"Incomes of Farmers and Non-Farmers Analyzed"

Per Capita Figures Very Greatly in the Different States, New Report Shows

The population not residing on farms has a much more uniform income than the population depending on agriculture for its support, according to a summary of figures presented in detail in the latest report of the National Bureau of Economic Research, entitled "Incomes in the Various States: Sources and Distribution, 1919, 1920 and 1921."

The report states that the non-farm population in 1919, as it is shown, was $1,056 in the District of Columbia, and this was about twice as great as the lowest—$460 in Florida—while the highest per capita income of the farm population was $1,064 in Nevada and the lowest $192 in Tennessee.

Here per capita current income of the non-farm population varies from year to year is shown in the case of seven units which headed the list in 1919 income as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Per Capita Current Income 1919</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>$1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of the farm population, the variation in per capita income in the different States is very striking. In 1919 the highest per capita income was almost 400 per cent of the lowest; in 1921 the highest was over 275 per cent of the lowest; in 1920 the variation was a little less.

Reasons for Wide Disparity

The chief reason for the wide disparity in the per capita income of the farm population is the difference in agricultural yield per individual due to differences in fertility of soil cultivated, 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 farms and property and working capital in various States. The States with a great proportion of tenant farmers or mortgaged farmers would probably show a lower per capita income for the farm population, because a considerable portion of the farm income would be distributed among non-farmers.
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Report on Trade Unions Used in 31 Universities

Results of a recent questionnaire show that 31 American colleges and universities are using the report of the National Bureau of Economic Research, as published in its series of monographs on Trade Unions in connection with their labor courses.

Professor James E. Lafferty, of the University of Nebraska, "I am now using the book as a lecture material and I intend to refer the students to it in the way of collateral reading. In fact, I use it in my publications on labor problems. They are of the greatest value to all economists."

Professor Myron W. Treverton, of the University of Missouri writes, "I have been using Wolman's Growth of American Trade Unions during this term as collateral reading for my course in labor problems. I am also having it reviewed as a special assignment to a graduate student."

Professor Edward McMahon at the University of Washington finds "It is good as collateral reading."

From the University of Pittsburgh comes word through Francis Tyson, "We are using Dr. Wolman's significant volume as collateral reading in our industrial relations courses and in personal administrations."

At Wellesley College, according to Professor Henry R. Mussey, this report is "Suggested as an important part of every student's work in course on labor."

Gordon S. Wiltz, Associate Professor of Economics at the University of Illinois, who is responsible for adding this book to the course in Economics at the University of Cyprus, Southern Branch, writes, "My students are just now engaged in reading Wolman's study."

At the University of Toronto, Professor R. M. Maciver writes, "We find it very useful as a work of reference."

Professor William Z. Ripley, Harvard decides, "We have found it extremely valuable as a source of information for notes and writing."

Professor Matthew B. Hammond at Ohio State University "gave the substance of it in two lectures to my class in Industrial Relations."

At the University of Michigan "this book is being used as collateral reading in the seminars in Economics and in the Public Administration (large course) and Labor Movement (small advanced course). Possible set text as part of the course in Trade Unions (small course) and seminar in Trade Unions."

Professor Selig Perlman at the University of Wisconsin writes, "I will use it for collateral reading in connection with my course in American Labor History which is given for the second semester."

Others using this report either as collateral reading or for reference purposes are:

- Professor Rolfe Ray Cullard, at Goucher College; Professor Amary Hewes, at Mt. Holyoke College; Professor F. S. Diller, at Northwestern University; Professor E. K. Perl, at George Washington University; Professor J. Montgomerie Gombrich, at Teachers College; Professor C. S. Tippett, at the State College of Iowa; Professor R. C. Bushing, at the University of Rochester; Professor Tipton R. Shaftey, at Michigan State University, in that year, this class of income in this division was practically normal."

The total current agricultural income of farmers and property owners in 1921 received by farmers of the New England States was about $15,000,000, which was slightly more than the total current agricultural income of entrepreneurs and property owners. In the same year, the farmers of the New England States received close to 35 per cent of the total current income of farm rents in the country.

New England Farmers Prosper As West Slumps

Easterners Better Situated As Regards Ownership of Land and Capital

However, it is quite apparent from the estimates for the other years that the participation of non-farmers in the total agricultural income is probably greater in Nebraska than in the other States, even where the farm income was high, the farmers seem to have received only 25 per cent of the State total.

Income in Iowa Dividends

Iowa is another State in the West North Central division where the current agricultural income of farmers was shown to amount to nearly 80 per cent. From a total of $4,000,000,000 in 1919, it dropped in 1921 to only about $3,000,000, representing a reduction of nearly 80 per cent.