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SCOPE AND METHOD OF CENSUS

Legal basis for the census.—The census of agriculture of 1930 was authorized by the act of Congress providing for the Fifteenth Decennial Census, approved June 18, 1929. The most important provisions relating to agriculture were as follows: That the Director of the Census should determine the number and form of the schedules to be used; that each enumerator must personally visit each dwelling in his subdivision and secure each and every item of information required; and that the census of population and agriculture be taken as of the 1st day of April, 1930. A copy of the pertinent paragraphs of the act will be found in the appendix to this volume.

Schedules and methods of canvass.—A general farm schedule was prepared in accordance with provisions of the act. This included the personal information regarding the farm operator—his residence, age, color, days of other occupation, if any, and the date upon which he commenced operations; and also general agricultural information regarding farm land, tenure, value, debt, taxes, farm expenditures, machinery, facilities, domestic animals, poultry, bees, livestock products, field crops, fruits and nuts, forest products, nurseries and greenhouses, and the movement of farm population.

Two supplemental schedules for special fruits and nuts were also prepared, one for the State of California and selected counties in four other Western States, and the other for the State of Florida and selected counties in four other Southern States.

Facsimiles of these schedules, and of the general farm schedules used in 1925 and 1920, with a copy of the instructions to enumerators in 1930, will be found in the appendix to this volume.

These agriculture schedules were carried by the enumerator who collected population statistics in accordance with the provisions of the law. All farm information was secured by a personal interview with the farmer, a member of his family, or other responsible individual.

Special schedules were also prepared for securing information regarding irrigation and drainage enterprises, copies of which, with related data, will be found in the respective volumes for Irrigation and Drainage.

Special nursery and greenhouse schedules were used for taking, by mail, a census of this phase of agricultural activity, copies of which are to be found in the volume for Horticulture.

Dates of enumeration.—The 1930 census of agriculture was taken as of April 1. The dates for previous censuses were January 1, 1925 and 1920; April 15, 1910; and June 1 for earlier census years. As a result of these changes in dates it should be noted that many of the 1930 figures are not exactly comparable with those of previous censuses. This is particularly true of livestock which is discussed in Chapter VIII, where classifications are arranged to show fairly comparable age groups, with notes and text indicating the possible differences due to the dates of enumeration. It is also true, but to a lesser extent, of other farm data, inasmuch as the inventory items are as of April 1, 1930, while production and other such items are for the preceding calendar year. Between January 1 and April 1 there is considerable moving from farm to farm and this somewhat affects results.

Area of enumeration.—The agricultural census covered the continental United States (the 48 States and the District of Columbia), and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands of the United States.

Data in this volume are for the continental United States only. Separate agriculture bulletins were published for Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and separate bulletins containing statistics of population and agriculture were published for Alaska, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands of the United States. Data for these possessions are published in one volume, “Outlying Territories and Possessions.” No provision was made in the Fifteenth Decennial Census act for the enumeration of the Philippine Islands.

Method of tabulation.—After completion of the enumeration, the schedules were examined by the supervisors and forwarded to the Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C., where a large force of trained clerks in the Division of Agriculture, under the supervision of experts, examined the schedules to make sure the items had been properly entered and were consistent.

At the census of 1930 the punch-card system of tabulation was again used because of the large volume of data to be tabulated and the limited time. Under this system the various details as to color, tenure, and age of the farm operator, size and value of the farm, livestock, crops, etc., were transferred from the schedules to a series of cards by means of mechanical punches, the position of the holes on the cards indicating the facts to be recorded. The cards thus punched were separated into various classes by automatic sorting machines, and then run through electric tabulating machines which automatically recorded and tabulated on result slips all of the items on these cards. These result slips, after they were verified and computations made, formed the source from which the data were taken for the tables published in the reports of the census of agriculture.
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Reports on agriculture.—In the tabulation of the various agricultural items, precedence was given to those of major importance. In order that these be made available to the public at the earliest date possible, the tabulation was divided into four parts, and the publication of the data followed much the same order as the tabulation.

The results derived from the first three parts of the tabulation were published in four separate State bulletins showing data by counties. The first of the State bulletins presented the data for the number of farms, utilization of land in 1920, and specified farm values by minor civil divisions (townships, districts, etc.). These bulletins were assembled and published in Volume I of the reports on agriculture. The next two State bulletins, which contained the major items of general farm data, livestock, livestock products, and all crops, by counties, were followed by a United States summary bulletin showing corresponding data by geographic divisions and States, and these bulletins were assembled and published in Volume II. The last State bulletin presented, by counties, the major items of general farm data, livestock, and value of farm products sold, traded, or used by operator’s family, classified by type of farm. These bulletins, together with a United States summary bulletin containing corresponding data by divisions and States, were assembled and published in Volume III.

The fourth group in the series of tabulations included such items as age and days of other occupation of farm operator, period of farm occupancy, farm slaughter, hides and skins sold, and rotation pasture. These items were not published separately by counties, but the data by States are included in this volume.

Preliminary press releases for counties and States, showing the number of farms and the more important farm data, were issued as soon as possible after the tabulations were completed, and in advance of the publication of the State bulletins.

The general statistics of the census of agriculture are presented, according to subjects, in this volume. The basic tables, by geographic divisions and States, are accompanied by brief summary tables for the United States and such textbooks as is necessary to explain the data, the changes, and other items of importance.

In addition to the volumes, which constitute the complete reports, of the Fifteenth Decennial Census, there is published an abstract of the census which gives, in abbreviated form, the most important data of the census of agriculture, population, manufacturers, distribution, and mines and quarries.

A special volume, “Chickens and Chicken Eggs, Turkeys, Ducks, and Geese Raised on Farms,” was issued with data for selected items classified by size of flocks of chickens on hand.

Comprehensive studies covering various phases of agriculture, prepared by experts in charge of the technical supervision of the work, were published separately.

EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Farm.—A “farm,” for census purposes, is all the land which is directly farmed by one person, either by his own labor alone or with the assistance of members of his household or hired employees. The land operated by a partnership is likewise considered a farm. A “farm” may consist of a single tract of land or of a number of separate tracts, and these several tracts may be held under different tenures, as when one tract is owned by the farmer and another tract is rented by him. When a landowner has one or more tenants, renters, croppers, or managers, the land operated by each is considered a farm. Thus on a plantation the land operated by each cropper or other tenant was reported as a separate farm, and the land operated by the owner or manager, by means of wage hands, likewise was reported as a separate farm. The enumerators were instructed not to report as a farm any tract of land of less than 3 acres, unless its agricultural products in 1920 were valued at $250 or more.

The definition of a farm used in the 1930 census was the same as for 1920; that for 1920 contained an additional provision with regard to a farm of less than 3 acres, as follows: “* * * or which required for its agricultural operations the continuous services of at least one person.” It is possible that the difference in the number of farms shown for 1930 and 1925 as compared with 1920 is to some extent due to this change in the definition of a farm.

Farm operator.—A “farm operator,” according to the census definition, is a person who operates a farm, either performing the labor himself or directly supervising it. Therefore, the number of farm operators is the same as the number of farmers.

Color of farm operators.—Farm operators are classified as white and colored, the white including Mexicans and Hindus, and the colored including Negroes, Indians, Chinese, Japanese, and all other nonwhite races.

Tenure.—Farm operators are classified, according to the tenure under which they operate their farms, into four general classes, as follows:

- Full owners are farm operators who own all the land which they operate.
- Part owners are farm operators who own part of the land which they operate, and rent and operate additional land. Part owners, therefore, have some of the characteristics of full owners and some of the characteristics of tenants.
- Managers are farm operators who operate farms or ranches for the owners, receiving wages or salaries for their services.
- Tenants are farm operators who operate hired land only. In the present report separate figures are shown for three classes of tenants—namely, (1) cash tenants who pay a cash rental, as $7 per acre for crop land or $500 for the use of the whole
INTRODUCTION

farm; (2) croppers (for the Southern States), who are defined as share tenants, to whom landlords furnish all the work animals; and (3) all other tenants, including those giving a share of the products for the use of the land or a share for part and cash for part.

Land in farms.—The acreage designated as “All land in farms” includes considerable areas of land not actually under cultivation and some not even used for pasture, since each farmer was asked to report as a unit all the land under his control, or rather all the land which he thought of as a part of his farm. Isolated tracts of timberland and other areas not connected with the farm were not included.

APPRAISAL, INTERPRETATION, AND COMPARABILITY OF STATISTICS

The difference in the date of enumeration, the changes in the classification of land, and the wording of certain specific inquiries somewhat affect the comparability of the statistics. It is believed their accuracy has been improved in some respects, inasmuch as new questions and new classifications were adopted to overcome difficulties encountered in the 1920 and 1925 censuses.

The inventory items listed upon the date of enumeration are (other things being equal) more accurate than those which relate to production, and which were dependent upon memory of the preceding year. Change in residence of an important proportion of farmers made it difficult to secure exact reports on the operation of the past year in such cases, particularly in territory where more than one crop is grown on the land in one season, and a check on stubble and other evidence of the preceding year’s crop was not sufficient for a complete report.

The omissions or mistakes of the enumerator, or misunderstanding on the part of the farmer or unwillingness to answer certain questions on debts, taxes, or other personal matters, add to the list of unsatisfactory returns due to human frailities.

CHANGES IN THE NUMBER OF FARMS, FARM ACREAGE, AND POPULATION

In 1920, six principal causes were advanced for the decrease in number of farms between 1910 and 1920.


These same causes were also chiefly responsible for the changes which have occurred since 1920. Conditions have changed very materially and there are some very important points of difference between the situation in 1920 and that in 1930. While in 1920 there was no sign of reaction in movement of farm population from the farms, in 1930 there were signs of a distinct change.

Farm labor which was very difficult to secure and very expensive in 1920 had become fairly plentiful and reasonably cheap in 1930 and the indications were for more and cheaper labor.

Consolidation of farms is indicated in this census by the fact that while there was a decrease in the number of farms there was an actual increase in the acreage of farms. This is closely related to the increased use of improved heavy farm machinery. It is probable that the use of tractors, combined harvester-threshers and other power machinery has resulted in an increase in size of farms that can be easily worked as a unit, and a consolidation of smaller farm units. This also releases the operator of the smaller farm units for other work while it increases the amount of land that can be handled by one operator. The “combine” areas in Kansas and Oklahoma furnish illustrations of such results.

The development of new oil fields and mining areas has resulted in reduction of farms in such areas, as in the new oil sections of Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas.

The growth of cities required land formerly devoted to farms. With the development of the automobile and fine highways this factor has become of increasing importance.

Classification of farm lands.—The following classes of farm land, based on the uses of the land in 1929, are shown separately. This classification of farm land was first presented in the reports of the census of 1926.

Crop land.—The total crop land consists of three classes of land, as follows: 1. Crop land harvested in 1929. 2. Crop failure. 3. Idle or fallow land.

Pasture land, woodland not used for pasture, all other land in farms.—The total pasture land consists of three classes of land, as follows: 1. Favourable pasture. 2. Woodland pasture. 3. Other pasture.

These classes of land are more fully described in Chapter I, Farms and Farm Property.

Some duplication probably occurred where landlord and tenant both reported operations on the rented land. Similar duplication seems probable on a farm consisting of separate tracts far removed, operated at a distance from the home farm, and in different enumeration districts, as often occurs in the West.

When it was necessary to write in the name of minor crops, not listed on the schedule, the statistics are probably less complete than when the crop was specifically listed. Where minor crops were of local importance a fairly complete report appears to have been made, but in other territory some farmers probably failed to report small acreage or quantities of such crops.

On the whole, however, the amount of such crops not secured was so small that it scarcely affects the grand totals of acreage, production, or value.

Similar difficulties doubtless occur in recording livestock items, particularly livestock products. However, the most serious of livestock difficulties is probably induced by the date of enumeration, because of the tendency to use the daily production at the time of enumeration to arrive at yearly totals. This subject is more fully discussed in the livestock chapters.
Abandonment of farms which had become unprofitable was one of the principal reasons for the decrease in the number of farms during the past 10 years. This is especially true of the area in the Southeast, which was devastated by the cotton boll weevil where readjustment has not yet occurred.

This pest was probably responsible for more changes in the number of farms, farm acreage, and farm population than all other causes put together. Between 1920 and 1930, following the invasion of the weevil, there was a decrease in Georgia of about 55,000 farms due almost exclusively to this cause, and in South Carolina of about 34,000 farms due primarily to this cause. In Georgia the favorable reaction, which naturally occurs after a period of time, had begun in 1925 and is still taking place, but such reaction had not occurred in South Carolina because of the more recent invasion of the weevil. Other cotton States have suffered similarly from the weevil in this decade, but not with anything approaching the same severity.

The farm population has decreased in somewhat the same manner as the number of farms and for similar reasons. The essential changes are shown in the accompanying tables. It will be noted that the rural farm population decreased approximately 1,200,000, of which 425,000 was in Georgia and South Carolina.

Perhaps, however, the most important phase of the farm population statistics is the reaction mentioned previously. While the change in the labor situation, and the recovery following the boll weevil invasion in the Southeast are extremely important, they are outweighed by the change in the industrial situation and the movement "back to the farm" on that account, indicated by the enumeration of the movement of population to and from cities. Although the change in industrial conditions had been under way only a few months at the time of the census, a net gain of about 308,000 "back to the farm" had been reported. This is more noteworthy because it is the first time that such a return movement has been recorded and measured.

Table 1—Urban, Rural, and Farm Population, 1920 and 1930; and Movement of Farm Population During the 12-Month Period Preceding April 1, 1930; for the United States

[Statistics for 1920 relate to Apr. 1 and for 1930 to Jan. 1. A minus sign (−) denotes decrease. Figures for divisions and States in Table 2. See headnote on that table.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>INCREASE, 1930–1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>122,775,046</td>
<td>106,710,620</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban population (living in cities and other incorporated places of 2,500 inhabitants and over)</td>
<td>68,054,823</td>
<td>54,304,603</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural population</td>
<td>53,320,223</td>
<td>51,006,017</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-farm 1</td>
<td>30,167,513</td>
<td>31,358,640</td>
<td>−3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of total rural population</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-nonfarm</td>
<td>23,052,710</td>
<td>19,047,377</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of total rural population</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In incorporated places—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2,500 inhabitants</td>
<td>9,183,458</td>
<td>8,909,241</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 1,000 to 2,500 inhabitants</td>
<td>4,520,707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000 inhabitants</td>
<td>4,662,746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of incorporated places</td>
<td>44,680,770</td>
<td>42,430,770</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of total population in rural territory—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In incorporated places under 2,500 inhabitants</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 1,000 to 2,500 inhabitants</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000 inhabitants</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent outside of incorporated places</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm population</td>
<td>30,435,350</td>
<td>31,614,269</td>
<td>−3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of total population</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-farm 1</td>
<td>30,167,513</td>
<td>31,358,640</td>
<td>−3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of total farm population</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban-farm 2</td>
<td>287,897</td>
<td>255,029</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of total farm population</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Movement of farm population Apr. 1, 1929, to Mar. 31, 1930:

To farms from cities 3 | number | farms reporting | 680,422 | 237,542 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>average number per farm reporting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From farms to cities 4</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>farms reporting</td>
<td>372,483</td>
<td>184,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average number per farm reporting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net movement to farms | 307,939 |
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VALUE OF FARM PRODUCTS

It is highly desirable to have a complete total income from farms or a record of the total of both crops harvested and livestock products. The nearest approach to it, however, is a summary of the total value of various kinds of farm products; livestock, crops, and forest, nursery, and greenhouse products. This total amounted to nearly $12,000,000,000 in 1929 and gives a fair idea of the magnitude of farm operations.

Except for livestock products, the subtotals are fairly complete. In livestock products, however, no values are available for livestock sold or slaughtered, nor for hides or skins, nor for livestock raised. Neither is the increase in yearly inventories of livestock available. Separate figures are available for turkeys, ducks, and geese raised.

Furthermore, a very high proportion of crops are fed to livestock on the farm or used for the farmer's family. If these were included a very great amount of duplication would occur.

There are, also, some products of farms which are of minor value and not included, such as those which are derived from birds and animals not usually listed with livestock, and from fur-bearing animals, game preserves, fish farms, and from home industries and kindred enterprises.

For these reasons the current summary of value of farm products is confined to the major items specified. The sources of income by subjects are further detailed and analyzed in this volume, particularly in Chapter I, Farms and Farm Property, and Chapter XIV, Type of Farm.
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### TABLE 3.—VALUE OF SPECIFIED FARM PRODUCTS, BY DIVISIONS AND STATES, 1929

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION AND STATE</th>
<th>Total value of specified farm products</th>
<th>Livestock products</th>
<th>Crop products</th>
<th>Forest products</th>
<th>Nursery and greenhouse products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$11,772,822,232</td>
<td>$3,307,724,234</td>
<td>$8,067,113,229</td>
<td>$2,043,924,234</td>
<td>$1,145,707,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS

#### New England
- Maine
  - 110,408,678
- New Hampshire
  - 38,055,805
- Vermont
  - 93,207,805
- Massachusetts
  - 30,615,080
- Rhode Island
  - 10,355,900
- Connecticut
  - 64,204,128

#### Middle Atlantic
- New York
  - 408,809,805
- New Jersey
  - 150,809,805
- Pennsylvania
  - 306,809,805

#### East North Central
- Ohio
  - 510,809,805
- Indiana
  - 250,000,000
- Michigan
  - 306,809,805
- Wisconsin
  - 217,000,045

#### West North Central
- Minnesota
  - 406,151,000
- Iowa
  - 655,000,000
- Missouri
  - 348,000,000
- North Dakota
  - 281,000,000
- South Dakota
  - 227,000,000
- Nebraska
  - 378,000,000
- Kansas
  - 404,000,000

#### South Atlantic
- Delaware
  - 26,000,000
- Maryland
  - 146,000,000
- District of Columbia
  - 1,015,000
- Virginia
  - 254,000,000
- West Virginia
  - 88,000,000
- North Carolina
  - 510,000,000
- South Carolina
  - 264,000,000
- Georgia
  - 238,000,000
- Florida
  - 110,701,024

#### East South Central
- Kentucky
  - 229,000,000
- Tennessee
  - 266,000,000
- Alabama
  - 261,000,000
- Mississippi
  - 314,000,000

#### West South Central
- Arkansas
  - 245,000,000
- Louisiana
  - 172,000,000
- Oklahoma
  - 317,800,000
- Texas
  - 764,400,000

#### Mountain
- Montana
  - 117,200,000
- Idaho
  - 153,000,000
- Wyoming
  - 112,000,000
- Colorado
  - 216,000,000
- New Mexico
  - 181,000,000
- Arizona
  - 42,900,000
- Utah
  - 69,800,000
- Nevada
  - 14,900,000

#### Pacific
- Washington
  - 216,000,000
- Oregon
  - 132,000,000
- California
  - 728,000,000

---

1. Does not include the value of domestic animals sold or slaughtered (not estimated for 1929), or the value of, $6,023,089, of tannery, ducks, and goose raised. The total value of specified products reported in 1919 was $21,046,018,000, itemized as follows: Livestock products, $3,200,000,000; domestic animals sold or slaughtered, $5,610,000,000; crops, $14,115,000,000; forest products, $8,625,000,000; nursery and greenhouse products, $783,000,000. These figures for 1919 are not strictly comparable with those of 1929 because of differences in questions and inclusions of new items for 1929. See text discussion.

2. Does not include the value of turkeys, ducks, and goose raised.