 | puechigan | 20010, |
| 12 | 751 | 795 | 567 | Arizona |  |
| 13 | 745 | 750 | 716 | mashington |  |
| 14 | 740 | 846 | 716 | maryland |  |
| 25 | 739 | 867 | 759. | Phode leland |  |
| 16 | 738 | 844 | 626 | Ohlo |  |
| 17 | 235. | 828 | 705 | How Jorsey |  |
| 18 | 235 | 850 | 641 | Connegtiout |  |
| 19 | 708 | 649 | 569 | South parota |  |
| 20 | 204 | 773 | 729 | colorado |  |
| 21 | 698 | 817 | 672 | Pempoylvania |  |
| 22 | 694 | 738 | 670 | Tebraska | - |
| 33 | 680 | 736 | 579 | Oxlahoma |  |
| 24 | 670 | 771 | 708 | Missouri | - |
| 25 | 670 | 738 | 647 | panneacta. | -Txaterocomocrome |
| 26 | 666 | 748 | 669 | Texas |  |
| 27 | 663 | 231 | 652 | Ranese |  |
| 28 | 657 | 730 | 621 | Iova |  |
| 29 | 638 | 624 | 551 | Idaho |  |
| 30 | 636 | 742 | 620 | New Hampahiro | - |
| 31 | 628 | 757 | 610 | Indiana |  |
| 32 | 610 | 689 | 579 | wroonsin |  |
| 33 | 602 | 696 | 585 | Vermont | -2000000000000000 |
| 4 | 592 | 706 | 627 | Maine |  |
| 35 | 577 | 626. | 543 | Otah |  |
| 36 | 574 | 667 | 606 | Kentucky |  |
| 37 | 574 | 596 | 528 | Vixginia |  |
| 38 | 564 | 725 | 546 | Weat Virginia | - |
| 39 | 562 | 542 | 478 | Aricaneas | 2101010400100 |
| 40 | 555 | 544 | 438 | South Carolina |  |
| 41 | 552 | 561 | 487 | georeta |  |
| 42 | 547 | 618 | 540 | roulaiana |  |
| 43 | 542 | 508 | 470 | M1801831pp1 |  |
| 44 | 532 | 569 | 536. | Now Moxico |  |
| 45 | 532 | 574 | 529 | Tennesabe |  |
| 46 | 529 | 573 | 512 | North Dakota | - |
| 47. | 500 | 523 | 431 | Yorth carolina | -momocieroron |
| 48 | 483 | 513 | 430 | Alabama |  |
| 49 | 463 | 504 | 450 | morida |  |

the three years for each State separately. In the diagram of Chart 12, the bars representing 1921 more uniformly approach the size of those standing for the 1919 percentages than in the diagram of Chart 9.

In the matter of the rank of the different States, Chart 12 is also at variance with Chart 9. For instance, New Jersey in 1919 ranks tenth in per capita income of the entire population, but it drops to seventeenth place in the per capita income of the non-farm population. Connecticut drops from the thirteenth to the eighteenth place; Rhode Island from the ninth to the fifteenth, and Florida from the fortieth to the forty-ninth. On the other hand, Montana, which ranks twenty-first in the per capita income of the entire population (Chart 9), ranks ninth in the per capita non-farm population. Michigan shifts from the eighteenth place for the entire population to the eleventh for the non-farm population and, in the same manner, Oklahoma rises from the thirty-fifth place to the twenty-third.

## The Per Capita Current Income of the Farm Population.

In Chart 13 the current income of the farm population is subjected to the same treatment as that of the entire population and the non-farm population in Charts 9 and 12. This chart depicts graphically the comparative current income of the farm population in the various States. Perhaps the most striking feature of this chart is the complete disparity in most of the States between the income of the farm population in 1919 and that in 1921. (As in the preceding graphs, the figures represented in Chart 13 are in terms of dollars of current purchasing power, and consequently, owing to the fact that the average prices of goods consumed by farmers were lower in 1921 than in 1919, the differences between farm incomes in the two years are somewhat exaggerated. ${ }^{1}$ ) While in the diagram of Chart 12 the bars representing 1921 in general approach very closely the size of those in 1919, the discrepancy between the 1919 and 1921 values in Chart 13 is very great indeed. In Nebraska, for example, the per capita income of the farm population in 1921 dwindled down to about one-fifth of what it was in

[^4]CHABT . 13.

THE PER CAPITA CURRENT INCOME IN EACH STATE,
FARM POPULATION 1919-1920-1921

STATES ARRAYED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF
PER CAPITA CURRENT INCOME IN 1919

| RankofState1919 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Por capiea } \\ & \text { curyont Income } \\ & \text { (pollare) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | State | Par captia current Income 1919 and 1921 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 |  | $\stackrel{\$ 1,000}{1}$ |
| 1. | 1.064 | 832 | 628 | nerada | -01400000001 |
| 2 | 958 | 746 | 487 | Tyoming | -10000000 |
| 3 | 916 | 1.064 | 726 | callfornia |  |
| 4. | 669 | 347 | 150 | South dakota |  |
| 5 | 630 | 621 | 451 | oroson | -010060000 |
| 6 | 624 | 659 | 533 | Wabhington | -000000000 |
| 7 | 609 | 569 | 328 | coloredo | 5000000 |
| 8 | 587 | 523 | 342 | Idaho | - |
| 2 | 565 | 566 | 419 | New Jorsey | 2010-01000 |
| 10 | 559. | $-240$ | -137 | Iowb | 50 |
| 11 | 544 | 371 | 166 | 1111 nos 8 | 1000 |
| 12. | 537 | 612 | 470 | How York | 2 |
| 13 | 534 | 355 | 268 | Diak. of columbia | -0comor |
| 14 | 533 | 537 | 319 | Arizona |  |
| 15 | 521 | 615 | 508 | Rhode Italand | -1010100108 |
| 16 | 510 | 625 | 574 | Hassachusotta |  |
| 17 | 510 | 360 | 187 | North Dakota | \% |
| 18 | 487 | 395 | 186 | Kancees | 2 |
| 19 | 483 | 284 | 99 | Hebranka | -0 |
| 20 | 464 | 545 | 570 | Connectiout |  |
| 21 | 463 | 496 | 359 | Tisooneln | -0000000 |
| 22 | 449 | 392 | 237 | Utah | 508008 |
| 23 | 427 | 386 | 305 | Montana | -min |
| 24. | 406 | 257 | 142 | Mannosota | 50 |
| 25 | 392 | 374 | 341 | Haine | [000000 |
| 26 | 379 | 327 | 190 | Ohio | -77001 |
| 27 | 375 | 344 | 233 | How Mexiao | 2000 |
| 28 | 372 | 269 | 135 | Indiana | -ron |
| 29 | 368 | 374 | 276 | Ponnaylvania | 0000 |
| - 30 | 363 | 382 | 255 | Mxchigan |  |
| 31 | 360 | 327 | 171 | Toxas | $\square$ |
| 32 | 354 | 298 | 137 | Oklahoma | $\square$ |
| 33 | 348 | 299 | 178 | delaware | P-7 |
| 34 | 339 | 444 | 387 | vermont | - |
| 35 | 324 | 228 | 124 | 418sour | - |
| 36 | 312 | 288 | 168 | Maryland | -1707 |
| 37 | 298. | 192 | 99 | South carolina | -0, |
| 38 | 296 | 372 | 379 | New Hampghire | -20008080 |
| 39 | 277 | 242 | 164 | Florida | -000 |
| 40 | 275 | 217 | 156 | North Caroline | -00 |
| 41 | 256 | 165 | 84 | Georgia | \% |
| 42 | 243 | 192 | 126 | Arkansab | 808 |
| 43 | 241 | 149 | 100 | M188188ippl | $\square$ |
| 44 | 240 | 164 | 108 | Loulalana | Form 1919 |
| 45 | 214 | 202 | 124 | Virginia | Farcoron 1921 |
| 46 | 213 | 120 | 209 | Kentucky | 0 |
| 47 | 207 | 204 | 151 | Tost Virginia | T |
| 48 | 200 | 140 | 109 | Alabama | -000 |
| 49. | 192 | 165 | 122 | Tennobsec | rorr |

1919. Similar reductions are seen all the way along the line. It is, however, curious to note that in New England the per capita income of the farm population was, on the whole, somewhat higher in 1921 than in 1919.

Aside from the discrepancy in the per capita income between the years, we also note that in the case of the farm population the variation in the per capita income in the different States is tremendously large. In 1919 the highest per capita income was about 550 per cent of the lowest; in 1921 the highest was over 725 per cent of the lowest; in 1920 the variation was a little lower. The chief reason for such wide dispersion in the per capita income of the farm population is the difference in agricultural yield per individual, due to differences in fertility, climatic conditions, and the use of capital. Another reason, however, and not the least important, is the difference in per capita ownership by the farm population of farm property and working capital in the various States. The State with a great proportion of tenant farmers or mortgaged farms would naturally show a low per capita income for the farm population, for a considerable portion of the farm income would be distributed among non-farmers.

A characteristic feature, already touched upon in our chapter on agricultural production, is brought out in the graph in connection with the States where dairying and the production of poultry products are of great importance. The per capita income in Wisconsin during the three years is remarkable for its steadiness, especially when compared with the other States in the Middle West adjacent to it. The variation in per capita income of the farm population of Wisconsin, like that of a few other States with a large proportion of agricultural products serving the immediate consumers, such as New York, Pennsylvania, and California, reflects the changes in the general price level of consumers' goods rather than those of agricultural products. Unlike most of the other States where 1919 was the highest year, the per capita income in the group of States typified by Wisconsin was higher in 1920 than in either of the other two years.

## Current Income per Farmer.

The differences in the income of the farm population in the different States and years are best shown in Charts 14 and 15.



In these charts we have outline maps of the United States shaded in accordance with six classes of income per farmer and family. The gradation in shading is here carried out in the same manner as in similar charts appearing previously, i.e., the darker the shading, the lower the income. A glance at the two maps is sufficient to enable one to grasp the appalling economic reverses which overcame the farmers of the country in 1921. In 1919 there was not a single State where the average income per farmer was below $\$ 500$. Only three States showed average incomes below $\$ 1,000$ and in five States the average income per farmer was above $\$ 2,500$. In 1921, however, the darker shades on the map dominated, nine States in the corn and wheat sections of the country and four States in the cotton belt showing incomes per farmer below $\$ 500$. The farmers in two-thirds of the States, representing about threefourths of the area of the country, and comprising 85 per cent of the farm population, received average incomes of less than $\$ 1,000$. Only in one State was the average income per farmer above $\$ 2,000$, and the number of States with average incomes per farmer above $\$ 1,500$ was limited to six.

## The Share of the Farm Population in the Current Income of Each State.

In a previous chapter we had occasion to see that agricultural wages play only a minor part in the total wages and salaries received by all employees. The explanation advanced at that point was that in agriculture the greater share of the work is performed by the farmers themselves and their families. Let us now see how the combined current income of farmers and farm employees compares with the total current income of the entire population of each State. Table XLIX shows for each State the per cent of the total current income in the State received by the farm population in each of the three years. For comparative purposes, a column has also been added to show the per cent of the total population in each State living on farms. We learn that in the Continental United States the farm population, comprising about 30 per cent of the total, receives less than 18 per cent of the total current income of the country. In 1921 the farm population received scarcely 10 per cent.

With the exception of a very few States, the disparity between the percentages representing income and those representing population is very great indeed. In Maryland 19.3 per cent of the population receives only from 9.2 per cent to 5.2 per cent of the total income. In West Virginia, the farm population, comprising 32.7 per cent of the total, obtains from 15.3 per cent to 11.3 per cent of the total income of the State.

To make a fair comparison between the income of the farm population and that of the non-farm population, we must, of course, consider the relative amount of capital involved, and allowance should also be made for the relatively larger purchasing value of farm incomes than those of urban incomes. ${ }^{1}$ However, we may get a general idea of the situation in each part of the country by merely studying the percentages given in Table XLIX. Where does the average income of the farm population most nearly approach that of the non-farm population? Following the previously established practice of selecting 1919 as the most typical of the three years, a ratio has been computed for each division of the percentage which the farm income is of the total income in that year to the percentage which the farm population is of the total population as of January 1, 1920. It is obvious that the closer these ratios approach to unity, the closer is the per capita income of the farm population to that of the entire or non-farm population.

The following is an array of these ratios for the several geographic divisions:

TABLE M.--RATIO OF PERCENTAGE OF FARM INCOME TO PERCENTAGE OF FARM POPULATION

| Rank | Geographic Division | Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pacific | . 99 |
| 2 | Mountain | . 86 |
| 3 | West North Central. | . 80 |
| 4 | West South Central. | . 68 |
| 5 | East North Central. | . 64 |
| 6 | East South Central. | . 62 |
| 7 | Middle Atlantic. | . 59 |
| 8 | South Atlantic . | . 59 |
| 9 | New England. . . . . . . | . 56 |
|  | Continental United States. | . 59 |

TABLE XLIX.-PER CENT OF TOTAL CURRENT INCOME IN EACH STATE RECEIVED BY FARM POPULATION,

| State and Geographic Division | Per Cent of State Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Income |  |  | Population Living on Farms in $1920{ }^{\circ}$ |
|  | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 |  |
| Continental United States... | 17.7 | 13.4 | 9.9 | 29.9 |
| New England | 4.8 | 4.6 | 5.1 | 8.5 |
| Maine. | 18.7 | 15.5 | 16.0 | 25.7 |
| New Hampshire | 8.8 | 9.4 | 11.2 | 17.2 |
| Vermont. . . . . . | 23.6 | 26.0 | 26.8 | 35.5 |
| Massachusetts. | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 3.1 |
| Rhode Island | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 2.5 |
| Connecticut. | 4.5 | 4.4 | 5.8 | 6.8 |
| Middle Atlantic. | 5.0 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 8.5 |
| New York. | 4.6 | 4.6 | 3.8 | 7.7 |
| New Jersey . . | 3.6 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 4.6 |
| Pennsylvania. | 6.1 | 5.3 | 4.7 | 10.9 |
| East North Central. | 14.7 | 11.1 | 8.4 | 22.9 |
| Ohio . . . | 11.4 | 8.6 | 6.7 | 19.8 |
| Indiana. | 21.0 | 13.7 | 8.8 | 31.0 |
| Illinois.... | 12.0 | 7.7 | 3.9 | 16.9 |
| Michigan. | 12.8 29.2 | 11.4 | 10.3 | 23.1 |
| W isconsin. | 29.2 | 27.7 | 24.4 | 35.0 |
| West North Central. | 32.9 | 21.2 | 13.0 | 41.2 |
| Minnesota. | 26.9 | 17.2 | 11.3 | 37.6 |
| Iowa. . : | 37.3 | 18.5 | 13.0 | 41.0 |
| Missouri . . . . | 21.1 | 14.0 | 8.7 | 35.6 |
| North Dakota. | 60.5 | 49.2 | 35.2 | 61.0 |
| South Dakota. | 55.7 | 41.2 | 25.1 | 56.9 |
| Nebraska. | 36.5 34.5 | 23.9 27.8 | 10.6 16.8 | 45.1 41.7 |


| aOmNHNNMNH <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mo Ho o } \\ & \text { min Mo } \end{aligned}$ |  |  <br>  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NNMHNMELTN <br>  |  |  |  <br>  | No |
|  | mornco <br>  |  |  <br>  | ザN心. |
| －$\infty$ NTHmmoco No No $\mathfrak{N}$ | alomer <br>  |  |  <br>  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

In the Pacific States there is apparently the greatest correspondence, if 1919 figures are typical, between the income of the farm population and that of the non-farm population; in New England, we have the greatest divergence. Viewing individual States, we find that in Nevada, Wyoming, and California, the percentage of total income received by the farm population is greater than the percentage of total population living on farms. In North and South Dakota, the percentage representing total income in 1919, and the percentage representing total population, were nearly the same. In other words, in the above five States, the per capita income of the farm population is either higher than or nearly the same as the per capita income of the entire or non-farm population. This fact is also shown in Table XLVI.

Chart 16 gives a graphic picture of the relative importance of the income received by the farm population in the total current income of each State. Only in the Dakotas and Mississippi does the income of the agricultural population surpass 50 per cent of the total, and only four other States show an agricultural income above 40 per cent of the total. In the majority of States the income of the farm population makes up between 20 and 40 per cent of the total.

## THE INCOME OF THE BULK OF THE PEOPLE

For certain purposes a greater refinement of data may be necessary than is shown in the tables presented thus far. To know merely the total income of the people living in the various States may, in some cases, mislead the investigator, and obscure the problem at hand. For instance, given two hypothetical States, $A$ and $B$, with approximately the same number of inhabitants, the first having a total income of $\$ 100,000,000$ and the other of $\$ 125,-$ 000,000 , - in which of the two States are the people more prosperous? Without any further information, one would, of course, be inclined to conclude that in the State with the larger income (the population of the two being equal) the people enjoy greater economic prosperity than in the one with the smaller total income. Such a conclusion may, however, be far from the truth, if the distribution of the income in the two States is radically different. With 100,000 people in each of the two hypothetical States, it is

conceivable that in State A each individual gets $\$ 1,000$, while in State B 100 individuals receive $\$ 40,000,000$, or $\$ 400,000$ apiece, and the other 99,900 individuals receive $\$ 85,000,000$, or only about $\$ 910$ each. In other words, if we desire to know the economic welfare of the majority of the people, the total income by itself or the per capita average of such total is not sufficient. Then again, our problem may be of more immediate and practical application. It is desired to know approximately the amount the people of the two hypothetical States spend on consumption goods. We may assume that in the State with equal distribution there is more money for consumption goods, particularly the goods to be purchased locally, than in the State where a great share of the income goes to a few rich, as the portion of the income saved or spent elsewhere will be greater for the wealthy than for the income distributed among the entire population.

## Higher Incomes Eliminated.

Tables $L$ and LI are the result of an attempt to eliminate the higher incomes in the several States and study only the income of the bulk of the population. These tables give estimates by States for each of the three years of the total income of those depending upon family incomes smaller than $\$ 10,000$ each, also of those depending upon family incomes less than $\$ 5,000$. The amounts recorded are the differences between the totals of current income for the entire population shown in Tables XLVI, XLVII, and XLVIII, and estimates of the total income received in each State by those with incomes $\$ 10,000$ and above and those with incomes $\$ 5,000$ and above. The latter estimates are based upon the Statistics of Income of the U. S. Bureau of Internal Revenue. ${ }^{1}$

It should be borne in mind that the estimates presented in Tables L and LI are in current dollars. The purchasing value of the dollar being different in each of the three years, our classifications, Incomes smaller than $\$ 10,000$ and Incomes smaller than $\$ 5,000$, are, strictly speaking, not identical throughout the period.

In addition to the estimates of the total income received by

[^5]those within the classes specified, estimates have also been made of the total population comprised in these classes. The population has been estimated on the basis of the number of returns in the higher income classes ( $\$ 10,000$ and above, and $\$ 5,000$ and above), and the estimated number of persons per return in each year. ${ }^{1}$

The population comprised in the income classes below $\$ 10,000$ and below $\$ 5,000$ is shown in Tables L and LI for each of the three years as percentages of the total in each State. These percentages, together with those representing the total income within the specified classes, which are also recorded in the tables, present some very interesting facts relative to the distribution of income in each section of the country.

Current Income of the Population in Income Classes Below \$10,000.
Starting with Table L, we learn that in 1919, 99.3 per cent of the total population in the country received only about 90.1 per cent of the total current income, so that about 0.7 per cent of the population, falling into the income classes $\$ 10,000$ and above, received almost 10 per cent of the total current income of the country. In the New England division the share of those with incomes above $\$ 10,000$ was even greater, 0.9 per cent of the population receiving 12.5 per cent of the income. The Middle Atlantic States present an advance in this respect even above New England, 15.2 per cent of the income being received by 1.1 per cent of the population.

Still considering entire geographic divisions, the Mountain States seem to present the least concentration of income in the highest income classes. In this division, 95.7 per cent of the income is received by 99.6 per cent of the population, i.e., in these States the number of people with incomes $\$ 10,000$ and above is quite small, and, what is more important, these higher incomes absorb a relatively smaller portion of the total income than in any of the other divisions.

[^6]TABLE L.-TOTAL CURRENT INCOME IN EACH STATE RECEIVED BY THE POPULATION DEPENDING UPON

| State and Geographic Diviston | 1919 |  |  | 1920 |  |  | 1921 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Amount } \\ & \text { Dollars (000's } \\ & \text { Omitted) } \end{aligned}$ | Per Cent of Total in State |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Amount } \\ & \text { Dollars (000's } \\ & \text { Omitted) } \end{aligned}$ | Per Cent of Total in State |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Amount } \\ & \text { Dollars (000's } \\ & \text { Omitted) } \end{aligned}$ | Per Cent of Total in State |  |
|  |  | Income | Population |  | Income | Popula- tion |  | Income | Population |
| Continental United States. | 58,158,856 | 90.1 | 99.3 | 64,522,985 | 91.6 | 99.3 | 55,350,294 | 92.7 | 99.5 |
| New England | 4,603,503 | 87.5 | 99.1 | 5,680,311 | 90.0 | 99.1 | 4,834,931 | 90.9 | 99.3 |
| Maine.... | 389,433 | 94.0 | 99.6 | -449,118 | 94.1 | 99.5 | 497,089 | 94.2 | 99.6 |
| New Hampshir | 238,424 | 93.4 | 99.5 | 283,856 | 94.2 | 99.5 | 244,760 | 95.0 | 99.7 |
| Vermont. . . . | 167,173 | 93.1 | 99.6 | 200,708 | 93.9 | 99.6 | 173,260 | 95.5 | 99.7 |
| Massachusetts | 2,563,691 | 85.4 | 99.0 | 3,231,969 | 88.8 | 98.9 | 2,780,232 | 90.1 | 99.1 |
| Rhode Island | 383,721 | 87.0 | 99.1 | 461,815 | 88.2 | 99.0 | 411,489 | 88.7 | 99.1 |
| Connecticut. | 861,061 | 89.1 | 99.1 | 1,052,845 | 90.9 | 99.1 | 828,101 | 90.8 | 99.3 |
| Middle Atlantic | 14,643,155 | 84.8 | 98.9 | 17,596,150 | 88.3 | 98.9 | 15,805,318 | 89.3 | 99.1 |
| New York. | 7,486,411 | 80.9 | 98.5 | 9,131,219 | 86.3 | 98.6 | 8,600,780 | 87.8 | 98.1 |
| New Jersey. | 2,028,334 | 89.3 | 99.2 | -2,348,059 | 90.2 | 99.1 | 2,062,072 | 90.8 | 99.2 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,128,410 | 89.4 | 99.3 | 6,116,872 | 90.6 | 99.2 | 5,142,466 | 91.4 | 99.4 |
| East North Central | 13,077,438 | 91.7 | 99.3 | 14,606,458 | 92.3 | 99.3 | 11,879,486 | 93.0 |  |
| Ohio . . . . . . . . . | 3,478,503 | 91.5 | 99.3 | 14,677,360 | 92.2 | 99.3 99.3 | $11,879,486$ $3,001,739$ | 93.0 92.9 | 99.5 |
| Indiana | 1,521,850 | 95.1 | 99.6 | 1,695,793 | 95.0 | 99.6 | 1,323,324 | 95.7 | 99.7 |
| Illinois. . | 4,487,162 | 89.9 | 99.1 | 4,787,521 | 90.6 | 99.1 | 4,294,103 | 91.2 | 99.3 |
| Michigan. | 2,197,572 | 91.4 | 99.5 | 2,648,529 | 93.0 | 99.4 | 1,965,761 | 93.7 | 99.6 |
| Wisconsin | 1,392,351 | 95.3 | 99.6 | 1,557,255 | 94.6 | 99.6 | 1,294,559 | 95.5 | 99.7 |
| West North Central | 6,809,949 | 93.7 | 99.5 | 6,457,589 | 93.2 | 99.4 | 5,444,170 | 95.9 |  |
| Minnesota..... | 1,266,842 | 93.7 | 99.5 | 1,249,568 | 93.1 | 99.5 | 1,444,170 | 95.9 94.5 | 99.7 99.7 |
| Iowa.... | 1,396,363 | 94.5 | 99.4 | 1,162,102 | 90.9 | 99.2 | 1,022,023 | 94.5 98.6 | 99.7 99.8 |
| Missouri..... | 1,677,715 | 90.3 | 99.5 | 1,821,324 | 92.4 | 99.4 | 1,608,924 | 93.8 | 99.6 |
| North Dakota | 325,936 420,954 | 98.0 | 99.8 | 283,427 | 98.2 | 99.9 | 207,043 | 98.9 | 99.9 |
| South Dakota | 420,954 725,312 | 96.8 94.0 | 99.7 99.4 | 294,346 | 96.3 | 99.7 | 213,681 | 98.7 | 99.9 |
| Kansas... | 996,827 | 94.0 95.8 | 99.4 99.7 | 645,535 $1,001,287$ | 92.8 95.6 | 99.4 99.6 | 526,736 797 | 96.1 | 99.8 |


| ஈmッomnooonn <br>  |  | $\infty \quad 0 \infty \infty$ ஷigigig |  융ㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mos. } \\ & \text { ig Bioj } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  |  |  ட்ல゙め゙88 |  <br>  |  ๙ธஜக8 |
|  －$\infty$ ず <br>  | Nஜ゚여엉 misio耳促品荗 N |  |  |  |
|  <br>  | $\infty$ NNo <br>  | Nower igigigi |  <br>  |  |
|  | ก $\infty \infty \propto \infty$ にずかめ゚め |  |  <br>  |  |
|  $\circ 0_{0} 0^{\circ}$ H คペ <br>  ${ }^{-}$ |  |  |  <br>  ヘิฑ <br>  |  |
| ○ーOONTMNNo <br>  | NNN N <br>  | $0 \infty$ 人 288888 | ーNNササが心N ஷigisigigigig | Mino |
| －OONOONNN <br>  | $\pm \infty \infty 0$ <br>  | －ロロート ぶウ்がが | NOTNCOLON <br>  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  Nㅓㅇ№m |  |  |  $\mathfrak{N}$ <br>  <br>  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

For individual States, North Dakota shows the minimum "spread" between the percentages of income and population at the point of incomes of $\$ 10,000$ each. In 1919 only 2 per cent of the total income in that State went to the 0.2 per cent of the total population who received incomes of $\$ 10,000$ and above. The greatest disparity between the percentage of total income and that of total population (at the point of incomes of $\$ 10,000$ each) is found in New York, where 98.5 per cent of the population received only 80.9 per cent of the total current income, which means that 1.5 per cent of the population with incomes $\$ 10,000$ and above got over 19 per cent of the total current income in the State. This would seem to indicate that, although the per capita income of the entire population in the State of New York is comparatively high, the per capita income of the majority falling within the lower income classes may not make as favorable a showing.

It is of interest to note that in 1920, and especially in 1921, the lower incomes almost invariably comprised a greater share of the total current income than in 1919, or that there was a greater approach to an even distribution of income in the second and third years, chronologically, than in the first. In 1920, which presumably was a prosperous year, the lower incomes apparently gained proportionately more than the higher ones, and during the 1921 depression the reduction in the higher incomes was greater than in the lower. In 1921 only 0.5 per cent of the total population received incomes $\$ 10,000$ and above. The total amount comprised in the higher incomes was only 7.3 per cent of the total current income, as compared with 9.9 per cent in 1919. A considerable portion of the apparent reduction in the higher incomes subsequent to 1919 may, of course, be due to the fact that the large income tax payers increasingly found methods of avoidance which resulted in greater underreporting on their income tax returns. Unfortunately, there is no way of measuring this. The greatest relative reduction in the higher incomes in 1921 seems to have taken place in Delaware, where the per cent of total current income received by those with incomes of $\$ 10,000$ and above changed to 7.1 per cent from 17.1 in 1919. In New York, also, we see a very great reduction in the current income in the higher income classes, as compared with that in the lower income classes. As a matter of fact, the situation
in New York was very peculiar. In the face of a considerable reduction in the current income of the higher income classes, there was an increase over 1919 in the current income received by those depending upon incomes smaller than $\$ 10,000$. Somewhat the same situation obtained in California, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia, and, to a lesser degree, in New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Current Income of the Population in Income Classes Below \$5,000.
We have seen that less than 1 per cent of the population is included in income classes $\$ 10,000$ and above; but even incomes between $\$ 5,000$ and $\$ 10,000$ are comparatively rare, particularly in some States. Table LI presents a study of the income of the people in each State with incomes smaller than $\$ 5,000$. Fully 98 per cent of the total population apparently falls within this class. It would seem that, normally, this class receives about 85 per cent of the total current income, the individual States presenting considerable variation in this respect. During the three years, this class accounted for only about 75 per cent of the total current income in New York, and for about 95 per cent in New Mexico. As in the case of incomes $\$ 10,000$ and above, New York had proportionately a greater number of people with incomes more than $\$ 5,000$ than any other State. But even here, only 3.5 per cent of the population fell in this class in 1919. The smallest number of incomes $\$ 5,000$ and above was in Alabama, only 0.6 per cent of the population in the State enjoying such incomes in 1919.

## Distribution of Income by Specified Income Classes by Geographic Divisions.

That there is quite a different distribution by States of the income falling within different income classes is evident. The effect of the comparatively small number of large incomes in the different sections of the country is illustrated by the figures in Table N giving a comparison for 1919 of the percentage distribution by geographic divisions of the total current income received by the population included in the income classes discussed in connection with Tables $\mathbf{L}$ and LI.
TABLE LI--TOTAL CURRENT INCOME IN EACH STATE RECEIVED BY THE POPULATION DEPENDING UPON FAMILY INCOMES SMALLER THAN \$5,000 EACH, 1919-1920-1921

| State and Geographic | 1919 |  |  | 1920 |  |  | 1921 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Amount } \\ & \text { Dollars (000's } \\ & \text { Omitted) } \end{aligned}$ | Per Cent of Total in State |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Amount } \\ & \text { Dollars (O00's } \\ & \text { Omitted) } \end{aligned}$ | Per Cent of Total in State |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Amount } \\ & \text { Dollars (o00's } \\ & \text { Omitted) } \end{aligned}$ | Per Cent of Total in State |  |
|  |  | Income | $\begin{gathered} \text { Popula- } \\ \text { tion } \end{gathered}$ |  | Income | $\begin{gathered} \text { Popula- } \\ \text { tion } \end{gathered}$ |  | Income | $\begin{gathered} \text { Popula- } \\ \text { tion } \end{gathered}$ |
| Continental United States. | 54,959,107 | 85.2 | 98.1 | 61,108,309 | 86.8 | 98.0 | 52,708,018 | 88.3 | 98.5 |
| New England | 4,365,285 | 85.0 | 97.8 | 5,428,991 | 86.0 | 97.6 | 4,593,009 | 86.3 | 97.9 |
| Maine | 370,243 | 89.4 | 98.5 | 429,872 | 90.1 | 98.5 | 380,066 | 90.2 | 98.7 |
| New Hampshire | 227,156 | 89.0 | 98.4 | 272,498 | 90.4 | 98.4 | 234,620 | 91.1 | 98.7 |
| Vermont. | 159,000 | 88.5 | 98.6 | 192,599 | 90.1 | 98.6 | 166,743 | 91.9 | 98.9 |
| Massachusetts | 2,429,998 | 80.9 | 97.5 | 3,092,137 | 84.9 | 97.3 | 2,635,562 | 85.4 | 97.6 |
| Rhode Island | 364,128 | 82.5 | 97.7 | 442,460 | 84.5 | 97.7 | 393,064 | 84.7 | 97.9 |
| Connecticut | 814,760 | 84.3 | 97.7 | 999,425 | 86.3 | 97.5 | 782,954 | 85.8 | 98.0 |
| Middle Atlantic | 13,765,320 | 79.7 | 97.3 | 16,615,238 | 83.4 | 97.1 | 14,907,798 | 84.3 | 97.5 |
| New York. | 6,972,309 | 75.3 | 96.5 | 8,548,467 | 80.8 | 96.3 | 8,075,634 | 82.4 | 96.8 |
| New Jersey | 1,909,084 | 84.0 | 97.7 | 2,222,264 | 85.4 | 97.3 | 1,930,669 | 85.0 | 97.6 |
| Pennsylvania | 4,883,927 | 85.2 | 98.1 | 5,844,507 | 86.6 | 98.6 | 4,901,495 | 87.1 | 98.3 |
| East North Central. | 12,380,566 | 86.8 | 98.0 | 13,879,871 | 87.4 | 98.0 | 11,318,459 | 88.6 | 98.3 |
| Ohio. | 3,312,989 | 87.1 | 98.1 | 3,799,616 | 88.0 | 98.1 | 2,866,953 | 88.7 | 98.6 |
| Indiana | 1,459,131 | 91.2 | 98.6 | 1,629,450 | 91.3 | 98.7 | 1,276,328 | 86.1 | 98.1 |
| Illinois. | 4,175,590 | 83.7 | 97.1 | 4,486,074 | 84.9 | 97.1 | 4,050,618 | 92.3 | 97.8 |
| Michigan | 2,099,669 | 87.3 | 98.3 | 2,540,128 | 89.2 | 98.2 | 1,885,759 | 89.9 | 98.8 |
| Wisconsin | 1,333,187 | 91.2 | 98.7 | 1,424,603 | 86.5 | 98.5 | 1,238,801 | 91.4 | 98.8 |
| West North Central. | 6,376,665 | 87.7 | 98.1 | 6,050,902 | 87.3 | 98.1 | 5,212,942 | 91.9 | 99.1 |
| Minnesota | 1,205,696 | 89.2 | 98.5 | 1,186,477 | 88.4 | 98.4 | 1,026,311 | 90.8 | 99.0 |
| Iowa. | 1,268,031 | 85.8 | 97.2 | 1,027,028 | 80.3 | 96.9 | 958,188 | 92.5 | 99.1 |
| Missouri | 1,586,981 | 85.4 | 98.4 | 1,733,343 | 87.9 | 98.4 | 1,542,113 | 89.9 | 98.8 |
| North Dakota | 312,917 | 94.1 | 98.9 | 275,672 | 95.5 | 99.4 | 202,736 | 96.8 | 99.7 |
| South Dakot | 391,818 | 90.1 | 97.6 | 288,116 | 94.2 | 98.5 | 209,325 | 96.6 | 99.6 |
| Nebraska | 662,270 | 85.7 | 97.4 | 587,812 | 84.5 | 97.6 | 502,801 | 91.7 | 99.0 |
| Kansas. | 948,952 | 91.2 | 98.5 | 952,454 | 90.9 | 98.5 | 771,468 | 94.2 | 99.2 |


|  <br>  |  |  |  i̊영ㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇ | $\infty$ © $0 \cdot$ <br> సigos |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  | －0ッパ <br>  |  | 0 O <br>  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br> $=0^{-1} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ}$ ORo N゙っため |  はis N゙が ${ }^{\circ}$ ザo － |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |
| のONNーバササー <br>  |  |  | がいいいが心の க் |  |
| TOMDOONOOO． <br>  |  <br>  | $-61000$ இ்かை |  <br>  |  |
|  MNOM－MOD－10 － <br> 的 | $\Rightarrow$－ 겅NN かomini 요우 N |  |  <br>  <br>  N్NH |  |
| かッぃーOONOHN <br>  | ㅂㅇN | －－－ 0 に இ் |  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  | Nolos． <br>  |  | －0ッカサッロール <br>  | N15 M |
|  |  NㅓㅇNN べがベー Nㅓㅇํํ $\mathrm{N}^{-}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE N.—DISTRIBUTION OF THE NATIONAL TOTAL CURRENT INCOME RECEIVED BY THE POPULATION WITHIN SPECIFIED INCOME CLASSES BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS

1919

| Geographic Division | Per Cent of National Total in Each Class Received by the Inhabitants of Each Division |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Income Classes | Income Classes <br> Below \$10,000 | Income Classes <br> Below \$5,000 |
| United States. | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| New England | 8.09 | 7.92 | 7.94 |
| Middle Atlantic | 26.45 | 25.18 | 25.05 |
| East North Central. | 22.05 | 22.48 | 22.53 |
| West North Central | 12.04 | 11.71 | 11.60 |
| South Atlantic. | 9.53 | 9.86 | 10.02 |
| East South Central. | 4.53 | 4.96 | 5.02 |
| West South Central. | 7.97 | 7.62 | 7.63 |
| Mountain. | 2.75 | 3.44 | 3.46 |
| Pacific. | 6.59 | 6.83 | 6.75 |

We see that, while the people of the Middle Atlantic division received 26.45 per cent of the total current income of the country, when all incomes are considered, only 25.05 per cent of all the current income falling in classes below $\$ 5,000$ is received in that division. On the other hand, in the Mountain division, where only 2.75 per cent of the total current income of the country is accounted for, the inhabitants received 3.46 per cent of the national total disbursed in the form of smaller incomes below $\$ 5,000$.

## Per Capita Current Income of the 95 Per Cent of the People Included in the Lower Income Classes.

In line with the discussion of Tables L and LI of the preceding sections, we may examine Chart 17 which shows an array of the States according to the estimated per capita income received in 1921 by the 95 per cent of the non-farm population with lowest incomes. The estimates have been computed with the aid of the data presented for each State in the Statistics of Income of the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue. It is obvious that the blank space in each of the bars in the diagram is not the per capita income received by the 5 per cent of the population with highest incomes.

CHART. 17
THE PER CAPITA CURRENT INCOME OF THE NON-FARM POPULATION
ALL URBAN INCOMES AND THE LOWEST 93\% OF all URBAN* incomes

1924
states arrayed according to the size of the per capita current WNCOME OF THE POPULATION IN THE LOWEST $95 \%$ OF ALL URBAN INCOMES

| ParCapita Current Urban Income |  |  |  | State | Per Capita Current Urban'Income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank of State for Amount in Doilars |  |  |  |  | Per capita curient urbanincome |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { LOM2St } \\ 95 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Lewst } \\ 95 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total |  | $\$ 500 \ldots$ |
| 1 | 1 | 1.045 | 1,176 | DIet. of columbla: | $\square$ |
| 2 | 3 | 817 | 926 | California | $\longrightarrow \longrightarrow$ |
| 3 | 4 | 814 | 874 | Wroming | $\square$ |
| 4 | 5 | 808 | 850 | Hovada | $\square$ |
| 5 | 2 | 605 | 958 | Mow York | $\longrightarrow$ : |
| 6 | 6 | 698 | 814 | I112noi: | $\square$ |
| 7 | 7 | 672 | 788 | Mass.zohusatts | 3 |
| 8 | 9 | 654 | 729 | colorado | $\square$ |
| 9 | 10 | 654 | 716 | Vathington | $\square$ |
| 10 | 8 | 642 | 759 | Phodo Ialand |  |
| 12 | 12 | 618 | 708 | M1 maour 1 |  |
| 12 | 17 | 603 | 669 | Toxan | $\square$ |
| 13 | 13 | 598 | 705 | Hew Jorner |  |
| 14 | 14 | 597 | 678 | Oragen | $\square$. |
| 15 | 16 | 593 | 670 | Hobracke | $\underline{\square}$ |
| 16 | 19 | 589 | 652 | Kances | O |
| 17 | 11 | 588 | 716 | Maryland |  |
| 18 | 18 | 576 | 667 | pelamare | T |
| 39 | 15 | 572 | 672 | Pennerlvanis |  |
| 20 | 20 | 562 | 647 | Minnesota |  |
| 21. | 27 | 555 | 611 | Montana | 0 |
| 22 | 28 | 553 | 610 | Indiana | - |
| 23 | 24 | 549 | 621 | Iowa |  |
| 24 | 39 | 547 | 606 | Kentueky | - |
| 25 | 25 | 545 | 620 | Now Rampehire |  |
| 26. | 22 | 544 | 628 | uich1gan |  |
| 27 | 21 | 539 | 642 | connecticut |  |
| 28 | 23 | 538 | 626 | Ohio |  |
| 29 | 26 | 532 | 617 | Maine |  |
| 30 | 33 | 522 | 569 | South Dakota | $\square$ |
| 32 | 34 | 522 | 567 | Arizona | $\square$ |
| 32 | 31 | 509 | 579 | Oklahome | 0 |
| 33 | 35 | 508 | 551 | Idaho | 0 |
| 34 | 30 | 504 | 585. | Vermont | $\square$ |
| 35 | 32 | 498 | 579 | Tieconain |  |
| 36 | 39 | 497 | 536 | Nem Hexico | $\square$ |
| 37 | 37 | 489 | 543 | Deah | $\square$ |
| 38 | 36- | 471 | 546 | Tout Virgania | $\square$ |
| 39 | 40 | 463 | 529 | Tomneaneo | ? |
| 49 | 42 | 463 | 512 | North Dakota | $\square$ |
| 41 | 38 | 459 | 540 | Loulaiana | $\square$ |
| 42 | 41 | 452 | 528 | Virginia |  |
| 43 | 43. | 429 | 487 | 0eorgin | $\square$ |
| 44. | 45 | 419. | 479 | Mians menppi | $\square$ - |
| 45 | 44 | 416 | 478 | Arkaname | Lowest 95\% |
| 46 | 47 | 387 | 438 | 8outh Carolina | $\square \square$ all Population |
| 47. | 46 | 373 | 450 | phorida | - |
| 48 | 49 | 372 | 430 | Alabama | $\square$ |
| 49 | 48 | 351 | 431. | Horth Carelima | - |

- Population not residing on farms.

It is rather the per capita excess income due to the fact that some incomes are higher than those received by the 95 per cent of the population with lowest incomes. In other words, if all the population received, on the average, as much as the 95 per cent with lowest incomes, there would be an additional sum left over which, when distributed equally among all the inhabitants, would be represented by the length of the blank portion of the bars for the different States. The residues may also be viewed as the errors in the per capita income of the 95 per cent of the people with lowest incomes when represented by averages resulting from the division of all the income (including higher incomes) by the total population. We see, for instance, that the per capita error in New York was $\$ 153$, while in New Mexico it was only $\$ 39$.

It should be remembered that, as shown in Tables $L$ and LI, in 1921 the lower incomes were unusually favored in comparison with the higher ones and that, normally, the divergence between the per capitas computed for the 95 per cent of the population with lowest incomes and those based on the total income and the total population would in most instances be greater than shown in the chart. In New York, for example, the 1919 per capita income of the lowest 95 per cent of urban incomes was $\$ 720$, or $\$ 208$ less than the per capita based on all urban incomes in the State.

But even though Chart 17 represents a rather unusual year, we may draw from it conclusions of interest which in a large measure also apply to conditions in other years. It would seem that the length of the blank spaces in the bars of the diagram are good indicators of the nature of the distribution of income among the people in the various States. As already explained, these spaces represent the per capita excess income, going to the richest 5 per cent, over and above the amounts they would obtain under a distribution for the entire population similar to that for the 95 per cent of the population with lowest incomes. In other words, the larger the blank space, the larger the excess received by the rich, and, consequently, the less even the distribution. A glance at the chart shows that the most even distribution (which does not necessarily coincide with the highest per capita income) is found in the Mountain States, and the greatest disparity in the Eastern States, particularly those with large cities.

The practical significance of this chart is, perhaps, that it may. serve as a warning to those interested in the figures of income in connection with special problems. The chart makes clear the fact that per capita income, when based upon the entire population, might not at all fit in with the problem at hand. For instance, in 1921 the per capita income of the entire population in New York was about 13 per cent higher than that of Nevada. However, for the 95 per cent of the population with lowest incomes, the per capita income in Nevada was slightly higher than in New York. Similarly, when the entire population is considered, the per capita income in Maryland in 1921 was identically the same as in Washington. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to imply from this that the majority of the people in the two States were equally prosperous. A further examination of the figures discloses the fact that the per capita income of the 95 per cent of the population in Washington was $\$ 66$ greater, in other words over 11 per cent higher, than in Maryland. Again, we see from the chart that the per capita income of the entire population in Connecticut was higher than in Michigan, New Hampshire, Kentucky, Iowa, Indiana, and Montana. But in all of these States, the bulk of the population (the 95 per cent with lowest incomes) apparently received higher per capita incomes than in Connecticut. It therefore follows that in making use of figures of income extreme care must be exercised in selecting the data to correspond with the conditions of the particular problem under consideration.

## TABLE LII.-OWNERSHIP AND TENANCY OF URBAN HOMES IN EACH STATE, JAN. 1, 1920º

| State and Geographic Division | Per Cent of Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Owned |  | Rented | Total |
|  | Free ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Mortgaged |  |  |
| .Continental United States.. | 27.304 | 9.601 | 63.095 | 100.000 |
| New England |  |  |  |  |
| Maine.... | 34.104 | 6.195 | 59.701 | 100.000 |
| New Hampshire | 30.657 | 7.239 | 62.104 | 100.000 |
| Vermont... | 30.354 | 7.432 | 62.214 | 100.000 |
| Massachusetts. | 21.797 | 10.875 | 67.328 | 100.000 |
| Rhode Island. | 21.053 | 8.881 | 70.066 | 100.000 |
| Connecticut. | 17.623 | 11.270 | 71.107 | 100.000 |
| Middle Atlantic |  |  |  |  |
| New York. | 14.838 | 7.703 | 77.459 | 100.000 |
| New Jersey. | 20.418 | 11.934 | 67.648 | 100.000 |
| Pennsylvania. | 28.545 | 10.973 | 60.482 | 100.000 |
| East North Central |  |  |  |  |
| Ohio . . | 32.403 | 11.754 | 55.843 | 100.000 |
| Indiana. | 34.408 | 11.093 | 54.499 | 100.000 |
| Illinois.. | 26.431 | 10.339 | 63.230 | 100.000 |
| Michigan. | 35.924 | 13.461 | 50.615 | 100.000 |
| Wisconsin. | 37.976 | 12.133 | 49.891 | 100.000 |
| West North Central |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota. . . . . | 37.112 | 11.009 | 51.879 | 100.000 |
| Iowa. | 43.617 | 10.865 | 45.518 | 100.000 |
| Missouri | 25.565 | 8.488 | 65.947 | 100.000 |
| North Dakota. | 36.350 | 9.754 | 53.896 | 100.000 |
| South Dakota. | 41.901 | 11.021 | 47.078 | 100.000 |
| Nebraska. | 39.920 | 12.310 | 47.770 | 100.000 |
| Kansas. | 42.607 | 10.545 | 46.848 | 100.000 |
| South Atlantic |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware. | 26.130 | 12.589 | 61.281 | 100.000 |
| Maryland. | 33.650 | 11.151 | 55.199 | 100.000 |
| Dist. of Columbia. | 20.589 | 9.105 | 70.306 | 100.000 |
| Virginia. | 26.897 | 5.818 | 67.285 | 100.000 |
| West Virginia. | 33.992 | 7.756 | 58.252 | 100.000 |
| North Carolina | 31.400 | 5.314 | 63.286 | 100.000 |
| South Carolina. | 25.884 | 4.721 | 69.395 | 100.000 |
| Georgia. | 22.524 | 4.374 | 73.102 | 100.000 |
| Florida. | 27.144 | 5.627 | 67.229 | 100.000 |

Table LII.-Ownership and Tenancy of Urban Homes in Each State, Jan. 1, $1920{ }^{\circ}$-Continued

| State and Geographic Division | Per Cent of Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Owned |  | Rented | Total |
|  | Free ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Mortgaged |  |  |
| East South Central |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky. | 30.233 | 6.040 | 63.727 | 100.000 |
| Tennessee. | 29.262 | 5.477 | 65.261 | 100.000 |
| Alabama. | 24.314 | 4.795 | 70.891 | 100.000 |
| Mississippi | 30.566 | 4.182 | 65.252 | 100.000 |
| West South Central |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas. | 35.235 | 7.524 | 57.241 | 100.000 |
| Louisiana. | 24.081 | 4.270 | 71.649 | 100.000 |
| Oklahoma. | 34.867 | 9.706 | 55.427 | 100.000 |
| Texas. | 33.089 | 6.605 | 60.306 | 100.000 |
| Mountain |  |  |  |  |
| Montana. | 33.684 | 7.097 | 59.219 | 100.000 |
| Idaho. | 39.905 | 11.527 | 48.568 | 100.000 |
| Wyoming | 32.746 | 9.270 | 57.984 | 100.000 |
| Colorado. | 34.060 | 9.314 | 56.626 | 100.000 |
| New Mexico. | 38.772 | 6.290 | 54.938 | 100.000 |
| Arizona. | 29.022 | 6.465 | 64.513 | 100.000 |
| Utah. | 39.910 | 10.445 | 49.645 | 100.000 |
| Nevada. | 37.831 | 5.336 | 56.833 | 100.000 |
| Pacific |  |  |  |  |
| Washington | 36.650 | 11.697 | 51.653 | 100.000 |
| Oregon. | 36.013 | 10.056 | 53.931 | 100.000 |
| California. | 29.500 | 8.842 | 61.658 | 100.000 |

[^7]TABLE LIII. - AVERAGE FARM PRICES OF GROWN HORSES, 1919, 1920, AND 1921, AND RATIOS OF THESE PRICES TO PRICES OF ANIMALS ON FARM AS OF JANUARY 1 OF EACH YEAR ${ }^{a}$

|  | 1919 |  |  | 1920 |  |  | 1921 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Farm Price 15th of (Horses) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monthly } \\ & \text { Receipts } \\ & \text { Pity } \\ & \text { Prineivat } \\ & \text { Livestock } \\ & \text { Martects } \\ & \text { (000) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Product } \\ & (000) \end{aligned}$ | Farm Price 15th of Month (Horsea) | Monthly Receipt at 8 Principal Markets (000) | $\underset{(000)}{\text { Product }}$ | Farm Price 15tho of Month (Horses) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monthly } \\ & \text { Receipts } \\ & \text { ath } \\ & \text { Principal } \\ & \text { Livestock } \\ & \text { Markets } \\ & \text { (000) } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{\text {Product }}^{\text {(000) }}$ |
| January. | \$120 | 50 | 6,000 | \$118 | 75 | 8,850 | $\$ 96$ | 35 | 3,360 |
| February. | 121 | 43 | 5,203 | 123 | 63 | 7,749 | 98 | 41 | 4,018 |
| March. | 124 | 36 | 4,464 | 127 | 48 | 6,096 | 101 | 44 | 4,444 |
| April. | 127 | 26 | 3,302 | 131 | 22 | 2,882 | 100 | 25 | 2,500 |
| May. | 129 | 17 | 2,193 | 132 | 19 | 2,508 | 98 | 18 | 1,764 |
| June. | 127 | 26 | 3,302 | 130 | 17 | 2,210 | 98 | 14 | 1,372 |
| July . | 127 | 34 | 4,318 | 127 | 21 | 2,667 | 94 | 11 | 1,034 |
| August. | 125 | 49 | 6,125 | 124 | 42 | 5,208 | 93 | 17 | 1,581 |
| September. | 119 | 77 | 9,163 | 119 | 32 | 3,808 | 89 | 22 | 1,958 |
| October. | 114 | 68 | 7,752 | 112 | 20 | 2,240 | 85 | 36 | 3,060 |
| November. | 113 | 71 | 8,023 | 103 | 10 | 1,030 | 82 | 29 | 2,378 |
| December. | 113 | 40 | 4,520 | 97 | 8 | 776 | 81 | 25 | 2,025 |
| Weighted Average and Totals | 120 | $5{ }^{6} 7$ | 64,365 | 122 | 377 | 46,024 | 93 | 317 | 29,494 |
| Ratio of Average-for-year Price to January 1 Price.. | $120 \div 98.5=1.218$ |  |  | $122 \div 94.5=1.291$ |  |  | $93 \div 84=1.107$ |  |  |

-Source: Fear Bouks of the Department of Agriculture - 1919, pp. 654-656; 1920. pp. 724, 725, and 727; 1921, pp. 685-687.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See p. 27, Preliminary Statement.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The more exact measure of welfare is the income per ammain. "An ammain is the gross demand for articles of consumption having a total money value equal to that demanded by the average male in the given class at the age when his total requirements for expense of maintenance reach a maximum." U. S. Public Health Reports, Nov. 26, 1920. See also Income in the United States, Vol. II, p. 233.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ The estimate of this item for the total population in each State has been split into two parts in accordance with the relative size of the farm and non-farm population in the State, the farm population being given a weight of 1 and the non-farm population a weight of 2 .

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ It should of course be remembered that the District of Columbia is also practically all urban.
    ${ }^{2}$ With the exception of goods consumed by farmers, the price level of consumption goods in 1921 was about the same as in 1919.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ It has not been found feasible at this time to compute with accuracy the current income of the different classes of the population in each State in terms of dollars of 1913 purchasing power. The indices of the prices of goods consumed by farmers in all States combined are $1.845,2.001$, and 1.557 for 1919,1920 , and 1921 , respectively $(1913=1.00)$.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Internal Revenue figures were raised 10 per cent in order to allow roughly for under-reporting and income omitted from reports for various reasons; 10 per cent seems to be a very conservative estimate, and it is quite probable that, if anything, it is too low. Consequently, the totals as shown in Tables L and LI may be somewhat high.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ The number of persons per return for all income classes was estimated to be 2.82 in 1919, 2.78 in 1920, and 2.76 in 1921. To arrive at these estimates, the number of returns from heads of families, computed from the income tax figures, was multiplied by 4.2, the number of persons per urban family (Census of Population, 1920, Vol. II, p. 1273). The products were added to the number of returns received from single men and single women. Slight adjustments were made in the final figures so as to take care of the fact that in higher income classes there are slightly fewer people gainfully employed per family than in the lower income classes.

[^7]:    ${ }^{a}$ Based on Census figures,-See Census of Population, 1920, Vol. II, p. 1302.
    ${ }^{6}$ To the Total Homes owned iree, as reported by the Census, were added 0.447 of the Homes reported as owned encumbered. The ratio of 0.447 is an estimate by Dr. W. I. King (based on a study in Milwaukee, Wisconsin) of the average equity of owners in mortgaged urban homes.

