This PDF is a selection from an out-of-print volume from the National Bureau of Economic Research

Volume Title: Income in the Various States: Its Sources and Distribution, 1919, 1920, and 1921

Volume Author/Editor: Maurice Leven

Volume Publisher: NBER

Volume ISBN: 0-87014-006-X

Volume URL: http://www.nber.org/books/leve25-1

Publication Date: 1925

Chapter Title: Summary and Analysis: The Distribution of Total Net Income

Chapter Author: Maurice Leven

Chapter URL: http://www.nber.org/chapters/c5000

Chapter pages in book: (p. 250 - 302)

#### 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



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

Dollars	(000's	Omitted)	
---------	--------	----------	--

STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC	CURRENT	r PURCHASING	VALUE	1913 ]	PURCHASING V	VALUE
DIVISION	1919	1920	1921	1919	1920	192 <b>1</b>
Continental United States	66,195,700	72,380,365	84,426,667	36,994,672	35,283,751	49,007,859
New England.	<b>5,355,117</b>	<b>5,855,167</b>	8,129,278	<b>2,995,442</b>	$\begin{array}{r} \textbf{2,867,410} \\ \textbf{228,959} \\ \textbf{141,584} \\ \textbf{114,403} \\ \textbf{1,647,205} \\ \textbf{226,185} \\ \textbf{509,074} \end{array}$	<b>4,613,344</b>
Maine	427,580	472,572	616,055	237,281		356,101
New Hampshire	260,759	291,804	389,944	144,465		220,557
Vermont	175,578	236,472	261,569	97,598		154,592
Massachusetts	3,057,076	3,353,710	4,688,916	1,713,608		2,650,603
Rhode Island	454,983	460,061	733,091	255,178		413,942
Connecticut	979,141	1,040,548	1,439,703	547,312		817,549
Middle Atlantic	17 <b>,509,177</b>	1 <b>9,072,103</b>	<b>26,496,647</b>	<b>9,844,815</b>	<b>9,385,330</b>	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
Pennsylvania	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	<b>17,821,653</b>	8,152,065	<b>7,993,931</b>	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	3,790,199
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 Central	7,971,594	$\begin{array}{r} \textbf{8,471,843} \\ \textbf{1,770,205} \\ \textbf{1,419,038} \\ \textbf{2,117,708} \\ \textbf{461,635} \\ \textbf{483,850} \\ \textbf{783,552} \\ \textbf{1,435,855} \end{array}$	7,020,690	4,445,221	4,104,906	<b>4,176,806</b>
Minnesota	1,510,046		1,592,231	839,381	856,413	941,035
lowa	1,818,461		1,058,327	1,017,036	689,858	634,869
Missouri	1,900,781		2,134,004	1,064,863	1,034,037	1,252,350
North Dakota	240,332		273,698	133,074	220,772	170,635
South Dakota	576,122		201,737	320,602	232,620	126,086
Nebraska	994,081		727,072	553,189	378,894	435,112
Kansas	931,771		1,033,621	517,076	692,312	616,719
South Atlantic	<b>6,310,287</b>	<b>6,336,442</b>	7,091,482	<b>3,511,345</b>	<b>3,067,107</b>	<b>4,187,388</b>
Delaware	154,257	131,746	202,483	86,759	64,772	116,638
Maryland	955,090	1,021,707	1,348,076	535,965	501,082	775,202
Dist. of Columbia	437,608	444,319	702,520	242,308	215,680	393,128
Virginia	913,918	1,074,823	1,091,827	506,326	518,487	644,907
West Virginia	640,929	861,901	886,882	354,496	416,176	512,352
North Carolina	981,805	919,973	981,324	547,882	444,002	606,879
South Carolina	733,866	499,409	404,883	408,611	240,216	253,052
Georgia.	1,113,237	870,656	923,159	618,122	418,780	563,589
Florida	379,577	511,908	550,328	210,876	247,897	321,641
East South Central	2,998,710	<b>2,804,167</b>	<b>3,380,325</b>	1, <b>669,205</b>	1,353,584	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	348,702	489,028
Mississippi	635,328	352,055	516,984	354,734	169,829	323,519
West South Central	<b>5,271,687</b>	<b>5,233,444</b>	<b>5,169,189</b>	<b>2,939,052</b>	<b>2,530,471</b>	<b>3,134,039</b>
Arkansas	577,951	564,597	551,934	322,158	272 620	337,574
Louisiana	817,520	742,918	893,168	456,970	361 344	529,756
Oklahoma	1,178,630	1,200,800	968,289	656,253	580,658	581,206
Texas	2,697,586	2,725,129	2,755,798	1,503,071	1,315,852	1,685,503
Mountain	1,816,791	2,501,335	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{2,419,148}\\ 325,544\\ 266,721\\ 194,189\\ 823,172\\ 188,314\\ 254,923\\ 293,545\\ 72,740 \end{array}$	1,006 947	1,704.694	1,442,760
Montana	177,105	336,561		97,632	161,498	191,609
Idaho	321,897	311,359		178,040	149,047	164,338
Wyoming	107,566	156,891		59,759	75,501	118,553
Colorado	576,339	817,918		320,188	396,086	481,106
New Mexico	129,402	200,925		71,452	96,275	113,374
Arizona.	240,596	306,897		133,664	147,760	155,821
Utah	219,918	291,996		131,973	140,721	175,146
Nevada	43,968	78,788		24,238	37,806	42,813
Pacific	<b>4,365,590</b>	<b>5,710,060</b>	<b>6,898,255</b>	2,430,580	2,776,018	3,992,976
Washington	1,044,184	1,086,081	1,316,189	578,816	524,930	769,251
Oregon	590,566	700,560	677,473	329,557	339,090	409;845
California	2,730,840	3,923,419	4,904,593	1,522,207	1,911,998	2,813,880

## INCOME IN THE VARIOUS STATES

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. 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 <sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 27, Preliminary Statement.

## 252 INCOME IN THE VARIOUS STATES

#### 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.<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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.

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

_
Omitted)
(000's (

	ЧТ	. POPULATIC	P N(	Non-F	лавм Рории	q NOILY	FARM
STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION	. 6161	1920	1921	1919	1920	1921	FOPULA-
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
v 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	<b>3</b> 3
Middle Atlantic.	22,108	22.417	22,845	20,215	20.524	20.952	1.803
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	206
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 EACH YEAR, 1919-1920-1921 - Continued

	Farm	POPULA-	2 5,172	1 897	2 985	1 1.211	5 395	5 362	2 584	6 738	0 6.417	5 51	1 279		2 1.065	4 478	8 1.501	2 1.075	7 1.685	0 282	
	ULATION <sup>b</sup>	1921	7,54	1,55	1,45	2,21	26	78 78	- 73	1,04	7.88	17	1.20	41	1.29	1,03	1,12	.045	1,26	, 73	
	FARM POP	1920	7,419	1,506	1,428	2,199	256	277	718	1,035	7.656	173	1.179	430	1,257	998	1,077	618	1,226	698	_
	Non-	1919	7,325	1,474	1,410	2,187	248	272	202	1,027	7,493	171	1.163	444	1,231	973	1,040	009	1,196	675	
	P NO	1921	12,714	2,448	2,437	3,422	660	647	1,316	1,784	14,297	226	1,480	412	2,357	1,512	2,629	1,717	2,952	1,012	
s Umitted)	ь Рорилаті	1920	12,591	2,403	2,413	3,410	651	639	1,302	1,773	14,073	224	1,458	431	2,322	1,476	2,578	1,693	2,911	.080	
000)	AL	6161	12,497	2,371	2,395	3,398	643	634	1,291	1,765	13,910	222	1,442	445	2,296	1,451	2,541	1,675	2,881	957	
		STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION	West North Central	Minnesota	Iowa	Missouri	North Dakota	South Dakota	Nebraska	Kansas	South Atlantic	Delaware	Maryland	District of Columbia.	Virginia	West Virginia	North Carolina	South Carolina	Georgia.	Florida	

<sup>•</sup> These estimates are based on the National Totals as estimated by the National Bureau of Economic Research and the relative increase in population in each atte as shown by the Censuses of Population of 1910 and 1920.

<sup>6</sup> The non-farm population represents all the population not residing on farms. It is consequently different from "Urban Population," as reported by the Census. <sup>e</sup> The farm population is taken as reported by the *Census of Agriculture*, 1920 (Vol. V, p. 894). It is assumed that no material changes in numbers have taken place during the three years.

.

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

STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC	Dor Pu	LLARS OF CUR	RENT	D Po	OLLARS OF 19 RCHASING VA	913 LUE
DIVISION	1919	1920	1921	1919	1920	1921
Continental United States	630	680	779	352	332	452
New England Maine. New Hampshire Vermont Massachusetts Rhode Island Connecticut	557 590 497 799 757 716	615 657 672 865 757 746	798 876 743 1,188 1,190 1,004	309 327 276 448 425 400	298 319 325 425 372 365	461 496 439 672 672 570
Middle Atlantic New York New Jersey Pennsylvania	896 761 680	923 834 771	1,392 1,038 929	506 426 380	457 409 377	795 588 527
East North Central Ohio Indiana Illinois. Michigan Wisconsin	699 610 775 664 547	704 616 830 833 746	781 579 989 778 698	388 339 436 372 304	342 299 408 407. 360	446 338 570 452 422
West North Central Minnesota Iowa Missouri North Dakota South Dakota Nebraska Kansas	637 759 559 374 909 770 528	737 588 621 709 757 602 810	650 434 624 415 312 552 579	354 425 313 207 506 428 293	356 286 303 339 364 291 390	384 261 366 299 195 331 346
South Atlantic Delawaro Maryland Dist of Columbia Virginia West Virginia North Carolina South Carolina Georgia Florida	695 662 983 398 442 386 438 386 386 397	588 701 1,031 463 584 357 295 299 522	896 911 1,705 463 587 373 236 313 544	391 372 545 221 244 216 244 215 220	289 344 500 223 282 172 142 144 253	516 524 274 339 231 147 191 318
East South Central Kentucky Tennessee Alabama Mississippi	345 329 328 355	348 377 307 197	452 405 336 289	192 183 182 198	197 182 148 95	270 242 205 181
West South Central Arkansas Louisiana Oklahoma Texas	332 456 587 584	320 411 586 579	309 489 461 572	185 255 327 325	155 200 284 280	189 290 277 350
Mountain Montana Idaho Wyoming Colorado. New Mexico Arizona. Utah Nevada	328 756 560 618 360 736 494 564	603 712 796 864 555 900 645 1,023	557 589 947 850 515 706 633 945	181 418 311 344 199 409 274 311	289 341 383 418 266 433 311 491	328 363 578 497 310 432 . 377 556
Pacific Washington Oregon California	776 759 810	794 888 1,127	941 841 1,347	430 424 451	384 430 549	550 508 773

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	200%
1920	480%
1921 <b></b>	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  $25 \, \text{¢}$ , 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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.

#### TABLE 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)

	19	919	11	920	· 19	)21
DIVISION	Farm	Non-Farm	Farm	Non-Farm	Farm	Non-Farm
	Population	Population	Population	Population	Population	Population
Continental United States	10,477,031	55,718,669	11,704,105	60,676,260	5,008,862	79,417,805
New England	<b>191,862</b>	<b>5,163,255</b>	<b>367,069</b>	<b>5,488,098</b>	360,540	$7,768,738 \\ 530,193 \\ 344,604 \\ 204,561 \\ 4,600,749 \\ 723,309 \\ 1,365,322$
Maine	69,381	358,199	75,438	397,134	85,862	
New Hampshire	14,084	246,675	29,419	262,385	45,340	
Vermont	32,212	143,366	80,849	155,623	57,008	
Massachusetts	41,815	3,015,261	100,089	3,253,621	88,167	
Rhode Island	5,967	449,016	11,709	448,352	9,782	
Connecticut	28,403	950,738	69,565	970,983	74,381	
Middle Atlantic	634,940	16,874,237	1 <b>,253,319</b>	17,818,784	<b>787,882</b>	25,708,765
New York	326,523	8,915,078	658,864	8,99,0445	442,058	14,359,999
New Jersey	58,946	2,318,293	125,888	2,533,781	68,862	3,334,523
Pennsylvania	249,471	5,640,866	468,567	6,294,558	276,962	8,014,243
East North Central	1 <b>,827,746</b>	1 <b>2,769,001</b>	<b>2,136,344</b>	<b>14,259,460</b>	<b>798,769</b>	17,022,884
Ohio	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 Minnesota Nossouri North Dakota South Dakota Nebraska Kansas	<b>2,580,276</b> 431,145 703,691 358,874 122,613 324,229 392,701 247,023	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{5,391,318} \\ \textbf{1,078,901} \\ \textbf{1,114,770} \\ \textbf{1,541,907} \\ \textbf{1,541,907} \\ \textbf{117,719} \\ \textbf{251,893} \\ \textbf{601,380} \\ \textbf{684,748} \end{array}$	2,433,770 554,815 298,760 384,535 262,153 233,639 207,801 492,067	6,038,073 1,215,390 1,120,278 1,733,173 199,482 250,211 575,751 943,788	144,680 106,437 -91,177 -56,910 74,284 - 2,481 31,045 83,482	<b>6,876,010</b> 1,485,794 1,149,504 2,190,914 199,414 204,218 696,027 950,139
South Atlantic Delaware Dist. of Columbia Virginia West Virginia North Carolina Georgia Florida	$1,548,808 \\ 14,744 \\ 68,341 \\ 254 \\ 165,176 \\ 65,135 \\ 412,586 \\ 351,029 \\ 418,247 \\ 53,296 \\ \end{cases}$	4,761,479 139,513 886,749 437,354 748,742 575,794 569,219 382,837 694,990 326,281	$1,360,148 \\ 16,686 \\ 89,470 \\ 497 \\ 278,909 \\ 130,134 \\ 328,603 \\ 171,799 \\ 211,103 \\ 132,947 \\ \end{cases}$	4,976,294 115,060 932,237 443,822 795,914 731,767 591,370 327,610 659,553 378,961	680,911 8,948 61,275 391 106,300 65,891 245,493 43,341 91,614 57,658	6,410,571 193,535 1,286,801 702,129 985,527 820,991 735,831 361,542 831,545 492,670
East South Central Kentucky Alabama Mississippi	<b>933,88</b> 1 183,583 183,062 248,972 318,264	<b>2,064,829</b> 647,770 582,629 517,366 317,064	<b>619,306</b> 103,083 223,859 164,972 127,392	<b>2,184,86</b> 1 740,859 659,709 559,630 224,663	<b>558,148</b> 125,151 131,928 155,457 145,612	<b>2,822,177</b> 978,397 826,83 <b>7</b> 645,571 371,372
West South Central	1 <b>,802,028</b>	<b>3,469,659</b>	1 <b>,450,127</b>	<b>3,783,317</b>	640,954	<b>4,528,235</b>
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
Oklahoma	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 Montana Idaho Wyoming. Colorado New Mexico Arizona Utah. Nevada.	<b>319,048</b> -50,423 153,305 11,928 99,907 24,442 48,559 33,425 -2,095	$1,497,743 \\ 227,528 \\ 168,592 \\ 95,638 \\ 476,432 \\ 104,960 \\ 192,037 \\ 186,493 \\ 46,063 \\ \end{cases}$	729,970 67,752 140,918 32,613 250,155 71,576 75,916 77,242 13,798	1,771,365 $268,809$ $170,441$ $124,278$ $567,763$ $129,349$ $230,981$ $214,754$ $64,990$	<b>300,706</b> 19,760 85,059 24,566 80,722 34,131 36,131 38,050 2,287	2,118,442 305,784 201,662 169,623 742,450 154,183 218,792 255,495 70,453
Pacific	<b>638,442</b>	<b>3,727,1</b> 48	1 <b>,354,052</b>	<b>4,356,008</b>	<b>736,272</b>	<b>6,161,983</b>
Washington	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
California	311,763	2,419,077	915,450	3,007,969	493,901	4,410,692

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

	TOTAL A	MOUNT DOLL	ARS (000'в (	)mitted)	РЕВ САР	ITA OR PER	FAMILY (I	OLLARS)
STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION			Farm Po	pulation	Der Conite	Do- Conità		р Д
	Entire Population	Non-Farm Population	Farmers (and Families)	Agri- cultural Employees	For the Population	For Capita Non-Farm Population	For Capita Form Population	Fer Farmer (and Family)
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
Mame	414,381 255,379	336,934 232,886	66,525 $17,152$	10,922 5.341	540 578	592 636	392 206	1,402
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
Connecticut	441,225 966,748	433,343 $923,414$	$^{5,448}_{28,302}$	2,434 15,032	734	739 725	521 464	1,404 1.311
<sup>5</sup> 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	928 228	537	1,892
Pennsylvania	5,734,244	2,130,000 5,385,634	300,015	20,044 48,595	662	( 35 698	202 368	2,130 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 1,500,021	3,370,548 1 263 284	379,897 200 860	52,089 36 777	666 549	738 690	379	1,497
Illinois	4,991,251	4,394,227	510,129	86,895	775	822	544	2.182
Michigan	2,405,624 1 461 288	2,097,144	272,367 272,106	36,113	664 550	756	363	1,403
Wort North Control	0000(TOT (1	1000,0001	0.001 100	000/20	002	010	C0∓	1,997
Minnesota	7,207,940	4,8/5,4/7 987,854	2,024,133 310.478	308,330 53 689	582	600 670	408 406	1,864 1755
Iowa	1,477,907	927,022	474,486	76,399	617	657	559	2.249
Missouri	1,857,876	1,465,567	348,059	44,250	547	670	324	1,335
South Dakota	435,034	192,550	208,516	33,968	017 686	670 108	010 699	2,105 2,823
NebraskaKansas	772,514	490,356 680 708	234,048 266 e41	48,110	598 508	694	483	1,901
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	110,010,11	0611000	700,071	12,403	600	600	401	167,1

South Atlantic Delaware Maryland	<b>6,188,836</b> 164,962 947,604	<b>4,513,023</b> 147,154 860,627	1,559,130 14,697 68,105	116,683 3,111 18,872	<b>445</b> 743 657	<b>602</b> 861 740	<b>261</b> 348 312	1,357 1,470 1,460
District of Columbia Virginia	424,950 934,655 647,489	424,473 706,616 548,688	454 204,724 91.651	$23 \\ 23,315 \\ 7.150$	955 407 446	956 574 564	534 214 207	2,454 1,112 1,063
North Carolina	932,862	519,847	399,602	13,413	367	555	275 298	1,486 1.583
Georgia.	1,092,184	659,970	410,859	21,355	379	552	256	1,329
Florida	390,773	312,760	65,087	12,926	408	463	277	1,247
East South Central	3,056,463	1,960,708	1,046,480	49,275	345	532	211	866
Kentucky	911,558	633,694 561 279	258,028	19,830	3/8 346	531 531	213	026
Alahama	751.216	484.000	258.484	8,732	321	483	200	1,012
Mississippi	588,036	281,736	298,063	8,237	328	541	241	1,099
West South Central	4,768,689	3,120,209	1,473,884	174,596	469	632	315	1,487
Arkansas.	612,855	334,688	263,141	15,026	352	562	243	1,134
Louisiana	738,518	549,694	165,685	23,139	412	547 200	240	1,231
Ukianoma.	1,039,030	0/4,045 1.561.182	310,904 728,074	93,030	515	999	360	1,679
			- ( <u>-</u>					
Mountain	2,090,628	1,460,933	506,889	122,806	634	686	539	2,112
MontanaIdebo	334,580	238,324	72,858	23,398	620 613	638 638	421 587	1,203
Wvoming	165.914	101,429	54,332	10,153	864	811	958	3,535
Colorado	630,559	468,515	132,558	29,486	677	704	609	2,245
New Mexico.	165,913	105,381	48,337	12,195	462	532	375	1,644
Arizona.	225,402	171,122	30,091	12,109	009 537	577	440	2,122
Utau	68 013	50,822	30,002 10,930	6.261	872	820	1.064	3,650
·····	00,000	770,000	- c, co		1	•		
Pacific	4,356,664	3,574,070	591,078	191,516	793	798	772	2,602
Washington	903,783 561 600	191,137	111 011	23,001    23,020	722	756	630	2,265
California	2,829,281	2,355,664	342,182	131,435	839	825	916	3,036

. a Total Income exclusive of Surpluses and Inventory Gains; also excludes Imputed Interest on Durable Consumption Goods.

TABLE XLVII.-DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL CURRENT INCOME BY FARM AND NON-FARM POPULATION IN EACH STATE, 1920

	TOTAL AN	IOUNT DOLL	ARS (000'S (	Dmitted)	PER CAP	ITA OR PER	FAMILY (I	OLLARS)
DIVISION			Farm Po	pulation	Par Canita	Do- Conita	0C	F
	Entire Population	Non-Farm Population	Farmers (and Families)	Agri- cultural Employees	Population	Population	Fer Capita Farm Population	rer rarmer (and Family)
ed States	70,441,109	61,024,258	7,753,614	1,663,237	662	816	298	1,215
	6,313,930	6,021,844	220,736	71,350	848	877	467	1,454
nire	411,240 301,349	273,107	01,400 22,034	6.208	170 170	742	374	1,296
•	212,706	158,095	46,038	9,573	209	969	444	1,614
ts	3,640,227 523,408	3,566,095	51,283 6,695	22,849	939 861	949 967	625	1,688
	1,157,994	1,107,171	33,268	17,555	830	850	545	1,541
	19,931,097 10,579,956	19,004,891 10,089,899	767,136 403,696	159,070 85,361	889 1,012	926 1.045	<b>489</b> 612	1,847 2,138
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2,602,595 6,748,546	2,521,313 6,393,679	57,545 305,895	23,737 48,972	816 769	828 817	566 374	2,004 1,547
ntral	15,881,988	14,078,070	1,502,857	301,061	734	841	367	1,403
	4,310,032 1,784,274	3,943,337	314,131 204,827	38,890	606 606	844 757	327 269	1,239
	5,286,688	4,878,811	310,666	97,211 49 zev	810 767	898	371	1,329
	1,646,817	1,190,863	392,092	63,862	622	689	381 496	1,448 2,098
entral	6,929,218	5,461,295	1,060,847	407,076	550	736	264	446
	1,278,386	1,111,01	149,532	29,200 86,351	530 530	730	25/	968 2002
	1,971,074	1,694,571	229,426	47,077	578	121	228	880
8	288,785 305,771	146,721	97,310 87.974	44,754 37,881	444 479	573 649	360	1,267
	695,427	529,566	115,313	50,548	534	138	284	937
	1,041,304	107'001	210,000	01,209	TAC	121	395	1,283

, 1,007 1,578 1,578 1,578 1,578 1,578 1,578 1,578 1,578 1,033 1,033 1,042	721 748 781 691 666	1,214 872 751 1,350 1,482	1,774 2,019 2,019 2,019 2,019 2,019 3,512 3,512 2,189 2,189	2,901 2,237 2,218 3,581
<b>201</b> 202 203 202 203 203 203 204 203 204 202 203 203 203 203 203 203 203 203 203	<b>156</b> 170 165 140 149	<b>267</b> 192 164 327	<b>485</b> 386 386 386 523 537 537 537 537 537	857 659 . 621 1,064
<b>655</b> 1,095 596 525 544 561 561	<b>576</b> 667 513 508	<b>695</b> 542 618 736 748	732 624 795 795 795 795 795 795 795	895 750 977
<b>448</b> 669 739 739 739 739 739 739 739 739 739 73	332 399 302 302 253 253	<b>478</b> 314 420 518 544	<b>64</b> 7 577 864 715 715 715 726 944	889 732 716 989
<b>129,160</b> 3,523 26,797 25,779 25,779 8,1188 188 188 188 188 188,188 18,188 18,180 18,1	<b>51,807</b> 19,747 13,438 9,897 8,725	<b>192,583</b> 17,738 27,956 45,455 101,434	<b>140,620</b> 24,321 13,006 35,062 14,643 114,643 10,867 6,892	<b>210,510</b> 41,040 23,251 146,219
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{1,157,737}\\ \textbf{1,1799}\\ \textbf{59,759}\\ \textbf{59,750}\\ \textbf{1,1799}\\ \textbf{292}\\ \textbf{1,1799}\\ \textbf{292}\\ \textbf{1,292}\\ \textbf{293,500}\\ \textbf{309,660}\\ \textbf{188,606}\\ \textbf{253,900}\\ \textbf{54,476}\\ \textbf{54,476} \end{array}$	755,977 201,796 196,898 176,675 180,608	1,203,654 202,301 101,050 257,842 642,461	<b>425,682</b> 62,717 83,469 37,226 116,283 41,145 6,556 6,556	<b>658,988</b> 145,726 109,618 403,644
<b>5,013,433</b> 134,632 997,232 997,223 748,812 748,812 723,572 563,373 366,178 366,178 366,178 366,178 366,178 366,178 361,772 572 572 572 572 572 572 572 572 572	<b>2,151,759</b> 746,124 616,100 525,385 264,150	3,537,167 332,967 630,220 758,449 1,815,531	1,614,314 252,475 147,188 119,994 526,094 119,994 1196,072 59,270	4,141,485 813,967 432,202 2,895,316
<b>6,300,330</b> <b>149,954</b> <b>1,077,776</b> <b>470,966</b> <b>964,341</b> <b>821,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>8221,260</b> <b>964,774</b> <b>964,774</b> <b>964,774</b> <b>964,774</b> <b>964,774</b> <b>964,774</b> <b>964,774</b> <b>964,774</b> <b>964,774</b>	<b>2,959,543</b> 967,667 826,436 711,957 453,483	<b>4,933,404</b> 553,006 759,226 1,061,746 2,559,426	2,180,616 333,513 252,290 170,226 677,439 1677,439 169,885 169,885 247,461 251,084 72,718	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{5,010,983} \\ \textbf{1,000,733} \\ 565,071 \\ \textbf{3,445,179} \end{array}$
South Atlantic. Delaware. Maryland. District of Columbia. Virginia. West Virginia. North Carolina. South Carolina. Florida.	East South Central. Kentucky Tennessee Alabama Mississippi	West South Central. Arkansas. Louisiana. Oklahoma. Texas.	Mountain Montana Idaho Wyoming Oolorado New Mexico Arizona Utah	Pacific Washington Oregon California.

· Total Income exclusive of Surpluses and Inventory Gains; also excludes Imputed Interest on Durable Consumption Goods.

TABLE XLVIII — DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL CURRENT. INCOME BY FARM AND NON-FARM POPULATION IN EACH STATE, 1921

•

	TOTAL A	MOUNT DOLL.	ARS (000's 0	Omitted)	PE	R CAPITA 0	R PER FAM	ILY
STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION			Farm Pc	pulation	Đar Canita	Der Canita	Dow Conito	Doe Former
	Entire Population	Non-Farm Population	Farmers (and Families)	Agri- cultural Employees	Population	Non-Farm Population	Farm Population	Fer Farmer (and Family)
Continental United States	59,720,695	53,837,177	4,475,942	1,407,576	551	701	186	104
New England,	5,321,273 421,522	5,047,814 354,240	203,679 55,670	69,780 11 612	703 546	727 617	437 341	1,342
New Hampshire.	257,565	228,789	22,888	5,888	579	620	379	1,145
Vermont.	181,373 3,084,579	132,842 3,016,587	39,460 45,448	9,071 22,544	515 781	585 788	387 574	1,384
Connecticut	463,963 912,271	456,271 859,085	4,896 $35,317$	2,796 17,869	$7\overline{53}$ $636$	$\frac{759}{641}$	508 570	1,262 1,636
Middle Atlantic	17,693,699	16,995,337	539,382	158,980	775	811	422	1,299
New York.	9,790,835 $2,270,664$	9,420,405 2,210,416	292,973 38,125	83,457 22,123	921 692	958 705	470 419	1,552 1.327
Pennsylvaňia	5,626,200	5,364,516	208,284	53,400	630	672	276	1,053
East North Central	12,773,714 3 232 200	11,705,693 3 016 111	803,658 165 411	264,363 50,777	578 549	680 626	217	750
Indiana	1,382,270	1,259,977	86,955	35,338	465	610	135	429
Michigan	$\frac{4}{2},706,273$ 2,097,538	4,523,962 $1,880,889$	93,966 180,384	88,345 $36,265$	707 546	814 628	$166 \\ 255$	402 929
Wisconsin	1,355,334	1,024,754	276,942	53,638	504	579	359	1,482
West North Central	5,675,507 1 1 20 1 20	4,940,160	414,424 81 828	320,923	446 460	655 647	142	382
Iowa	1,036,307	901,313	66,424	68,570	425	621	137	315
Missouri	1,715,593 200,362	1,565,940 135,679	30,515	43,597 34 168	501 317	708	124 187	407
South Dakota	216,613	162,164	28,317	26,132	335	569	150	383
Nebraska	548,182 819,321	490,299 $681,892$	21,035	36,848 66,190	417	670 652	99 186	171 435

<b>596</b> 584 589 589 594 753 829 829 829 829 829 829 652	<b>501</b> 566 541 541	<b>610</b> 564 479 551 700	1,072 925 1,444 1,444 993 993 1,930 1,930 1,312	$1,951 \\ 1,795 \\ 1,534 \\ 2,221 \\ 2,221$
1723 168 168 151 151 156 156 156 156 156 156	110 109 109 100	145 126 108 137 171	315 3405 3405 319 328 319 328 328 328 328 328 328 328 328 328 328	<b>614</b> 533 451 726
<b>561</b> 667 667 667 528 528 431 433 438 437 438	517 606 529 430 470	<b>602</b> 478 540 669	<b>641</b> 611 551 729 567 567 563 563	847 716 678 926
<b>364</b> 557 613 1,174 346 272 226 227 227 257 257	<b>282</b> 340 310 250	<b>375</b> 252 354 366 433	740 492 498 498 619 403 451 805 805	<b>807</b> 679 898
106,066 3,275 19,478 19,478 26 2,386 7,353 11,704 13,011 16,027 12,306	43,435 17,003 11,875 7,505 7,052	<b>154,369</b> 13,425 20,392 34,510 86,042	$\begin{array}{c} 110,012\\ 16,228\\ 17,419\\ 10,596\\ 28,479\\ 10,185\\ 9,337\\ 9,337\\ 6,220\\ 6,220\\ \end{array}$	179, <b>648</b> 34,139 20,753 124,756
684,657 5,842 27,511 213 213 213 213 64,910 64,910 64,910 64,910 83,529 93,529 93,529 34,013	<b>525,549</b> 124,914 142,604 138,213 119,818	<b>604,214</b> 130,802 64,547 105,347 303,518	257,322 527,322 51,368 51,368 28,697 28,697 28,697 28,697 28,697 28,655 3,930	<b>443,057</b> 116,933 75,787 250,337
<b>4,420,439</b> 116,733 850,973 850,973 883,498 682,449 682,449 682,449 564,827567 564,827 564,827 564,827567 566,827 566,827 566,827 566,827567 567,827 577,827 577,827,827 577,827 577,927,927,927,927,927,927,927,927,927,9	<b>1,961,858</b> 687,593 579,118 451,925 243,222	3,192,433 305,650 561,620 628,674 1,696,489	1,480,993 218,684 138,743 138,743 120,664 511,960 109,970 115,977 51,873	<b>4,092,450</b> 797,753 401,613 2,893,084
5,211,162 9125,850 9125,850 914,687 814,687 837,099 637,099 720,503 759,668 374,921	<b>2,530,842</b> 829,510 733,597 597,643 370,092	<b>3,951,016</b> <b>449,877</b> <b>646,559</b> <b>768,531</b> <b>768,531</b> <b>2,086,049</b>	1,848,327 287,439 207,530 153,469 599,136 184,576 184,576 184,972 209,182 62,023	4,715,155 948,825 498,153 3,268,177
South Atlantic Delaware Maryland District of Columbia Virginia West Virginia North Carolina South Carolina Georgia Florida.	East South Central Kentucky Tennessee Alabama Mississippi	West South Central Arkansas Louisiana Oklahoma Texas	Mountain Montaina Idaho Wyoming Colorado New Mexico Arizona Utah	Pacific. Washington Oregon. California.

• Total Income exclusive of Surpluses and Inventory Gains; also excludes Imputed Interest on Durable Consumption Goods.

#### CHART 8

### 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

<u> </u>				-						· ·
ſ	Pe	r Cent	of		Per Cent	of	Total C	urrent	National	Theome
Rank	Tota	1 Curre	nt				1919	and 19	21	
10	DATIO	nal ino		State						
State	1010	1000	1001		5	5	10	2	15	
1919	1919	1920	1921			L .		<b></b>		<u> </u>
μ,	A 360	15 020	16 404	Man Mank						
	0 000	0 500	10,404	Asw IOTA			_	_		
<u> </u>	0,000	9,200	9,421	Penneyivania						
3	1.757	7.202	7,000	1111018		-				
4	5,893	6,127	5.412	Ohio						
5_	4.654	5.168	5.165	Massachusetts		2				
6	4.385	4,891	5,472	California						
2	3,729	4.043	3.512	Michigan						
8	3.692	3.633	3.493	Toxas						
	2.520	2,695	3 802	New Jargey						
10	2 880	2.798	2 872	Wi esouri						
	2 480	2.533	2 215	Indiane					•	
	2,400	21222	1 225	Tama						
H.	2.291	1 1.012	2 260	10WA						
<u></u>	41402	4.330	2,209	WADGONUAL						
14	2,096	1.905	1.892	Winnesota						
15	1,693	1.370	1.272	Georgia						
16	1.612	1.487	1.372	Kansas						
17	1.604	1.507	1.287	Oklahoma						
18	1.498	1.644	1.528	Connecticut						1
19	1.497	1.421	1.589	Washington						
20	1.469	1.530	1.518	Maryland	6					
21	1.449	1.269	1.364	Virginia						
22	1 446	1.261	1,207	North Carolina	<b>1</b> -7					
	1 417	1 374	1 280	Fantualer						
24	1.413	1 1 77	1.307	Terreres						
	1.247	1.1/3	1.220	remassea						
25	1.190	.987	.910	Nedraeka						
26	1.164	1.011	1.001	Alabama						
27	1,145	1.078	1.083	Louisiana						
28	1.013	.771	.649	South Carolina						
29	1.004	1.166	1.067	West Virginia						
30	.977	.962	1.003	Colorado						
31	.950	.785	.753	Arkansas						
.32	.911	.644	.620	Mississippi	5					
33	.871	.802	.834	Oregon	5					
24	.684	.743	.777	Rhode Island	Б					
25	.674	.474	.363	South Dakota	E					
36	.666	.669	.810	Dist. of Columbia	6					
127	.642	.678	.206	Naine	R					
28	.604	.504	628	Florida	F					
10	519	482	481	Nontana	2					
<u> }</u> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	1 1 2 1 7	4706	1.401	Wanth Balanta	<del>ل</del> ه ا					
40	1 .215	.410	<u>- 151</u>	BOTTA DAKOLA						
41	405	- 358	<u>↓348</u>	Idaho	<b>.</b>		•			
42	. 396	.428	.431	New Hampshire	Þ					
43	1.370	.356	.350	Utah	1		-	name 1	919	
44	.349	.351	.305	Arisona	b		_		921	
45	.278	.303	.304	Vermont	Б		_			
46	.257	.242	.257	Wyoming	6					
47	257	247	247	New Merico	6					
AA I	256	.212	211	Deleware	6					
	1.105	.102	1.104	Nevada	ť					
	+ • • • • • • •	L	+							

 $\mathbf{266}$ 

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

Benk	Cui	Per Capi Front In (Dollar)	ita Scome	State	Per Capita Current Income 1919 and 1921										
State 1919	1919	1920	1921		\$500 \$1,000										
1	955	1,093	1,174	Dist. of Columbia											
2	897	1.012	921	New York											
1	872	944	805	Nevada											
4	864 .	864	749	Wyoming											
5_	839	989	898	California											
_6	785	939	781	Massachusetts											
2	275	810	207	Illinois											
8	743	669	557	Delaware											
9	734	861	753	Rhode Island											
10	727	816	692	New Jersey											
11	722	716	618	Oregon											
12	718	732	679	Washington											
13	707	830	636	Connectigut											
14	689	726	504	Arisona											
15	_686	479	335	South Dakota											
16	677	715	619	Colorado											
17	666	743	542	Ohio	500-27(1/1010-10-10-00700)										
18	664	767	546	Nichigan											
19	662	769	630	Penneylyania											
20	657	739	613	Waryland											
21	620	608	492	Montane											
22 .	617	530	425	Towa											
21	613	577	458	Idaho											
24	ROR	534	417	Nebraska											
25	590	<b>4</b> 91	459	Kansas											
26	E 79	670	E 20	Var Vernahi so											
20	570	550	2/7	Ninnosota											
27	550	422	EAL	Wissensin											
- 60	222	642	445	Tradone											
20	240	#70	502	11d coount											
-30	247	- 370	201	Madaa											
10	530	EEA	240	HALIE											
	257_	224	+71	Venil											
<u>₩</u>	247		417	Borth Dakota											
34	247	299	+33	Aklahoma	<u></u>										
- 32	212	210	<u>-300</u>	UEIANOBA											
30	509	607	<u>↓_515</u> .	Vermont											
37	462	409	403	New Mexico											
38	440	556	431	Vest Virginia											
39	412	420	1_154	Louisiana											
40	408	428	370	Florida											
41	407	415	346	Virginia											
	390_		226	South Carolina											
<b>3</b>	379		257	Gaorgia											
44	378	399	340	Kentucky	1919										
45	367	345	274	North Carolina	1921										
46	352	314	252	Arkanses											
47	346	352	310	Tennessee											
48	328	253	207	Mississippi											
49	121	302	250	Alabama											
			1	1											

## INCOME IN THE VARIOUS STATES

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





## 272 INCOME IN THE VARIOUS STATES

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,<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> It should of course be remembered that the District of Columbia is also practically all urban.

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of goods consumed by farmers, the price level of consumption goods in 1921 was about the same as in 1919.

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

.

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

STATES ARRAYED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF

PER CAPITA CURRENT INCOME IN 1919

State         1919         1920         1921         1970         1,000           1         955         1,095         1,176         Dist. of Columbia         TERMINICTURE Contraction of Columbia           2         928         1,045         958         Bew York         TERMINICTURE Contraction of Columbia           3         861         778         667         Delsware         TERMINICTURE Contraction of Columbia           4         825         977         926         California         TERMINICTURE Contraction of Columbia           5         822         898         814         Lilliots         TERMINICTURE Contraction of Columbia           7         811         923         874         798         Hassenbusette         TERMINICTURE Contraction of Columbia           10         756         757         758         678         Gregon         TERMINICTURE Contraction of Columbia           11         756         881         628         Michigan         TERMINICTURE Contraction of Columbia           12         751         752         567         Maryland         TERMINICTURE Contraction of Columbia           13         745         752         758         Rode Flanch         TERMINICTUR Contraction of Columbia	Rank	Pe Curre (I	r Capit nt Inco ollars)	8	State	Per Capita Current Income 1919 and 1921
1         956         1.095         1.176         Dist. of Columbia         International internationa international internatinternational internatinternation	State 1919	1919	1920	1921		\$500 \$1,000
2       928       1,045       958       New York       THILLITTICATION INTERPORT         4       825       977       926       California       THILLITTICATION INTERPORT         5       822       898       814       Hillopia       THILLITTICATION INTERPORT         6       620       972       850       New Ada       THILLITTICATION INTERPORT         7       811       923       874       Nyoa Ada       THILLITTICATION INTERPORT         8       774       949       949       788       Masa adama to the transmitter transmitter the transmitter	1	956	1.095	1.176	Dist. of Columbia	
3       861       778       667       Delaware       Differenta       Differena	2	928	1.045	958	New York	24/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/
4       825       977       926 (Balifornia       IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	3	861	778	667	Delaware	
1       5       822       898       814       1111001#       11111001#         6       820       972       850       Newsda       111111111111111111111111111111111111	.4	825	977	926	California	1//////////////////////////////////////
6       820       972       850       Normals       International Action and A	5	822	898_	814	Illinois	
7       811       923       874       Tyoning       TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT	6	820	972	850	Nevada	(10100000000000000000000000000000000000
8       794       949       758       Maesschwestie       TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT	<u>1</u>	811	923	874	Tyoning	
9       759       750       651       Montana       International internatinternational internatinternational internationa	8	794	949	788	Massachusetts	
10       756       752       678       Oregon       Contraction of the second of	9	759	760_	611	Montana	
11       756       681       628       bit ohigan       fillentiation         12       751       795       557       Arisona       fillentiation         13       745       750       716       Washington       fillentiation         14       740       846       716       Washington       fillentiation         15       738       844       626       Ohio       fillentiation         16       738       844       626       Ohio       fillentiation         17       735       828       705       New Jersey       fillentiation         18       725       850       641       Connectious       fillentiation         20       704       773       726       Colorado       fillentiation         21       698       817       672       Pannaylymaia       fillentiation         22       694       738       670       Nebreaka       fillentiation         23       680       736       S79       Nebreaka       fillentiation         24       670       771       708       Missouri       fillentiation         27       663       731       652       Raneas       f	10	756	752	678	Oregen	
12       751       795       567       Arisona       functional function functional function functio	11	756	881	628	Michigan	
13       745       750       726       Waryland       THE STREET S	12	751	795	567	Arizona	
14       740       846       716 Waryland       TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT	13	745	750	716	Washington	
15       739       867       759       Rhode Teland       7771777777777777777777777777777777777	14		846	716	Maryland	
16       738       844       626       Ohio       777777777777777777777777777777777777	15	739	867	759	Rhodo Island	
17       735       828       705       New Jersey       IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	16	738	844	626	Ohio	
18       725       850       641       Connectiout       Connectiout         19       708       649       556       South Dakota       Connection         20       704       773       729       Colorado       Connection         21       698       817       672       Pennsylvana       Connection         22       694       738       670       Nobraska       Connection         23       680       736       579       Oklahoma       Connection         24       670       771       708       Missouri       Connection         25       670       738       647       Winnesota       Connection         25       670       738       647       Winnesota       Connection         26       666       748       669       Texas       Connection         27       638       624       551       Idaho       Connection       Connection         28       636       742       620       New Hampahire       Connection       Connection         31       628       757       90       610       Indiana       Connection       Connection         34       592 <td< td=""><td>L17</td><td>735</td><td>828</td><td>. 705</td><td>New Jersey</td><td></td></td<>	L17	735	828	. 705	New Jersey	
19       708       649       569       South Dakota       IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	18	725	850	641	Connecticut	were and a second second second
20       704       773       729       Colorado         21       698       B17       672       Panngylvania       Colorado         22       694       738       670       Nobraska       Colorado         23       680       736       579       Oklahoma       Colorado         24       670       771.       708       Missouri       Colorado         25       670       738       647       Minneota       Colorado         25       670       738       647       Minneota       Colorado         26       665       748       659       Texas       Colorado         27       663       731       652       Kaneas       Colorado       Colorado         27       663       742       620       New Hampahire       Colorado       Colorado         28       657       730       621       Iowa       Colorado       Colorado       Colorado         30       638       624       551       Idaho       Colorado	19	708	649	569	South Dakota	
21       698       B17       672       Panneylvania       Internet inte	20	704	773	729	Colorado	
22       694       738       670       Nobraska         23       680       736       579       Oklahoma       IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	21	698	817	672	Pennsylvania	
23       680       736       579       Oklahoma       IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	22	694	738	670	Nebraska	
24       670       771       708       Missouri       Internet	23	680	736	579	Oklahoma	
25       670       738       647 Winnesota       Interest and the second a	24	670	771.	708	Missouri	*****
26       666       748       669       Texas       Image: Constraint of the second seco	25	670	738	647	Winnesota	
22       663       731       652       Kangag       Contraction         28       657       730       621       Icwa       Contraction         29       638       624       551       Idaho       Contraction         30       636       742       620       New Hampahire       Contraction         31       628       757       610       Indiana       Contraction         31       628       757       610       Indiana       Contraction         32       610       689       579       Wisconsin       Contraction         33       602       696       585       Vermont       Contraction         34       592       706       617       Naine       Contraction         35       577       626       543       Utah       Contraction         36       574       667       606       Kentucky       Contraction         37.       574       596       528       Virginia       Contraction         38       564       725       546       West Virginia       Contraction         43       541       508       Louisiana       Contraction       Contraction       Co	26	666	748	669	Телаз	
28       657       730       621 Iowa       International Internation Inter	27	663	731	652	Kansas	
29       638       624       551 [fdaho       DTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT	_28	657	730	621	Iowa	
30       636       742       620 New Hampahire       Internet	29	638	624	551	Idaho	
31       628       757       610       Indiana       Intimute International Internatinternation Internatinternational International Internatinternatio	30	636	742	620	New Hampahire	
32       610       689       579 Visconein       IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	31	628	757	610	Indiana	
33     602     696     585     Vermont     International state in the sta	32	610	689	579	Wisconsin	
34       592       706       617 [Waine       International State	33	602	696	585	Vermont	
35     577     626     543 [Utah     International formation fo	34	592	706	617	Naine	
36         574         667         606 Kentucky         International state           37         574         596         528 Virginia         International state           38         564         725         546 West Virginia         International state           39         562         542         478 Arkansas         International state           40         555         544         438 South Carolina         International state           41         552         561         487 Georgia         International state           43         541         508         470 Hististana         International state           43         541         508         470 Wististana         International state           44         532         569         536 New Maxico         International state           44         532         569         532 Tennessee         International state         International state           45         531         574         529 Tennessee         International state         International state         International state           46         513         513         430 Alabana         International state         International state         International state           48         483         513<	35	577	626	543	Utah	
37         574         596         528         Virginia         Contraction           38         564         725         546         West Virginia         Contraction           39         562         542         478         Arkansas         Contraction           40         555         544         438         South Carolina         Contraction           41         552         561         487         Georgia         Contraction           42         541         508         470         Mississiopi         Contraction           43         541         508         470         Massissiopi         Contraction         Contraction           44         532         569         536         North Dekots         Contraction         Contraction         Contraction           45         529         573         512         North Dekots         Contraction         Contraction         Contraction           47         500         523         131         430         Alabana         Contraction         Contraction           48         483         513         430         Alabana         Contraction         Contraction         Contraction	36	574	667	606	Kentucky	
38         564         725         546 West Virginia         777777777777777777777777777777777777	37	574	596	528	Virginia	
39         562         542         478         Arkansas         International           40         555         544         438         South Carolina         International           41         552         554         437         Georgia         International           42         547         618         540         Louisiana         International           43         541         508         470         Mississippi         International         International           44         532         569         536         New Mexico         International         Internation	38	564	725	· 546	West Virginia	
40         555         544         438         South Carolina         2000000000000000000000000000000000000	39	562	542	478	Arkaneas	
41       552       561       487 Georgia       International Constraints         42       547       618       540 Louisiana       International Constraints         43       541       508       470 Mississippi       International Constraints         44       532       569       536 New Mexico       International Constraints         45       531       574       529 Tennessee       International Constraints         46       529       573       512 North Dakota       International Constraints         47       500       523       1 31 North Carolina       International Constraints         48       483       513       430 Alabama       International Constraints         49       463       504       450 Prorida       International Constraints	40	555	544	438	South Carolina	
42         547         618         540 Louisiana         Internet and the second se	41	552	561	487	Georgia	
43         541         508         470         Mississippi         Contraction         Mississippi         Missipi         Mississipi         Mi	42	547	618	540	Louisiana	
44         532         569         536         New Mexico         2011/10/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/	43	541	508	470	Niesissippi –	
45         531         574         529         Tennessee         Internet for the second	_44	532	569	536	New Mexico	1919
46.         529         573         512         North Dakota         International           47.         500         523         , 431         North Carolina         International           48         483         513         430         Alabama         International           49         463         5504         .450         Florida         International	45	531	574	529	Tennessee	1921
47         500         523         431         North         Carolina         Difference           48         483         513         430         Alabama         Difference         Difference           49         463         504         450         Plorida         Difference         Difference	46	529	573	512	North Dakota	
48 483 513 430 Alabama 700000000000000000000000000000000000	47.	500	523	431	North Carolina	·····
49 463 504 450 Prorida	_48	483	513	430	Alabama	
	49	463	504	450	Florida	71777777777777777777777777777777777777

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.<sup>1</sup>) 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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).

#### 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

		n Cante	A		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Rank	Curre	nt Inco			Per Capita Current Income 1919 and 1921
nand .	11	11874)		State	1
State	<sup>w</sup>		<u> </u>		Artis
1010	1010	1920	1921		\$500 \$1,000
1717			4764		<u>┧╴╸╸╸╸╴╴╵╶╴╸╸╸╸╸╸</u>
, I	1 064	812	628	Namada	
<u> </u>	1.004	-032	407	Nevada	
2-	720	740	407		
<b> </b> →_	916	1.064	_/20	GALLIOFNIA	
4_	609		150	South Dakota	
5	630	621	451	Oregon	
6	614	659	533	Washington	
2	609	_ 569	328	Colorado	
8	587	523	342	Idaho	
_ 9_	565	566	419	New Jersey	
10	559	240	137	Iowa	777
1	544	371	166	Tilinois	7777
12.	537	612	470	New York	
12	524	255	268	Dist. of Columbia	
<u></u>		- 372	200	ATICODA	
			543	Dhada Tal	
1-15-	521	015	508	Knoae Island	
16	510	025	274	Hassachusetts	
17	510	360	187	North Dakota	
<u> </u>	487	395	186	Kansas	
19	483	284	99	Nebraska	7/77
20	464	545	570	Connectiout	
21	463	496	359	Wisconsin	
22	449	392	237	Utah	
23	427	386	305	Montana	
24	406	257	142	Minnesota	
25	192	374	341	Maine	
36	1 170	327	190	Obio	7777
27	2/7	244	222	New Verice	
	1 3/2	240	135	Indiana	
<u> </u>	1 2/1	209		Terrente	
29	108	3/4	270	Pennsylvania	
	363	381	255	Michigan	
	360	327	171	Texas	
32	354	298	137	Oklahoma	
33_	348	299	178	Delaware	
34	339	444	387	Vermont	
35	324	228	124	Missouri	
36	312	288	168	Maryland	77277
37	298	192	99	South Carolina	773
38	296	372	379	New Hampshire	
20	277	242	164	Florida	7777
40	274	217	156	North Caroline	
	254	165	84	Georgia	77
		102	126	Askoncos	
	243	140	120	Migoleoinni	
<del>-••</del>	241		100	Imabelesippi	
44	240	164	108	Louisiana	pérformant annual 1919
45	214	202	124	Virginia	1921
46	213	170	109	Kentucky	777
47	207	204	151	West Virginia	7777
48	200	140	109	Alabama	772
49	192	165	121	Tennessee	
	I	1	1.		

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 The variation in per capita income of the farm adjacent to it. 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 Table XLIX shows for each State the per cent of the total State. 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 In 1921 the farm population received scarcely 10 per country. 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 MRATIO OF	PERCENTAGE OF FARM INCOME	E TO PER-
CENTA	GE OF FARM POPULATION	

RANK	Geographic Division	Ratio
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Pacific         Mountain         West North Central         West South Central         East North Central         East South Central         Middle Atlantic         South Atlantic         New England         Continental United States	$\begin{array}{r} .99\\\\ .86\\ .80\\ .68\\ .64\\ .62\\ .59\\ .59\\ .59\\ .56\\ .59\end{array}$

<sup>1</sup> See p. 258.

TABLE XLIX.—PER CENT OF TOTAL CURRENT INCOME IN EACH STATE RECEIVED BY FARM POPULATION, 1919–1920–1921

	Population Living	on Farms in 1920 •	29.9	8.5 25.7 17.2	355 357 6.8 5.7 1.5 5 6	8.5 7.7 10.9	<b>22.9</b> 19.8 31.0 23.1 35.0	41.2 37.6 35.6 61.0 61.0 45.1 41.7
STATE TOTAL		1921	9.9	5.1 16.0 11.2	26.8 2.2 5.8 5.8	9.39 9.77 7.77	8.8 8.8 3.9 24.4 24.4	13.0 11.3 8.7 35.2 10.6 16.8
PER CENT OF	Current Income	1920	13.4	<b>4.6</b> 15.5 9.4	26.0 2.0 1.8 4.4	<b>4.6</b> 4.6 3.1 5.3	11.1 8.6 13.7 7.7 27.7 27.7	<b>21.2</b> 17.2 18.5 14.0 49.2 23.9 27.8
		1919	17.7	<b>4.8</b> 18.7 8.8	23.6 2.0 1.8 4.5	5.0 3.6 6.1	14.7 21.0 12.0 29.2 29.2	<b>32.9</b> 26.9 26.1 37.3 36.5 34.5 34.5
	STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION		Continental United States	New England. Maine New Hamoshire.	Vermont Massachusetts Rhode Island Connecticut	8 Middle Atlantic. New York. New Jersey. Pennsylvania.	East North Central. Ohio Indiana. Illinois. Michigan . Wisconsin	West North Central Minnesota. Iowa Missouri North Dakota South Dakota South Dakota Kansas.

<b>45</b> 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 258,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,532,40 259,502,40 259,502,40 259,502,40 259,502,40 259,502,40 259,502,40 259,502,40 259,502,40 259,502,502,502,502,502,502,502,502,502,502	<b>58.3</b> 54.4 56.9 71.0	<b>51.0</b> 65.5 68.8 88.8 88.8	<b>35</b> 96.5 234.6 231.1 2012 2012 2012 2012	18.2 20.9 27.3 15.1
15. 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 8.1 16.2 11.3 27.5 87.5 12.4 12.4 12.4 12.4	<b>24.5</b> 17.1 21.1 24.4 34.3	19.2 32.1 13.1 18.2 18.7	19.9 23.9 21.4 21.4 25.5 15.9 15.9 16.4	<b>13.2</b> 15.9 19.4 11.5
204 7.5 3619 381 287 162 287	27.3 25.5 41.8 41.8	<b>28.3</b> 39.8 17,0 28,6 29,1	<b>260</b> 2560 2955 2955 2955 2955 219 219 219 219 219	17.4 18.7 23.5 16.0
27.1 10.8 9.2 4.4 39.6 39.6 0.0 20.0	<b>35.9</b> 30.5 35.6 52.1	<b>34.6</b> 255.4 325.6 34.5 84.5	28.8.1 28.8.1 28.4.5.7 28.4.4.5.7 28.4.4.5 29.1.4.5 29.1.4.5 29.1.4.5 29.1.4.5 20.1.5 20.5 20.5 20.5 20.5 20.5 20.5 20.5 20	18.0 18.0 24.0 16.7
South Atlantic Delaware Maryland Dist. of Columbia. Virginia West Virginia. North Carolina. South Carolina. Florida.	East South Central. Kentucky. Tennessee. Alabama. Mississippi.	West South Central Arkansas Louisiana Oklahoma Texas	Mountain Montana Idaho Wyoming Colorado New Mexico Arizona Utah Nevada	Pacific. Washington Oregon California.

a Census of Agriculture, 1920, Vol. V. p. 894.

п

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 necessarv 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 For instance, given two hypothetical States, problem at hand. 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



## 286 INCOME IN THE VARIOUS STATES

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.<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> 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. 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.

<sup>1</sup> 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. TABLE L.-TOTAL CURRENT INCOME IN EACH STATE RECEIVED BY THE POPULATION DEPENDING UPON FAMILY INCOMES SMALLER THAN \$10,000 EACH, 1919-1920-1921

	ent of n State	Popula- tion	99.5	00.3	9.66	66 200	0001	99.1	99.3	00	1.20	000	99.4	1	2.2 2.5	6.99 1 00	00 0	00 A 00	99.7		2.00	1.66	99.00 9 00	0.66	99.99 00 00	200	99.8
1921	Per C Total i	Income	92.7	90.0	94.2	95.U	90.1	88.7	90.8	80.3	87.8	90.8	91.4	0.0	0.00	92.9	01.9	03.7	95.5	1	95.9	0.44.0 900 a	0.00	0.00	000	96	97.4
	Amount Douted (2007-	Omitted)	55,350,294	4,834,931	397,089	244,760	2.780.232	411,489	828,101	15,805,318	8.600.780	2,062,072	5,142,466	11 070 406	9 001 790	0,001,709	4 204 103	1.965 761	1,294,559		5,444,170	1,000,909	1,022,023	1,000,244	213 681	526,736	797,854
	ent of a State	Popula- tion	99.3	99.1	99.5 20.5	99.5 00.6	0.86	0.06	99.1	08.0	98.6	99.1	99.2	e de la		99.0 00 A	001	99.4	9.66		90.4 7 00	000	7.00	1000	2.00	99.4	9.66
1920	Per C Total i	Income	91.6	90.0	94.1	94.2 03 0	80.80	88.2	90.9	88.3	86.3	90.2	90.6	0. 2	00 00	92.20	90.6	93.0	94.6	0.00	13.20	0.00	92.4	08.2	96.3 96.3	92.8	92.6
	Amount	Omitted)	64,522,985	5,680,311	449,118	283,850	3,231,969	461,815	1,052,845	17.596.150	9,131,219	2,348,059	6,116,872	14 666 458	3 077 360	1,605,703	4,787,521	2,648,529	1,557,255	001 417 2	0,457,589	1 162 102	1,821,324	283 497	294.346	645,535	1,001,287
	ent of n State	Popula- tion	99.3	99.1	99.6	99.00 00.6	<b>99.0</b>	99.1	99.1	98.9	98.5	99.2	99.3	00 3	003	9.00	1.66	99.5	99.6	200	000 7	90.00	99.5	8 66	99.7	99.4	99.7
1919	Per C Total i	Income	90.1	87.5	94.0 03.4	90.4 03.1	85.4	87.0	89.1	84.8	80.9	89.3	89.4	01.7	91.5	95.1	89.9	91.4	95.3	7 00	03.7	94.5	90.3	98.0	96.8	94.0	95.8
	Amount Dollars (000's	Omitted)	58,158,856	4,603,503	389,433 226 424	167.173	2,563,691	383,721	861,061	14,643,155	7,486,411	2,028,334	5,128,410	13.077.438	3.478.503	1.521.850	4,487,162	2,197,572	1,392,351	6 800 040	1.266.842	1.396,363	1,677,715	325,936	420,954	725,312	996,827
	STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION		Continental United States	New England	Maine	Vermont	Massachusetts.	Rhode Island.	Connecticut	Middle Atlantic	New York.	New Jersey	Pennsylvanıa	East North Central	Ohio	Indiana	Illinois	Michigan	Wisconsin	West North Cantral	Minnesota	Iowa	Missouri	North Dakota	South Dakota	Nebraska	Kansas

99.9 99.9 99.9 99.9 99.9 99.9 99.9 99.	0.000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.000000	808 800 800 800 800 800 800 800 800 800	<b>90.3</b> 99.6 99.1 99.1
94.1 92.9 92.9 94.1 94.5 94.5 94.5 94.4	96.0 95.8 95.8 95.8 97.1 96.5 94.8 96.9 96.3	97.5 97.6 97.6 97.6 97.6 97.0 98.9 97.0 98.9 97.0 98.2 98.2	93.9 97.6 92.6 92.6
<b>4,904,144</b> 116,886 116,886 116,886 441,114 784,211 604,785 673,885 378,968 373,094 353,865	2,443,723 797,083 702,967 580,644 363,029 3,810,854 436,717 613,238 740,313 2,020,586	1,801,935 282,620 205,815 149,772 574,041 145,797 180,037 202,981 60,872	4,425,733 926,502 474,430 3,024,801
<b>99.8</b> 99.8 99.8 99.8 99.8 99.8 99.8	99.78 99.78 99.99 99.6 99.6 99.6 99.6	99.7 99.7 99.9 99.7 99.7 99.7 99.8	<b>99.1</b> 99.5 98.9
93.2 91.4 92.7 93.7 95.0 95.0 95.1 95.1 95.1 95.1 95.3	95.2 95.2 96.3 96.3 95.1 95.1	97.3 985.0 985.0 986.3 986.3 98.4 98.4 98.7	<b>93.0</b> 98.1 94.4 91.3
<b>5,869,696</b> 137,022 9137,022 912,974 769,463 842,250 842,250 8212,403 817,418 387,514	<b>2,816,000</b> 917,156 775,079 684,602 439,163 <b>4,652,560</b> 529,088 702,403 988,174 2,432,895	<b>2,122,013</b> 332,605 248,570 248,570 165,976 652,406 652,406 167,145 241,533 241,533 241,533 241,533 71,747	<b>4,662,208</b> 981,941 533,159 3,147,108
99.7 99.7 99.7 99.7 99.7 99.7 99.7 99.7	99.7 99.7 99.8 99.6 99.6 99.5 99.5	<b>99.6</b> 99.7 99.8 99.8 99.6 99.7 99.7	<b>99.1</b> 99.4 98.9
92.7 82.9 94.0 95.0 95.0 93.4 93.4 93.4 93.4	<b>94.4</b> 94.8 94.0 94.0 95.5 92.9 92.9 92.7 92.7	95.7 97.9 97.5 93.6 93.6 95.6 97.7	91.2 94.0 89.8 89.8
5,736,307 136,307 136,708 824,580 881,104 878,496 614,831 878,837 622,113 1,034,520 365,118	2,885,306 863,709 747,801 720,901 552,895 552,895 663,837 663,837 663,837 663,837 972,935 2,208,841	2,001,372 324,482 254,439 157,905 590,045 161,823 2161,823 2161,823 2161,823 2161,823 2161,823 2161,823 2161,823 2161,823 216,411	<b>3,970,960</b> 907,748 521,150 2,542,062
South Atlantic Delaware Maryland District of Columbia Virginia West Virginia North Carolina South Carolina Georgia Florida	East South Central. Kentucky Tennessee Alabama. Mississippi. West South Central. Arkansas. Louisiana. Oklahoma Texas.	Mountain Montana Idaho Wyoming Colorado New Mexico Arizona Utah	Pacific. Washington. Oregon. California.

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 New York, also, we see a very great reduction in the in 1919. 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 Table LI presents a study of the income of the people some States. 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 L and LI.

	nt of a State	Popula- tion	98.5	97.9 98.7	98.7	97.6	97.9 98.0	97.5 96.8	97.6 98.3	98.3 08.6	98.1 98.1	8.86 8.86 8.80	90.0	99.0 99.0	98.8 198.8	9.66 99.6	99.0 99.2
1921	Per Ce Total i	Income	88.3	86.3 90.2	1.10	85.4	84.7 85.8	<b>84.3</b> 82.4	85.0 87.1	88.6 22.7	86.1 86.1	87.3 80.9	91.0 01.0	90.8 8.06	89.9	8.06 9.66	91.7 94.2
921	Amount Dollars (000's	Omitted)	52,708,018	4,593,009 380.066	234,620	2,635,562	393,064 782,954	14,907,798 8.075.634	1,930,669 4,901,495	11,318,459 2 866 953	1,276,328	4,050,618	1,230,001 5.212.042	1,026,311	1,542,113	202,730	502,801 771,468
19-1920-1	ent of n State	Popula- tion	98.0	97.6 98.5	98.4 98.4	97.3	97.7 97.5	97.1 96.3	97.3 98.6	98.0 08 1	98.7	97.1 98.2	90.J	98.4 4.90	98.4	99.4 98.5	97.6 98.5
ACH, 19.	Per C Total i	Income	86.8	86.0 90.1	90.4	84.9	84.5 86.3	<b>83.4</b> 80.8	85.4 86.6	87.4 88.0	91.3	84.9 89.2	87.3	88.4 80.3	87.9	94.2	84.5 90.9
AN \$5,000 E	Amount Dollars (000's	Omitted)	61,108,309	5,428,991 429,872	272,498	3,092,137	442,460 999,425	16,615,238 8,548,467	2,222,264 5,844,507	13,879,871 3 700 616	1,629,450	4,486,074 2,540,128	6.050.002	1,186,477	1,733,343	2/0,0/2 288,116	587,812 952,454
LER TH	ent of n State	Popula- tion	98.1	97.8 98.5	98.4	97.5	97.7 97.7	97.3 96.5	97.7 98.1	98.0 08 1	08.0 98.0	98.3 1.76 28.3	08.1	98.5 07.9	985 14 14 14	92.9 97.6	97.4 98.5
S SMAL 1919	Per C Total i	Income	85.2	85.0 89.4	89.0	80.9	82.5 84.3	<b>79.7</b> 75.3	84.0 85.2	80.8 87 1	91.2	87.3 87.3	87.7	89.2 85.8	85.4	94.1 90.1	85.7 91.2
Y INCOME	Amount Dollars (000's	Omitted)	54,959,107	<b>4,365,285</b> 370,243	227,156	2,429,998	364,128 814,760	13,765,320 6.972,309	1,909,084 4,883,927	12,380,566 3 319 080	1,459,131	4,175,590 2,099,669	1,000,101	1,205,696	1,586,981	312,917 391,818	662,270 948,952
FAMII	STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION		Continental United States.	New England	New Hampshire	Nermont	Connecticut	86 Middle Atlantic. New York	New Jersey. Pennsylvania.	East North Central	Indiana	Michigan	Wiscousin	Minnesota	Missouri	North Dakota	Nebraska. Kansas.

TABLE LI.-TOTAL CURRENT INCOME IN EACH STATE RECEIVED BY THE POPULATION DEPENDING UPON

99.0 99.0 99.0 99.0 99.0 99.0 99.0	99.2 99.4 99.6 99.6 99.6 99.6 99.6 99.6 99.6	99.5 99.7 99.7 99.4 99.4 99.4 4 99.4 4 99.4 4 99.2 8 99.4	97.8 99.0 98.6 97.1
88.67 89.7 89.7 89.7 89.7 89.7 89.7 89.7 89.	92.7 92.7 92.7 94.4 94.4 93.3 93.0 93.0 93.0 93.0	<b>95.0</b> 96.4 95.1 97.3 97.3 93.8 93.5 94.2	89.0 94.0 91.4 87.2
<b>4,671,918</b> 111,510 745,597 402,473 557,287 550,091 656,824 570,368 370,368 370,368 370,368 335,785	2,369,713 769,094 678,532 566,020 356,067 3,685,949 424,575 536,995 714,855 714,855 714,855 714,855	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{1,752,442}\\ 277,054\\ 202,946\\ 145,942\\ 552,831\\ 145,942\\ 552,831\\ 145,518\\ 145,518\\ 175,518\\ 175,518\\ 175,518\\ 175,518\\ 186,193\end{array}$	<b>4,195,788</b> 891,502 455,416 2,848,870
98.0 99.1 99.1 99.1 99.4 99.4 99.4 99.4 99.4	99.1 99.1 99.1 99.5 99.4 99.8 8.7 98.7 98.7 98.7	<b>98.8</b> 99.1 98.6 98.7 98.7 98.8 98.8 98.8	<b>96.8</b> 98.8 98.1 96.0
80.1 80.1 82.7 82.7 82.9 80.9 93.0 93.0 93.0 86.9 86.9	91.5 90.8 94.3 94.3 94.3 94.3 97.5 93.6 93.6 93.6 91.0	<b>93.3</b> 95.5 95.5 95.8 95.8 92.8 92.8 92.8	86.5 91.8 89.8 84.4
<b>5,610,580</b> 130,363 890,860 890,860 890,560 877,164 738,243 819,243 836,172 886,172 886,172 886,172 886,172	2,708,211 878,923 738,155 663,546 663,587 427,587 427,587 445,404 517,520 664,180 664,180 934,198 934,198 2,329,506	<b>2,033,944</b> 323,530 240,913 100,795 610,795 610,795 610,795 610,795 633,353 233,353 233,353 233,353 69,194	<b>4,335,168</b> 918,840 507,265 2,909,063
98.8 97.7 97.7 99.0 99.0 99.0 99.0 99.1 99.1 99.1	90.1 99.0 99.0 98.6 98.6 98.6 98.6 98.6	98.3 97.6 97.6 98.7 98.7 98.7 98.7	97.2 97.8 97.9 96.7
89.0 78.3 85.7 85.7 85.7 99.0 90.5 90.5 90.5 88.4	90.2 90.0 92.9 90.4 90.4 88.0 91.1 83.0 87.7 87.7	<b>91.0</b> 93.6 92.3 90.8 94.5 94.5 94.1	85.2 88.5 87.8 83.5 83.5
5,505,218 129,175 8129,175 840,847 590,847 592,498 843,883 592,498 843,436 843,436 843,436 843,436 843,436 843,436 843,5375	2,757,798 820,074 707,951 697,947 531,826 531,826 4,194,989 558,497 626,139 626,139 921,026 22,089,327 2,089,327	1,902,423 313,040 241,299 150,670 1551,319 1561,319 205,090 64,030 64,030	3,710,843 854,296 493,051 2,363,496
South Atlantic Delaware Maryland Virginia Virginia West Virginia North Carolina South Carolina Florida	East South Central Kentucky Tennessee Alabama. Mississippi West South Central Arknnsas Louisiana. Öklahoma.	Mountain Montana Idaho Wyoming Colorado New Mexico Arizona Utah Nevada	Pacific Washington Oregon California

•

### INCOME IN THE VARIOUS STATES

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

GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION	PER CENT OF NATIONAL TOTAL IN EACH CLASS RECEIVED BY THE INHABITANTS OF EACH DIVISION								
	All Income Classes	Income Classes Below \$10,000	Income Classes Below \$5,000						
United States	100.00	100.00	100.00						
New England	8.09	7.92	7.94						
Middle Atlantic	20.45	25.18	25.05						
West North Central	12.05	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						

1919

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 95% OF ALL URBAN" INCOMES

#### 1921

STATES ARRAYED ACCORDING TO THE SIZE OF THE PER CAPITA CURRENT

INCOME OF THE POPULATION IN THE LOWEST 95% OF ALL URBAN INCOMES

Per Capita Current Urban Income			Par Capita Current Urban Income		
Rank of	State for	Amount	in Dollars	State	T CI Copila Cortein Ci Can incente
Lowest 95%	Total	Lowest 95%	Total	•	\$500 \$1000
1	1	1.045	1.176	Dist. of Columbia	
2	1	817	926	California	
-		814	874	Treating	
		0.04	850	Verada	
2	3	800	958	New York	
	L A	609	814	Tilinota	
	7	670	788	Veester	
6	6	654	720	Colorado	
6	10	654	747	Techington	
10	9	642	750	Phode Jelend	
11	10	610	709	Midde IBland	
1.10	14	610	440	ALBBOURI .	
1.	1.5	003	007	Yom Tonoom	
	13	270	470		
1.4	14	29/	670	Vegen	
15	10	273	670	Nedralka	
10	19	207	072	KANSAS	
17	11	200	710	Maryland	
18	18	576	667	Delaware	
19	15	572	072	Penney1Van1a	
20	20	502	047	Minnesota	
21	27	555	611	Montana	
44	20	223	010	Indiana	
23	24	249	021	Towa	
24	29	547	000	Kentucky	
25	25	545	620	New Hampahire	
26	22	544	628	Michigan	
27	21	539	641	Connecticut	
28	23	538	626	Ohio	
29	26	532	617	Maine	
30	33_	522	569	South Dakota	
131	34	- 222	207	Arizona	
32	31	509_	579	Oklahoma	
33	35	508	551	Idaho	
34	30	504	585	Vermont	
35	32	498	579	Wisconsin	
36	39	497	536	New Mexico	
37	37	484	543	<u>U</u> tah	
38	36-	471	546	West Wirginia	
39	40	463	529	Tennessee	
40	42	463	512	North Dakota	
41	38	459	540	Louisiana	
42	41.	452	528	Virginia	
43	43	429	487	Georgia	
_44	45	419	470	Mississippi	
45	44	416	478	Arkansas	
46	47	387	438	South Carolina	
47	46	373	.450	Florida	
48	49	372	430	Alabama	
49	48	1 351	431	North Carolina	

· 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.

	PER CENT OF TOTAL											
STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC Division		NED	-									
	Free <sup>6</sup>	Mortgaged	Rented	TOTAL								
Continental United States	27.304	9.601	63.095	100.000								
New England			2									
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								
	34.408	11.093	54.499	100.000								
Michigan	20.431	10.339	50 615	100.000								
Wissonsin	30.924	10.401	JU.015	100.000								
	31.810	12.100	40.001	100.000								
West North Central	27 119	11 009	51 870	100.000								
Town	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 °

#### TABLE LII.—OWNERSHIP AND TENANCY OF URBAN HOMES IN EACH STATE, JAN. 1, 1920 a—Continued

	PER CENT OF TOTAL											
STATE AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION	Ov	NED	Deserve									
	۶ Free	Mortgaged	<b>RENTED</b>	TOTAL								
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								

<sup>a</sup> Based on Census figures,-See Census of Population, 1920, Vol. II, p. 1302.

<sup>b</sup> To the Total Homes owned free, 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.

ATIOS OF THESE PRICI (EAR <sup>a</sup>
---

1921	Product (000) (Horses) (Horses) (Horses) (Antholic Horses) (Horses) (1000) (Horses) (1000)	8,850 \$96 35 3,360	7,749 98 41 4,018	6,096 101 44 4,444	2,882 100 25 2,500	2,508 98 18 1,764	2,210 98 14 1,372	2,667 94 11 1,034	5,208 93 17 1,581	3,808 89 22 1,958	2,240 85 36 3,060	1,030 82 29 2,378	776 81 25 2,025	46,024 93 317 29,494	291 93 ÷ 84 = 1.107
1920	Monthly Receipts th of Principal onth Livestock Markets (000)	18 75	23 63	27 48	31 22	32 19	30 17	27 21	24 42	19 32	12 20	03 10	97 8	22 377	122 ÷ 94.5 = ]
	Do) (Ho	000 \$1	203	464 1 1	302 1	193 1	302	318 1	125    1	163 1	752 1 1	023 1	520	365   1	
		6	ີ້ທີ	4	ີຕົ	6	ີຕົ	4,5	6	6	~	<u>∞</u>	4	6	1.218
1919	Monthly Receipts at 8 Principal Livestock Markets (000)	50	43	36	26	17	26	34	49	17	<b>8</b> 8	11	40	557	÷ 98.5 =
	Farm Price 15th of Month (Horses)	\$120	121	124	127	129	127	127	125	119	114	113	113	120	120
		January	February	March	S April	May	June	July	August.	September	October	November.	December.	Weighted Average and Totals	Ratio of Average-for-year Price to January 1 Price

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