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## PREFACE

This publication brings together the statistical and economic information that is available concerning the food uses of peanuts, other than crushing for oil. It discusses the major factors that affect consumption in the several alternative outlets. Background material is included on trends in production, foreign trade, and domestic crushing, and on Government programs that bave directly affected the peanut industry. The edible trade has been directly affected in some years by changes in production, in occasional years by changes in the demand for peanuts in alternative outlets, and in most years since 1933 by the level of price support and by other details of the Government support program. As appendix includes detailed tables of supply and disposition of peanuts annually from 1909 to date and of monthly prices of peanuts at various locations for several stages of processing, mainly from 1920 to date.

This material is designed to belp farmers, extension workers, college professors and students, government officials, and members of the peanut industry to understand the basic economic forces that affect consumption of peanuts and peanut products. For example, the statistical analyses of consumption can be used in the operation of Government programs to indicate the most likely level of peanut consumption under given conditions of prices and income. They can be used also to indicate the probable effect of changes in price or in consumer income on consumption. The analyses also indicate, in a general way, the effect of acreagecontrol or diversion programs on total returns to producers for any given year. Descriptive material on supplies and prices of peanut products and competing foods suggest certain possible longer-run effects of the price-support program.

Data relating to the comercial use of peanuts in alternative outlets, such as in peanut butter or as salted nuts, are available only since a few years before World War II. For this reason, detailed statistical studies of the factors that affect consumption in individual outlets are difficult. As the items which compete most closely with peanut products differ for each major outlet, it has not been possible to determine quantitatively how consumption of peanuts has been related to prices for particular peanut products and to prices or consumption of competing items such as jams, jellies, sandwich meats, "soft-center" candies, other salted nuts, and popcorn. However, an attempt has been made to bring together the information that is available for these competing items, and discussion is included of such competitive effects as are apparent. Statistical analyses of the major factors that affect consumption of all shelled peanuts and of cleaned (roasting stock)peanuts are included.

The research on which this report is based was made under authority of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (RMA, Title II). Credit is due many specialists in the Department of Agriculture and the peanut industry who have contributed information and discussed various points with the authors. Special acknowledgment is made to Edgar L. Burtis, formerly of the Bureau of Agricultural Economica, to Harold J. Clay of the Production and Marketing Administration, and to the Nationsl Confectioners' Association of the United States, the Peanut Butter Manufacturers' Association, and the Peanut and Fut Salters' Association and their members, for helpful suggestions. Most of the statistical calculations were made by Floretta L. Downes.
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## SUMMARY

Production of peanuts increased Pairly steadily from 1909 until 1939. During the early years of World War II, production expanded sharply and remained at a high level through 1950. These changes were largely a result of changes in acreages.

United States average yields per acre have followed no pronounced longterm upward or downward trend. This in part reflects the expansion of acreage in lower-yielding areas. In recent years production has been down considerably from the peak reached in 1948 , mainly because of the effects of the acreage allotment program. In 1950 Georgia was the leading producer, with 34 percent of the United States production. Alabama and Texas each produced 16 percent of the total, and North Carolina and Virginia produced 12 and 11 percent, respectively. Eight other States produced the remaining 11 percent.

Consumption of peanuts in the United States has increased along with production. Exports were small until 1945, when large quantities were shipped abrosd to be crushed. Exports continued large through 1948 but declined sharply in 1949 and 1950, although they were still above the prewar level. Until 1929, imported peanuts contributed a fairly substantial part of domestic use - in some years up to 13 percent. During World War I, substantial quantities were crushed to produce peanut oil and meal and this has been true also since 1934. Small quantities are used for seed and feed. In most years since 1934, the quantity of peanuts crushed has been determined mainly by production in excess of edible trade requirements at the pricesupport level; in all years, small quantities of low-grade farmers' stock peanuts and "oilstock" kernels have been crushed.

About 50 to 75 percent of the domestic disappearance of peanuts is used for edible products, chiefly peanut butter, candy, salting, and roasting in the shell. In 1949-50, commercial consumption per capita for food uses wes about 4 pounds (kernel basis) compared with 2.8 pounds in 1920-21. From 1942 to 1946, per capita consumption averaged 6 pounds. The increase during the war is believed to reflect mainly the substitution of peanut products for foods that were in short supply. Consumption of cleaned (roasted-in-the-shell) peanuts has been relatively constant since 1920, so that as a percentage of the total this use has declined. Use in peanut butter has more than doubled, and use in candy making and in salting has increased considerably. In recent years, about half of the shelled peanuts used in edible products have been used in peanut butter, with use in candy and as salted nuts each taking about a fourth of the total.

Peanut butter competes with other bread spreads and sandmich fillers. In 1949, per capita consumption of peanut butter was estimated at 1.4 pounds, compared with 3.5 pounds for commercially produced fruit spreads, 3.5 pounds meats commonly used in sandwiches, and 6.5 pounds for all cheese, excluding Italian and dessert types. During World War II, prices of peanut butter and of cheese were unusually high in relation to the price of jams and jellies. Since World War II, this relationship has been maintained. Prices of cheese rose more rapidly than did prices of peanut butter during the war, but declined sharply in 1949 and 1950, whereas prices of peanut butter increased moderately. Civilian per capita consumption of cheese in 1950 was the highest on record, whereas production of peanut butter per capita in 1949-50 was 33 percent below the peak reached in 1943, although moderately above the prewar level.

Salting of peanut kernels is the second largest peanut-consuming industry. This industry startel with the introduction of peanut-vending machines located in public places. Today salted peanut kernels are distributed throuch drug stores, nut, stores, grocery stores, and five-and-ten-cent stores, where they are freshly cooked and sold or are available in sealed packages. Sore salted peanut kernels are used by the baking
industry and by soda fountains. According to peanut salters, except for cashews, competition between salted peanut kernels and other nut kernels is slight. During 1935-39, prices of cashew nuts were about double the price of shelled Virginia-type extra-large peanuts, while in 1949-50, prices of cashews were only about one and one-fifth times as high. Imports of cashews into the United States increased from 4 mililion pounds in 1930 to 48 million pounds in 1950.

Peanuts have been used in candy for many years. Since 1941, use of peanuts in candy, including the kernel equivalent of peanut butter used In candy, has varied between a high of 209 million pounds in 1943 and a low of 107 million pounds in 1948. Nut rolls, which consist of a soft, mougat-like center surrounded by a layer of hlanched peanuts and covered with a chocolate coating, are the largest users of shelled peanuts in candy. Other confections in which peanuts are used are chocolate bars containing peanuts, chocolate-covered peanuts, peanut bars, and peanut brittle. The major competitor of peanut candy is other "soft-center" candy bars. Since the end of World War II, the price of peanuts has risen more rapidiy than the average price of the ingredients that are used in soft fillings.

Per capita expenditures for peanut products eaten at home tend to increase as income increases. The rate of expenditure is about twice as large for the highest-income groups as for the lowest. This reflects a sharp increase between the highest- and lowest-income groups in expenditures for shelled peanuts, a more moderate increase in those for peanut butter, and a considerable decrease in those for peanuts in the shell. The percentage which peanuts and peanut products represent of total expenditures for food varies only slightly among income groups from the average of 0.4 percent for all income groups. Expenditures for items that compete with peanut products also rise as incomes incresse, parificularly for tree nuts and candy. About a third of the houscholds included in a survey in the spring of 1948 reported use of peanut butter and 40 percent used jams and jellies during the survey week. Only 4.5 percent of the households reported consuming shelled peanuts at bome and only 1.1 percent, peanuts in the shell during this week. A somewhat larger proportion used tres nuts.

Based on analyses for 1920-40 and 1946-50, the demand at the wholesale level for both cleaned and shelled peanuts apparently is relatively inelastic. A l-percent change in the wholesale price, on the average, has been associated with a change of 0.3 percent in the opposite direction in per capita consumption of cleaned peanuts and 0.4 to 0.5 percent in per capita consumption of shelled peanuts. A l-percent change in disposable income, on the average, apparently caused a change of 0.6 percent in the same direction in per capita consumption of cleaned peanuts and 0.4 to 0.6 percent in that of shelled peanuts. The higher ifgure for shelled nuts is from an analysis based on year-to-year changes, and the
lower one was indicated by an analysis based on deviations from the longtime average. As consumption of cleaned peanuts is much smaller than consumption of shelled peanuts, a l-percent change in either price or income has a considerably greater effect, in terms of pounds per capita, on shelled than on cleaned peanuts. During the long run, demand for cleaned peanuts has declined, whereas demand for shelled peanuts has increased. Consumption of both cleaned and shelled peanuts was considerably higher during World War II than would have been expected, based on the level of prices and consumer income. This is believed to reflect mainly the shortage of substitute foods.

Govermment programs to support the price of peanuts began with the 1933 crop and, except for 1936-37, they have been continued each year since. Provisions of the programs vary considerably from year to year. The principal provisions for each year are discussed in this bulletin.

## COMMERCIAL FOOD USES OF PEANUTS

From 50 to 75 percent of the domestic disappearance of peanuts is used for food. A small quentity of peanuts is eaten by each groweris household or is sold directly by iarmers for food uses, but most peanuts used for direct edible consumption move through comercial channels and reach consumers in the form of nuts rossted in the shell, shelled auts roasted and salted, peanut candy, or peanut butter (fig. l). Since 1920, the comercial food use of peanuts has steadily increased. It reached an all-time high in 1944 when 925 million pounds (kernel besis) of peanuts were used in production of food products. This was more than three times the 300 million pounds consumed in food uses in 1920.

Postwar comercial consumption of peanuts for food uses (1946-50) averaged 618 million pounds (kernel basis), compared with the prewar (1937-41) average consumption of 566 million pounds. Comercial consumption per capita for food uses in 1949-50 was about 4 pounds (kernel basis) compared with 2.8 pounds in 1920-21. During $1942-46$ per capita consumption averaged 6 pounds. The increase during the war is believed to reflect mainly the substitution of peanut products for other foods in short supply, such as butter, cheese, sandwich meats, jams and jellies, candy and imported nuts.

## Roasted in the Shell

Use of peanuts as a roasted-in-the-shell nut for eating, initialiy the only outlet for the comercial crop, has become less important in the last 30 years. Such peanuts, prior to roasting, are referred to as "cleaned peanuts." Most other peanuts, after milling, move through commercial channels in the form of shelled peanuts. The average commercial food use of cleaned peanuts in 1920-29 was 91 milion pounds (cleaned-in-shell basis) or 17 percent of the total commercial food uses.


Figure 1.

This compares with 66 million pounds for $1946-50$, or 8 percent of the total. Consumption has gradually shilted from cleaned (roasted) peanuts to shelled, salted peanuts. New developments in packaging salted shelled peanuts, increased use of vending machines in public places, and the increase in wage levels, are believed to be mainly responsible for this change. The display and use, in more recent years, of electric cookers in most of the five-and-ten-cent stores and the establishment in most cities of nut stores, in which shelled peanuts and other nuts are sold freshly cooked to the public, and a reduction in the number of vendors selling hot, Presh-roasted peanuts in the shell, also contributed to this shift. In the opinion of some peanut roasters, almost any five-and-ten-cent food item is a competitor of roasted peanuts. Popcorn is believed to be a major competitor, although this could not be demonstrated statistically. In 1936-40, the season average price received by farmers for peanuts was 3.5 cents a pound, compared with 2.0 cents a pound received by farmers for popcorn (table 3). In 1948-50 the price received by farmers for peanuts was 10.6 cents a pound, compared with 4.1 cents a pound received for popcorn. Thus, between the two periods, the price of peanuts tripled and the price of popcorn doubled. The effect of such changes on retail prices, for which no data are available, would depend a great deal upon relative processing and marketing charges.

Peanut butter first came into use about 1890 as a food for invalids. Today the peanut-butter industry consumes about 50 percent of the peanuts used for all food purposes and about 20 percent of all peanuts picked and threshed. Before 1943, statistics showing the quantity of peanuts used in the manufacture of peanut butter were not available. In 1925 the Census of Manufactures (14) 1/ first reported production of peanut butter at 72 million pounds. In 1931, production increased to 104 million pounds and in 1939, according to the same source, production of peanut butter rose to 157 million pounds or more than double the 1925 production (table 1).

In 1943 a survey of the peanut-consuming industries by the War Food Administration indicated the consumption of shelled peanuts in candy, salting, and peanut butter. This survey showed that 345 million pounds of shelled peanuts were used in peanut butter consumed as such and that 32 million pounds of shelled peanuts were used in production of peanut butter for candy manufacturing. Trade estimates indicate a 15 -percent loss in weight of shelled peanuts in production of peanut butter. Thus production of peanut butter (for consumption as such) in 1943 is estimated at 293 million pounds, an increase of 87 percent over that of 1939 .

In 1944 the Bureau of Agricultural Economics began to collect data showing consumption of shelled peanuts by major uses, including peanut butter. These data are published monthly in Peanut Stocks and Processing (10) and are believed to include more than 90 percent of the total consumption. In the 1945 crop-year, according to a sumary of this report (11, 12), consumption of shelled peanuts in peanut butter, excluding the estimated quantity of peanuts used by manufacturers to make peanut butter for their own use in candy, was 333 million pounds, the second highest on record. In 1946, this figure dropped to 259 million pounds, with a further slight decline in 1947 and 1948. In 1949 consumption of shelled peanuts in peanut butter increased slightly to 256 million pounds. Use of peanuts in peanut butter in 1950 is estimated at 273 milion pounds.

No data are available on consumption of peanut butter. In table 1 , per capita production of peanut butter has been calculated, using a conversion factor based on trade estimates of 85 pounds of peanut butter per 100 pounds of shelled peanuts used. Before 1944 , the United States population on July 1 was used in arriving at per capita estimates, while for the crop-years 1944-50, ponulation on January 1 of the following year was usen. It can be assumed that during several yeara production of peanut butter nill average about the same as consumption plus exporta. No imports of peanut hutter are recorted. Exports of neanut butter are not reporterd separately in the Uniteत States foreign traie statiatics, but they sre believed to be small.

Numbers in parontheses refer to Literature Cited, 9.63.

Table 1.-Peanut butter: Use of shelled peanuts in manufacture and estimated production, specified years


1/ 1925-39, calendar year; 1943 to date, year beginning Sept. $l_{\text {. }}$ 2/ Census years, 1925-39, reported production; 1943 to date, 85 percent of the quantity of shelled peanuts used. Excludes peanut butter made by manufacturers for their own use in candy.

3/ Reported in value. Converted to quantity by using the wholesale price of peanut butter at Chicago.

Compiled as follows: 1925-39, Census of Manufactures (14); 1943, unpublished survey of U. S. War Food Administration; 1944 to date, Bureau of Agricultural Economics (10, 11, 12). See table 21, note 1, for minor adjustment made in 1944 and 1945.
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All of the principal food items used in making sandwiches are, to some extent, competitors of peanut butter. Chief among these are (1) jams, jellies, preserves, and fruit butters, (2) cheese and (3) sandwich meats, such as bologna, salami, and ham. Price series on these competitive items are limited. Table 2 shows wholesale prices per pound from 1926 to date for peanut butter, an average of three types of jams and jellies, and American cheese. In most years, the cost of peanut butter per pound was less than that for cheese or than the average price of jams and jellies. The separate price series for jams and jellies are not available for publication, but it may be said that in most years before 1941 prices of peanut butter were lower than those for jam but higher than those for jelly. Beginning in 1946, prices of peanut butter have been consistently higher than prices of peach jam but lower than prices of strawberry jam. Prices of cheese generally are somewhat higher than prices of jams and jellies. From 1941 through 1948, prices of cheese were substantially above prices of other commonly used sandwich spreads or fillers, except ham. In 1949 and 1950 prices of cheese were about 25 percent lower than in 1948, while prices for the others did not change greatly.

Price relatives are shown for the three groups on a 1935-39 average base. During World War II prices of peanut butter and cheese were unusually high in relation to prices of jams and jellies and they have continued so since. The low price for jams and jellies probably reflects, at least in part, the relatively low prices that have prevailed for sugar in recent years. Prices of cheese rose more rapidly than did prices of peanut butter during the war, but declined sharply in 1949 and 1950, whereas prices of peanut butter increased moderately. Civilian per capita consumption of cheese in 1950 was the highest on record, whereas in 1949-50 per capita production of peanut butter was 33 percent below the peak reached in 1943, although higher than in any prewar year. No long-term series are available on consumption or production of jams and jellies. The price-support program for peanuts has been important in causing the relatively high prices for peanut butter.

Data are available for 1949 which indicate approximately the relative importance of the various sandwich spreads. Based on data given by Winger (26), commercial production of fruit spreads (jams, jellies, preserves, fruit butters, and marmalades) is estimated at 3.5 pounds per capita. Packs produced in the home would provide substantial additional amounts. Production of meats commonly used for sandwiches (sausage and similar loaves, luncheon meats, potted and deviled meat products, and deviler hey.) also amounted to about 3.5 pounds per capita in 1949. Civilian fer capita consumption of American cheese in that year was 5.3 pounds; of all cheese, excluding Italian and dessert types, civilian per capita consumption was 6.5 pounds. In 1949, production of peanut butter was estimated at 1.4 pounds per capita.

A factor that has tended to depress demend for all sandwich spreads and fillers is the decliaing consumption of bread, which is indicated by a steady decline in per capita consumption of wheat flour. Consumption of flour declined from 159 pounds per capita in 1935-39 to 133 pounds in 1950, a drop of 16 percent.

Table 2.- Wholesale price of peanut butter and of certain competitive items, 1.926-50

| Calendar year | Wholesale price per pound |  |  |  | Price relatives (1935-39 = 100) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Peanut butter $1 /$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Jams and } \\ & : \text { jellies } \\ & : \quad 2 / \end{aligned}$ | American cheese 3/ | : | Peanut butter | Jams and jellies | American cheese |
|  | Cents | Cents | Cents | : |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1926 | 15.8 | 19.8 | 20.1 | : | 127 | 156 | 142 |
| 1927 | 16.8 | 18.0 | 22.7 | : | 135 | 142 | 160 |
| 1928 | 15.4 | 17.7 | 22.1 | : | 124 | 139 | 156 |
| 1929 | 14.8 | 15.4 | 20.2 | : | 119 | 121 | 142 |
| 1930 | 13.1 | 14.9 | 16.4 | : | 106 | 117 | 115 |
| 1931 | 11.6 | 13.6 | 12.5 | : | 94 | 107 | 88 |
| 1932 | 8.6 | 10.7 | 10.0 | : | 69 | 84 | 70 |
| 1933 | 8.6 | 11.3 | 10.2 | : | 69 | 89 | 72 |
| 1934 | 11.2 | 12.1 | 11.7 |  | 90 | 95 | 82 |
| 1935 | 15.1 | 12.1 | 14.3 |  | 122 | 95 | 101 |
| 1936 | 11.4 | 12.9 | 15.3 |  | 92 | 101 | 108 |
| 1937 | 12.8 | 13.5 | 15.9 |  | 103 | 106 | 112 |
| 1938 | 11.6 | 12.4 | 12.6 |  | 94 | 98 | 89 |
| 1939 | 11.0 | 12.7 | 12.8 |  | 89 | 100 | 90 |
| 1940 | 9.6 | 12.7 | 14.3 |  | 77 | 100 | 101 |
| 1941 | 11.0 | 13.2 | 19.4 |  | 89 | 104 | 137 |
| 1942 | 18.4 | 15.5 | 21.6 |  | 148 | 12.2 | 152 |
| 1943 | 23.2 | 17.0 | 23.2 |  | 187 | 134 | 163 |
| 1944 | 19.9 | 18.7 | 23.2 |  | 160 | 147 | 163 |
| 1945 | 20.6 | 18.8 | 23.2 | : | 166 | 148 | 163 |
| 1946 | 23.8 | 23.2 | 34.8 |  | 192 | 182 | 245 |
| 1947 | 25.2 | 24.7 | 36.0 |  | 203 | 194 | 254 |
| 1948 | 27.2 | 22.5 | 40.7 |  | 219 | 177 | 287 |
| 1949 | 28.0 | 21.1 | 30.4 | : | 226 | 166 | 214 |
| 1950 | 29.2 | 24.6 | 30.9 | : | 235 | 193 | 218 |

1/ Fancy grade, case lots, Chicago. Standard grade before 1943, first grade November 1949 to date.
2) Weighted average price of peach jam, strawberry jam, and grape jelly in case lots, f.o.b. plant. Grape jelly estimated from a related series after 1941. Price converted to a per pound basis. Weights based on production of these items in 1944-45.

3/ American cheddars, Wisconsin Cheese Exchange.
Peanut butter, jams and jellies from U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; cheese from U. S. Department of Agriculture.

## Use in Nut Salting

Peanut salting is the second largest peanut-consuming industry in the United States. According to Clay ( $2, ~ p, 68$ ), the introduction around 1900 of peanut-vending machines which were located in public places throuetout the country gave impetus to the peanut-salting industry, although salted peanuts had been sold on railroad trains since the early $1890^{\prime} s^{\circ}$ Spanish-type peanuts were first used in these machines, but in the late 1930's a vending machine was introduced to handle Virginia type peanuts. Today salted peanuts are distributed through grocery and drug stores and through nut stores and five-and-ten-cent stores, where they are freshly cooked and sold. Some salted peanuts are used by the baking industry and by soda fountains.
(Three separate types of peanuts are recognized in the commercial channels of trade - the Virginia type, the Spanish, and the Runner. of the several varieties included in the Virginia type, all are large podded and the kernels are covered with a plakish skin. They are grown in southwestern Virginia and northeastern North Carolina. Most peanuts sold in the skeli for roasting are of the Virginia type. The Spanish type is used widely in the Southeastern and Southwestern sections. The plant is upright in growth and is harvested easily, as the pods are closely centered near the Eurface of the ground. Snelled Spanish peanuts are used by salters, manufacturers of peanut butter and candy makers. They bave a higher oil content than either Runners or Virginias. Runner peanuts are grown commercially in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. The pod is medium size but it more nearly resembles the Spanish than the Virginia type. Runners formerly were gromm primarily for "hogging-off" or for crushing, but increasing quantities are used in the manufacture of peanut butter and peanut candy. The oil content is higher than for Virginias but lower than for Spanish. Vaiencia peanuts are grown mainly in New Mexico and are similar in habit of growth and type of kernel to the Spanish type.)

Before 1943 no statistics were available on peanuts used in nut salting. The Census of Manufactures (24), however, reported that the value of salted peanuts produced in 1937 was 12 million dcllars compared with 17 million dollars - the value of peanut butter reported produced in that year. In 1943, according to the survey of the peanut-consuming industry made by the War Food Administration, consumption of peanuts in nut salting was estimated at 244 million pounds, equal to 30 percent of the total shelled peanuts reported consumed.

In 1944 Peanut Stocks and Processing (10) reported consumption of 247 million pounds of shelled peanuts by the nut-salting industry. A high level of consumption continued during World War II, when imports of foreign nuts (especially cashews) were low and supplies of other competitive items were reduced. When hostilities ceased and importation of foreign nuts was
resumed, consumption of peanuts by nut salters declined. In 1949, nut salters c.nsumed only 118 million pounds of shelled peanuts or about half the cunsuniption of 1944 (fig. 1), but in 1950 this figure increased to 133 million pounds.

According to peanut salters, except for cashews there is little competition between salted peanuts and other salted nuts. In recent years, the peanut-salting industry has been much concerned because of increased importation of cashews and the narrowing (percentajewise) of tbe price difference between cashew nuts and Virginia-type extra-large sbelled peanuts. The average wholesale price of cashew-nut pieces from 1935 to 1939 was 17 cents a pound at New York or about twice the price of shelled Virginia-type extra-large peanuts. The 1948-50 average wholesale price of cashews was only about one and a fifth times the price of these peanuts (table 3).

Imports of cashew nuts Into the United States were first reported in 1930, when only 4 miliion pounds were imported. Since then imports of casbew nuts have steadily increased, reaching an all-time record of 48 million pounds in 1950 。

## Use in Candy

Peanuts have been used in candy for many years, but the quantity used was not reported separately until 1937. In that year the Census of Manufactures (14) reported production of 57 million pounds of peanut candy, and in $\overline{1939}$, the same source reported production of 62 million pounds. In 1941-43, the quantities of principal ingredients, including peanuts, used in candy were given in Confectionery Salea and Distribution (20) issued annually by the United States Department of Commerce. Since 1944, information on the use of peanuts in candy bas been given in the BAE montbly report Peanut Stocks and Frocessing (10)。 Since 1941, use of peanuts in candy, including the peanut-equivalent of peanut butter, has varied between a high of 209 million pounds in 1943 and a low of 107 mlli ion pounds in 1948 (fig. 1). In 1950 , use of shelled peanuts in candy was reported at 128 million pounds.

The largest use of shelled peanuts in candy is in the manufacture of nut rolls, which typically consist of \& soft, nougat-like center surrounded by a layer of blanched peanuts (usually the Spanish type) and covered with a chocolate coating. Other confections in which peanuts are used are chocolate bars that contain peanuts, chocolate-covered peanuts, peanut bars, and peanut brittle. The latter coasist of peanuts held together in a congealed sugar sirup. Quantitative data on the use of peanuts in separate confectionery products are not available.

Table 3.- Wholesale price of shelled peanuts and specified tree nuts, and price received by farmers for popcorn, 1921-51


1/ Calendar year for all nuts; price received for precedng crop for popcorn.
2/ Virginia-type, shelled, extra-large, New York.
$\overline{3} / 1932-38$, standard pieces; 1939-51, fancy pieces, New York.
California non-pareil-type: 1932-43, average all sizes; 1944, extra large; 1945, sheller run; 1946-51, average all sizes, New York.

5/ 1932-35, 1937 and 1938, Barcelona; 1942-46, Oregon Barcelona, average all sizes; 1936 and 1939-41, Levant, average all sizes; 1947, Levant, Large; 1948-51, Levant, extra large, New York.
6/ 1932-44, medium; 1945, fancy pieces; 1947-51, fancy halves, New York.
I/ 1932-38, imported average all kinds; 1939-43, domestic California; 1944, California pieces; 1945-48, California halves and pieces; 1949-51, light helves, New York.

8/ 1932-38, medium whole; 1939-43 and 1946-51, medium whole unblanched; 1944-45, whole, New York.
9/ Season average price, U. S. average.
Peanut prices compiled from Weekly Peanut Report (22); other nut prices compiled from New York Journal of Commerce (4); popcorn price from U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Major competitors of peanuts used in nut rolls are other "softcenter" candies. Peanut rolls are sold on candy stands in competition with other types of candy bars, chief among which are chocolate-covered bars that contain caramel, nougat, or sugar-cream fillings. Since World War II, the price of peanuts has risen more rapidiy than the average price of the ingredients used in soft fillings (table 4). Granulated sugar and corn sirup are the principal ingredients of such fillings. Sweetened condensed skim milk and a number of other items are used in smaller amounts. In most years since 1920, prices of peanuts have been considerably higher than the average price for soft-center ingredients. Since about 1941, however, the margin has been unusually wide, with prices of peanuts in all years more than double the average prices of soft-center ingredients.

Both salted peanuts and peanut candy compete at the retail level with other types of candy, particularly candy bars, with 5-and lo-cent packages of cakes and cookies, and with other snacks in this price range.

## CONSUMPTION OF PEANUTS AND RELATED ITEMS, BY INCOME GROUPS

Table 5 shows consumption, consumer expenditures, and percentage of bouseholds using specified peanut products, total tree nuts, jams and jellies, and candy; by income groups. These data are based on a survey made by the United States Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics (18) which covered one week in the spring of 1948. To make them comparable with other consumption statistics published in this report, they were converted to an annual per capita basis. The data are assumed to be representative of urban families throughout the United States but they include only food consumed at bome. For a number of items included in table 5 a substantial part of the total consumption would be caten away from bome.

Per capita expenditures for peanut products eaten at home tend to increase as income increases, the rate being about twice as large for the highest-income groups as for the lowest. The increase from low- to bighincome groups is sharp for shelled peanuts, more moderate for peanut butter, with a decrease for peanuts in the shell. However, expenditures for total food per capita also increase as incomes increase. Therefore, the percentage which peanut products represent of the total varies only slightly by income groups, from an average of 0.4 percent for all income groups, except the lowest with incomes per household of less than $\$ 1,000$ per year. Consumption of peanuts in the shell is relatively high in this group. For other peanut products it is extremely low, particularly for shelled peanuts.

The particularly heavy consumption of peanuts in the shell by the lowest-income group probably reflects in part the generally lower level of income in the southern than in the northern part of the country. A national sample of lower-income groups tends to be heavily weighted by southern families. Hence, what may appear to be a change in types of food purchases

Table 4.- Wholesale price of shelled peanuts and of certain items used in "soft-center" candies, 1920-50

| Year beginning September | : Wholesale price per pound |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Price relatives, } \\ 1935-39=100 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Peanuts } \\ & 1 / \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \vdots & \\ \vdots & \text { Sugar } \\ \vdots & 2 / \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \\ \vdots & \\ \vdots & \text { corn } \\ : & 3 / r u p \\ : & \end{array}$ | : Sweet- $:$ Weighted$:$ ened $:$ average,$:$ con- $:$ soft-$:$ densed $:$ center$:$ skimmilk $4 /$ ingredi-ents $5 /$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | : Soft- <br> : center <br> : ingredi- <br> : ents 5/ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | : |  |  |
|  | : 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1920 | 7.4 | 8.0 | 3.4 | 7.7 | 6.4 | : | 109 | 139 |
| 1921 | 7.1 | 5.5 | 2.5 | 5.3 | 4.6 | : | 104 | 100 |
| 1922 | : 11.6 | 7.8 | 3.2 | 7.6 | 6.3 | : | 171 | 137 |
| 1923 | : 12.7 | 7.9 | 3.7 | 6.7. | 6.6 | : | 187 | 143 |
| 1924 | : 9.6 | 6.2 | 4.3 | 6.2 | 5.9 | : | 141 | 128 |
| 1925 | : 8.9 | 5.3 | 3.4 | 6.1 | 5.1 | : | 131 | 111 |
| 1926 | 10.7 | 5.9 | 3.3 | 5.9 | 5.4 | : | 157 | 117 |
| 1927 | : 8.2 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 5.9 | 5.4 | : | 121 | 117 |
| 1928 | : 7.9 | 5.1 | 4.0 | 5.7 | 5.2 | : | 116 | 113 |
| 1929 | : 6.7 | 4.9 | 3.9 | 5.3 | 4.9 | : | 99 | 107 |
| 1930 | : 7.2 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 4.4 | : | 106 | 96 |
| 1931 | : 4.0 | 4.1 | 2.8 | 4.3 | 3.8 | : | 59 | 83 |
| 1932 | : 4.3 | 4.2 | 2.6 | 4.2 | 3.8 | : | 63 | 83 |
| 1933 | : 6.0 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 4.1 | : | 88 | 89 |
| 1934 | 9.0 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 4.6 | : | 132 | 100 |
| 1935 | : 7.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 4.8 | : | 103 | 104 |
| 1936 | : 7.6 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 4.9 | : | 111 | 107 |
| 1937 | 6.5 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 4.5 | : | 95 | 98 |
| 1938 | : 6.2 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 4.3 | 4.2 | : | 91 | 91 |
| 1939 | : 6.8 | 4.6 | 3.2 | 5.0 | 4.4 | : | 100 | 96 |
| 1940 | : 6.7 | 4.6 | 3.5 | 5.2 | 4.6 | : | 99 | 100 |
| 1941 | : 11.7 | 5.4 | 3.7 | 7.2 | 5.4 | : | 172 | 117 |
| 1942 | : 14.6 | 5.5 | 3.7 | 8.4 | 5.6 | : | 215 | 122 |
| 1943 | : 15.8 | 5.5 | 3.9 | 8.7 | 5.7 | : | 232 | 124 |
| 1944 | : 16.0 | 5.4 | 4.3 | 8.1 | 5.8 | : | 235 | 126 |
| 1945 | : 16.1 | 5.7 | 4.6 | 8.5 | 6.1 | : | 237 | 133 |
| 1946 | : 17.2 | 7.8 | 5.8 | 11.8 | 8.3 | : | 253 | 180 |
| 1947 | : 18.3 | 7.8 | 7.1 | 8.8 | 8.7 | : | 269 | 189 |
| 1948 | : 18.7 | 7.7 | 6.0 | 8.4 | 8.1 | : | 275 | 176 |
| 1949 | : 19.2 | 7.8 | 6.1 | 8.0 | 8.0 | : | 282 | 174 |
| 1950 | : 18.9 | 8.2 | 7.0 | 9.5 | 8.7 | : | 278 | 189 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  | : |  |  |

Table 4.- Wholesale price of shelled peanuts and of certain items
used in "softocenter" candies, $1920-50$ os continued
Spanish, No. 1, shelled, Chicago.
Granulated, barrels, New York.
Forty-three degrees, crystal, barrels, carlots, New York.
Bulk goods, U. S. average manufacturer's carlot selling price.
Weighted average including the following items (weights given in parentheses): Granulated sugar (51.90); corn sirup (34.73); sweetened condense skim milk (4.91); cornstarch (1.5l); corn sugar (1.40); maple sirup (1.35); coconut oil (1.30); nonfat dry milk solids ( 0.81 ); cottonseed oil ( 0.73 ); molasses ( 0.57 ); and butter ( 0.36 ).

Sugar from U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; corn sirup compiled from New York Journal of Commerce (4); peanuts and condensed skim milk from U.S. Department of Agriculture.
$\because 1020: 0-52-\quad:$

Table 5.- Peanuts and related comodities: Expenditures and consumption per capita and percentage distribution of households using, by income classes, spring of 2948


[^0]U. S. Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics (18). Data in the report on expenditures and consumption are stated in terms of per household per week. For this table, these have been converted to a per capita per year basis.

With rising income may actusily be the shift from many typically southern food habits (such as heavy use of peanuts in the shell by low-income groups) to those more characteristic of the North. This explanation is borne out by comparing consumption of peanuts and peanut butter in a typical southern city, such as Birmingham, Ala. with that in a typical northern city, such as Minneapolis-St. Paul. Detailed statistics by type of peanut products are not shown in the reports by cities issued by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics $(16,17)$. However, the total equivalent in pounds is much higher for low-income groups in the South than for those in the North. For the higher-income groups it is about the same, in the two regions.

Expenditures for items that cumpete with peanut products also increase as incomes increase, in the national average, particularly for tree nuts and candy. Per capita expenditures for tree nuts by the highest-income group were almost nine times as large as those for the lowest-income group; for candy, they were more than five times as large. For jams and jellies, expenditures by the highest-income group were about 70 percent larger than for the lowest-income group, whereas for peanut butter, expenditures were about 2.5 times as large in the highest-income group as in the lowest.

The following tabulation indicates the percentage increase (or decrease) in expenditures for each l-percent increase in income per household for these items. Fox (3, p. 80) says, "There are strong arguments for comparing the expenditure-income regressions from family budget data with the consumptionincome regressions from time series." The latter are discussed in a later section. Fox indicates that the expenditure-income regressions are to be preferred to consumption-income regressions whenever the price of the item tends to increase with income. This is true for candy and shelled tree nuts. For this reason, these relationships were computed for expenditures rather than for consumption.

## Item

Peanuts in the shell
Jams and jellies
Peanut butter
Tree nuts in the shell
Shelled peanuts
Shelled tree nuts Candy

Percentage change in expenditures for each 1 percent change in income per household l/

## Percent <br> $-0.4$

. 2
. 3
. 3 .55

All foods consumed at home
. 2
1/ Based on unweighted date. Fox (3) obtained a coefficient of 0.29 for all foods consumed at home when the data were weighted by proportion of total families falling in each income group and when certain other adjustments were made.

Consumption increases in about the same proportion as expenditures for most items, except in the highest-income group ( $\$ 7,500$ per household and over). This indicates that as incomes increase moderately, the price paid per pound for the various iteme is relatively constant. In the highest-income group, consumption of candy and of shelled tree nuts in pounds shows less of an increase over consumption in the lower-income groups than does the expenditure figure, indicating that for this group considerably higher prices per pound were paid. This group consumed relatively small amounts of tree nuts in the shell and shelled peanuts and reported no purchases of peanuts in the shell. It should be noted that the data on candy in table 5 includes both peanut and non-peanut items.

About a third of all households reported using peanut butter during the survey week, with the low-income groups having the lowest percentage and the highest-income group having a slightly higher percentage than the middle-income group. About 40 percent of all households used jams and jellies, with the distribution by income groups about the same as for peanut butter. Only 4.5 percent of the households reported shelled peanuts and only l.l percent reported peanuts. In the shell consumed at home. A somewhat larger proportion used tree nuts. The low percentage of households using peanuts as such undoubtedly reflects to a considerable extent the fact that this survey covered consumption for only a single week. The survey indicates definitely that only a few households use peanuts regularly, that is, as often as once a week. A study covering a longer time period would be required to indicate the percentage of bouseholds that use peanuts occasionally.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSES OF FACTORS ATFECTING USE OF PEANUTS FOR FOOD

Analyses of the quantitative effects of specified factors on consumption of peanuts are useful from several standpoints. These analyses indicate the relative effects of each major factor taken separately and the total part of the variation in coasumption that can be explained by the several factors taken together. In the anslyses of peanuts, prices of the nuts, consumer income, and a time trend were found to explain a mejor part of the variation in consumption of peanuts. The time trend represents the composite effects of gradual changes over time in consumer preferences, merchandizing methods, and in new or improved products. If an estimate is available of the probable level of peanut prices and of consumer income, these analyses can be used to indicate the most likely level of consumption of peanuts for some period in the future. For program operations, the analyses can be used to indicate the most likely level of consumption under given conditions of prices and income. Likewise, they can be used to indicate the probable effect of changes in price or income on consumption.

The analyses also belp to provide an understanding of the basic economic forces that affect consumption and prices of peanuts. These forces need to be understood by growers, processors, and government officials in order to appraise accurately the probable effects of various programs on the peanut industry. The economic concept of elasticity of demand is particularly important in this connection. Demand elasticity is defined as the percentage change in consumption which is normally associated with a one percent change in price. If the demand for a given product is elastic (that is, bas an elasticity greater than 1), the total value received from a given quantity marketed will increase as the quantity marketed increases, because price declines by a smaller proporticn than the increase in marketings. If the demand is inelastic (that is, has an elasticity less than 1), the total value decreases as the quantity marketed increases because, under such conditions, the decline in price is greater, proportionally, than the increase in quantity. The demand for most products that have close substitutes tends to be elastic; the demand for many products which represent a small part of total consumer expenditures and which have few close substitutes tends to be inelastic. Peanuts fall into the second category. The demand for both cleaned and shelled peanuts is inelastic. For cleaned peanuts, a l-percent change in wholesale price is associated, on the average, with an 0.3 -percent change in consumption; for shelled peanuts, a l-percent change in price is associated with an 0.4 - to an 0.5 -percent change in consumption. Demand is somewhat more inelastic for cleaned than for shelled peanuts, because there are fewer substitutes for cleaned than for shelled peanuts and peanut butter.

Elasticity of demand frequently can be measured at the retail level, the wholesale level, and the local market or farm level. If interest is primarily in consumer expenditures for a product, elasticity should be measured at the retail level; if concern is mainly with total returns to farmers, elasticity should be measured at the farm level. Analyses discussed in detail in this section are based on prices in wholesale markets, that is for cleaned or shelled stock at shipping points. No long-term series are available for retail prices of peanuts or peanut butter, but data for 1935 to 1941 indicate that year-to-year changes in retail prices of peanut butter are closely associated with changes in wholesale prices of shelled peanuts. It is difficult to use the price received by growers for farmers' stock peanuts in separate analyses for cleaned and shelled peanuts, as farmers' stock peanuts include peanuts for crushing, seed, and other uses, as well as for cleaning and shelling. Thus, the elasticities given by the analyses reflect the elasticity at the wholesale level. However, analyses were made showing the percentage change in prices received by growers for farmers' stock peanuts whick are normally associated with a given percentage change in prices of a given grade of cleaned or shelled peanuts f.o.b. shipping points in the same section. These analyses were based on the years 192040. Later years were affected by special conditions during World War II and to a greater extent by the Government support program for peanuts than were the earlier years. Results from these analyses are shown
in the tabulation below. As prices received by growers in practically all cases were about 10 percent more flexible than prices at shipping points, demand at the grower level would be somewhat more inelastic than that indicated by the analyses at the wholesale level. Thus, the indicated elasticity of 0.4 to 0.5 for shelled peanuts at the wholesale level would be equivalent to 0.35 to 0.45 at the farm level and, based on a regression analysis using the peanut butter prices referred to earlier, would be equiralent to about 1.0 at the retail level.

Peanuts: Percentage change from the preceding year in prices received by growers for farmers' stock normally associated with a l-percent change from the preceding year in prices of cleaned or shelled stock, f.0.b, shipping point

## $1 /$

Price of farmers' stock
Price of cleaned or shelled stock

Percentage
change
Percent
Cleaned Virginias, average of Jumbos and Fancy, Virginia-North Carolina section 1.11

Shelled Virginias, No. l, VirginiaNorth Carolina section .93
Shelled Spanish, No. 1, Southwest section
1.07

Shelled Spanish, No. l, Southeast section
1.14

Shelled Runners, No. 1, Southeast section
elastic also will raise both net and gross returns to producers. However, such a diversion would result in lower prices to producers of other oilseeds unless their prices were at the govermment support level. Since 1941, acreage allotments have been the principal production control mechanism, with diversion to oil of peanuts produced on allotted acreage used only in years in which yields per acre on the allotted acreage were higher than normal.

The two-price system for peanuts, which was in effect for the crops of 1941, 1942, 1950 and 1951, was more closely related to the acreage control program than to a direct diversion program. It wes put into operation following World War II to assist farmers in their downard adjustment of peanut production to the lower level of peacetime demand. Under this program, peanuts for direct edible use could be grown only on allotted acreages. However, farmers could grow peanuts on additional land (up to a specified maximum) provided the peanuts were sold to designated agencies for crushing or other specified purposes (see page 57 ). In 1951, prices received for such "excess" peanuts were about half as high as were the support prices received for "quota" peanuts moving into edible channels. This program was discontinued with the 1952 crop.

In summary, the peanut program appears to be an effective method of increasing both gross and net returns to growers, at least in the short run. In the longer run, higher prices obtained for peanuts and peanut products may result in increased competition from substitute items. This appears to have taken place in the case of imported cashews (see page 11) and perhaps to a lesser extent for certain other items. Such effects would reduce in part the short-run gains from the program.

As discussed previously, data on comercial use of peanuts in alternative outlets, such as in peanut butter or for nut salting, are available for only a few years before World War II. For this reason, detailed statistical studies of the factors that affect consumption in individual outlets cannot be made. However, total domestic disappearance of cleaned and of shelled peanuts has been estimated from 1920 to date. Two sets of analyses are presented here: One deals with the factors that affect consumption of cleaned (roasting stock) peanuts, and the other with factors that affect total consumption of shelled peanuts in all direct food uses, including peanut butter. An analysis for total peanuts would be almost the same as for shelled peanuts, as consumption of cleaned peanuts represents a small part of the total. Such an anslysis wuld be misleading, if applied in any given year, as the effects of economic factors on consumption are different for cleaned than for shelled peanuts, and the proportion which cleaned peanuts are of the total has trended downward over time. Consumption of total pesnuts for edible lise can ce estimated in any given year by combining results from the separate analyses for cleaned and shelled peanuts.

Results from the three analyses which appear best adapted for use under current conditions in estimating consumption of peanuts for various
levels of prices and consumer income are first discussed on a nontechntcal basis. In a later section, results from a number of alternative analyses are discussed and compared, and some of the more technical statistical aspects are considered.

## Cleaned Peanuts

Figure 2 shows the results from an analysis of the factors that affect per capita consumption of cleaned peanuts for edible use. The following three variables were used in explaining annual variations in cleaned peanut consumption: (1) average price of cleaned peanuts, f.o.b。mills, in cents per pound, (2) personal disposable income per capita in dollars, and (3) time - the year 1920 was taken at zero so that 1950 is equal to 30 . Consumption and the first two independent variables were expressed in logarithms for use in the analysis. This accounts for the curvilinear nature of the average relationships as shown on the chart when all variables are expressed in their original terms. The analysis was based on the crop-years beginning 1920-40 and 1946-50. The three variables together accounted for 86 percent of the variation in consumption of cleaned peanuts during this period. These variables, together with the actual and computed consumption of cleaned peanuts, are shown in table 6 .

The uppermost section of the chart shows the relationship between consumption and pice of cleaned peanuts after allowing for the effects of the other factors included in the analysis. On the average, a l-percent change in the wholesale price was associated with a change of 0.3 percent in the opposite direction in consumption of cleaned peanuts. Thus, the demand for cleaned peanuts at the wholesale level is "inelastic."

The middle section of the chart shows the relationship between consumption and disposable income after allowing for the effects of the other factors included in the analysis. On the average, a l-percent change in per capita disposable income was associated with a change of 0.6 percent in the same direction in per capita consumption of cleaned peanuts. This is in contrast to the family budget data, in which expenditures tended to decrease as income increased. What takes place, apparently, is that consumption of cleaned peanuts is heaviest in the lowest-income families, but within these families, consumption tends to increase as their incomes increase for any given level of peanut prices.

The third section of the chart shows the relationship between consumption and time after allowing for the effect of prices and income on consumption. On the average, consuruption of cleaned peanuts declined by 0.034 pound per capita each year after allowing for the effects of prices and income. It is generally realized that demand for peanut in the shell has declined. Some of the factors relating to this decline particularly new methods of packaging and merchandising shelled peanuts and other nuts, were discussed in an earlier section of this report. Attempts to measure the direct effects of consumption of shelled peanuts, or prices of popcorn,

## PEANUTS, CLEANED: CONSUMPTION FOR EDIBLE USE PER CAPITA IN RELATION TO SPECIFIED FACTORS

From an analysis based on logarithms for the period 1920-40, 1946-50




Figure 2.

Table 6.- Pernuts, cleaned: Actual and computed domestic disappearance per capita, and related variables, 1920-50

| Cropyear beginning | : | Disapp <br> perActual <br> 1/ | $x_{1}$ <br> pearance capita <br> : <br> :Computed <br> : 2/ | $\begin{aligned} & : \mathrm{X}_{2} \\ & : \text { Price } \\ & : \text { P } \\ & : \text { per } \\ & \text { :pound of : } \\ & \text { :cleaned } \\ & \text { : peanuts } \\ & : \quad 3 / \end{aligned}$ | $x_{3}$ <br> Disposable <br> income per capita 4/ | : | $\mathrm{X}_{4}$ Time | : : : : : : : | Ch1 square | : Standard <br> : of fore $\qquad$ <br> :Percent- <br> : age of :computed: <br> : value | errar cest $\qquad$ <br> Actual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | Pounds | Pounds | Cents | Dollars |  |  |  |  | Percent | Pouncis |
| 1920 | : | 0.90 | 0.82 | 8.45 | 532 |  | 0 |  | 4.28 |  |  |
| 1921 | : | . 70 | . 84 | 6.25 | 514 |  | 1 |  | 2.20 |  |  |
| 1922 | : | . 75 | . 81 | 8.53 | 595 |  | 2 |  | 2.50 |  |  |
| 1923 | : | . 88 | . 80 | 8.33 | 610 |  | 3 |  | 2.02 |  |  |
| 1924 |  | . 77 | .74 | 10.20 | 619 |  | 4 |  | 3.84 |  |  |
| 1925 | : | . 83 | . 82 | 7.15 | 646 |  | 5 |  | 3.31 |  |  |
| 1926 | : | . 81 | . 77 | 7.59 | 640 |  | 6 |  | 1.73 |  |  |
| 1927 | : | . 80 | . 71 | 8.90 | 638 |  | 7 |  | 1.04 |  |  |
| 1928 | : | . 77 | .74 | 7.74 | 671 |  | 8 |  | 1.69 |  |  |
| 1929 | : | . 68 | . 72 | 6.50 | 628 |  | 9 |  | 2.56 |  |  |
| 1930 | : | . 47 | . 61 | 6.94 | 529 |  | 10 |  | . 53 |  |  |
| 1931 | : | . 63 | . 62 | 3.29 | 407 |  | 11 |  | 6.51 |  |  |
| 1932 | : | . 50 | . 54 | 3.47 | 349 |  | 12 |  | 3.88 |  |  |
| 1933 | : | . 51 | . 51 | 5.15 | 400 |  | 13 |  | 3.81 |  |  |
| 1934 | : | . 46 | . 49 | 6.59 | 440 |  | 14 |  | 6.10 |  |  |
| 1935 |  | . 50 | . 52 | 6.24 | 500 |  | 15 |  | 1.35 |  |  |
| 1936 | : | . 55 | . 53 | 6.25 | 549 |  | 16 |  | . 66 |  |  |
| 1937 | : | . 55 | . 50 | 5.53 | 507 |  | 17 |  | 1.45 |  |  |
| 1938 | : | . 54 | . 48 | 6.18 | 523 |  | 18 |  | 1.57 |  |  |
| 1939 |  | . 51 | . 49 | 6.14 | 560 |  | 19 |  | 1.38 |  |  |
| 1940 |  | . 54 | . 51 | 6.19 | 651 |  | 20 |  | 3.13 |  |  |
| 1941 |  | . 50 | . 51 | 8.75 | 809 |  | 21 |  | 1.76 | 11.3 | 0.06 |
| 1942 | : | . 43 | . 52 | 10.63 | 962 |  | 22 |  | 2.63 | 11.4 | . 06 |
| 1943 | : | . 56 | . 48 | 15.13 | 1,034 |  | 23 |  | 2.08 | 11.3 | . 05 |
| 1944 |  | . 74 | . 48 | 15.19 | 1,085 |  | 24 |  | 2.12 | 11.4 | . 05 |
| 1945 | : | .57 | . 46 | 15.21 | 1,096 |  | 25 |  | 2.27 | 11.4 | . 05 |
| 1946 | : | . 45 | .45 | 17.47 | 1,159 |  | 26 |  | 3.24 | 11.5 | . 05 |
| 1947 |  | . 46 | . 45 | 17.36 | 1,258 |  | 27 |  | 3.32 | 11.6 | . 05 |
| 1948 |  | . 46 | . 45 | 16.81 | 1,270 |  | 28 |  | 3.56 | 11.6 | . 05 |
| 1949 |  | . 42 | . 42 | 19.77 | 1,302 |  | 29 |  | 4.43 | 11.8 | . 05 |
| 1950 | : | . 43 | . 43 | 18.93 | 1,433 |  | 30 |  | 4.88 | 11.9 | . 05 |

# Table 6.- Peanuts, cleaned: Actual and computed domestic disappearance per capita, and related variables, 1920-50 -0 continued 

1/ From table 19 in the appendix.
2/ Computed from the following equation when all variables except time are converted to logarithms:

$$
x_{1}=-1.493-.282 X_{2}+.611 X_{3}-.0146 X_{4}
$$

The following values relate to this analysis:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{b}_{12.34}}=.140 & r_{12.34}=.156 \\
\mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{b}_{13.24}}=.194 & r_{13.24}=.310 \\
\mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{b}_{14.23}}=.0014 & r_{14.23}=.840 \\
\mathrm{~s}_{1.234}=.0441 & R^{2} \\
{ }_{1.234}=.864
\end{array}
$$

3/ Harmonic mean of jumbo and fancy prices for cleaned Virginian, f.O.b. mill, 1920-37, year beginning November; for subsequent years, September. Data compiled from Weekly Peanut Report (22).

4/ Year beginning October. Data from United States Department of Commerce.
and of various other foods on consumption of cleaned peanuts by statistical analysis were not successful. Figure 2 indicates that domestic disappearance from 1943 to 1945 was considerably higher than would have been expected. This was probably due to a shortage of imported nuts and other items which act as substitutes for peanuts roasted in the shell.

Table 7 shows the approximate consumption of cleaned peanuts per capite which would be expected with specified levels of prices and disposable income in 1951-52. Such a table, if computed for earlier or later years, would change slightly, but the change during a few years only would not be large. There is a 65- to 70 -percent chance that estimates derived from this table will differ from actual consumption by not more than 0.05 pound per capita, and a 95 -percent chance that they will differ by not more than 0.10 pound.

## Shelled Peanuts

Figure 3 shows the results from an analysis of the factors that affect per capita consumption of shelled peanuts for edible use. The following three variables were used in explaining annual variations in consumption of shelled peanuts: (1) the average price of shelled peanuts, f.o.b. mills, in cents per pound, (2) personal disposable income per capita in dollars and (3) time, the year 1920 being taken at zero. All of these variables were expressed as logarithme for use in the analysis, so that the average relationships (as shown by the solid curves on the chart) when applied to the original values of the variables are curvilinear. The analysis was based on the crop-year beginning 1920-40 and 1946-50. The three variables together accounted for 90 percent of the variation in consumption of shelled peanuts during this period. These variables, together with actual and computed consumption of shelled peanuts, are shown in table 8.

In general, figure 3 is interpreted in the same way as is figure 2 , that is, each section shows the relationship between consumption and the variable indicated after allowing for the effects of the other variables included in the analysis. On the average, a l-percent change in wholesale price is associated with a change of 0.4 percent in the opposite direction in consumption of shelled peanuts. Thus, the demand for shelled peanuts at the wholesale level is inelastic, although in slightly smaller degree than for cleaned peanuts. On the average, a l-percent change in disposable income is associated with a change of 0.4 percent in consumption of shelled peanuts. This is about the same as the income effects indicated by the family budget data previously discussed.

The time trend for shelled peanuts is positive, as would be expected from the discussion in earlier sections. Based on the analysis, consumption of shelled peanuts would be expected to increase by about 0.006 pound per capita for each additional year in the current period after allowing for

Table 7.- Peanuts, cleaned: Domestic disappearance per capita which normally would be associated with given levels of prices and disposable income in current years I/

| Disposable income per capita | :$\vdots$$\vdots$ | Price of cleaned peanuts, f.O.b. mill, cents per pound 2/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $15: 16$ |  | $17$ | 18 | $19$ | $20$ | 21 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { ! } \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{array} \\ & \hline \text { Pounds } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline: 23 \\ & \text { : Pounds } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $24$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dollars | :Pounds Pounds |  |  | ounds | ounds | Pounds | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pounds } \\ 0.37 \end{gathered}$ | Pounds |  |  |  |
| 1,200 | : | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.38 | 0.38 |  | 0.37 | $0.36$ | $0.36$ | 0.35 |
| 1,250 | : | . 41 | . 40 | . 40 | . 39 | . 39 | . 38 | . 37 | . 37 | . 37 | . 36 |
| 1,300 | : | . 42 | . 41 | . 41 | . 40 | . 39 | . 39 | . 38 | . 38 | . 37 | . 37 |
| 1,350 | : | . 43 | . 42 | . 42 | . 41 | . 40 | . 40 | . 39 | . 39 | . 38 | . 38 |
| 1,400 | : | . 44 | . 43 | . 43 | . 42 | . 41 | . 41 | . 40 | . 40 | . 39 | . 39 |
| 1,450 | : | . 45 | . 4.4 | . 44 | . 43 | . 42 | . 42 | . 41 | . 40 | . 40 | . 40 |
| 1,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | . 46 | . 45 | . 44 | . 44 | . 43 | . 42 | . 42 | . 41 | .41 | . 40 |
| 1,550 | : | . 47 | . 46 | . 45 | . 45 | . 44 | . 43 | . 43 | . 42 | . 42 | . 41 |
| 1,600 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | . 48 | . 47 | . 46 | . 46 | . 45 | . 44 | . 44 | . 43 | . 42 | . 42 |
| 1,650 | : | . 49 | . 48 | . 47 | . 46 | . 46 | . 45 | . 44 | . 44 | . 43 | . 43 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 43 | . 43 |
| 1,700 | : | . 50 | . 49 | . 48 | . 47 | . 46 | . 46 | . 45 | . 45 | . 44 | . 44 |
| 1,750 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | . 51 | . 50 | . 49 | . 48 | . 47 | . 47 | . 46 | . 46 | . 45 | . 44 |
| 1,800 | : | . 51 | . 51 | . 50 | . 49 | . 48 | . 47 | . 47 | . 46 | . 46 | . 45 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1/ Based on regression equation shown in note 2, table 6, for 1951-52.
2) See note 3, table 6, for method of computing the average price of cleaned peanuts.

Table 8.- Peanuts, shelled: Actual and computed domestic disappearance per capita, and related variables, 1920-50


1/ Weighted average price of No. 1 Virginias, S. E. Runners, and S. E. and S. W. Spanish, f.0.b. mill. 1920-37, year beginning November for Virginias, September for S. E. Runners and Spanish, and August for S. W. Spanish; for subsequent years, September. Indiviaual quotations from Weekly Peanut Report (22).

2/ Year beginning October. Data irom U. S. Department of Coumerce.
Granulated, wholesale, New York, barrels. Data from U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
From table 19 in the appendix.
Computed from the following equation when all variables are converted to logarithms:

$$
x_{1}^{\prime}=-.621-.380 x_{2}+.443 x_{3}+.199 x_{4}
$$

The following values relate to this analysis:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
s_{b_{12.34}}=.077 & r_{12.34}=.528 \\
s_{b_{13.24}}=.103 & r^{2}{ }_{13.24}=.456 \\
s_{b_{14.23}}=.020 & r^{2}{ }_{14.23}=.819 \\
s_{1.234}=.0332 & R^{2}{ }_{1.234}=.895
\end{array}
$$

6/ Consumption in preceding year times computed percentage change in consumption from the preceding year as indicated by equation show in note 1 , table 10.

## PEANUTS, SHELLED: CONSUMPTION FOR EDIBLE USE PER CAPITA IN RELATION TO SPECIFIED FACTORS

From an analysis based on logarithms for the period 1920-40, 1946-50



the effects of prices and income. The time variable has a greater effect in the earlier years included in the analysis. The fact that the demand for shelled peanuts and peanut butter has been almost constant in recent years, after allowing for the effect of prices and consumer income, whereas it expanded considerably from year to year in the earlier period is important to both peanut growers and processors.

Table 9 shows the approximate consumption of shelled peanuts per capita which would be associated on the average with given levels of prices and disposable income in the year 1951-52. As with table 7, these relationships would be slightly different in earlier or later years. There is a 65 to 70 percent chance that estimates derived from this table will differ from actual consumption by not more than about 0.35 pound per capita, and a 95 percent chance that they will differ by not more than 0.7 pound.

As with cleaned peanuts, consumption of shelled peanuts during World War II was materially higher than would have been expected, based on the analysis. This reflects the shortage of competitive items, such as jams and jellies, non-peanut candy, imported nuts, butter, cheese, and sandwich meats in those years. Should shortages in these items again arise, consumption of peanuts could be expected to be higher than indicated by table 9.

This analysis also was run excluding the post-World War II years. The average relationships for the period 1920-40 are indicated by the dashed curves on the chart. The time trend was almost identical with that obtained by including the later years, and the effect of price was similar, except for level. The effect of income was considerably greater in the prewar period; a l-percent change in income was associated with a change of 0.56 percent in consumption, instead of 0.44 percent as for the longer period. A change of this kind appears reasonable ( $3, p_{0} 80$ ).

First-Difference Analysis for Shelled Peanuts - In many instances, more dependable results for forecasting are obtained by studying the factors that cause year-to-year changes in a given variable instead of those that cause deviations from the average for all years included in the analysis, as was done in the preceding studies. An analysis for shelled peanuts on this basis is shown in figure 4. This analysis is similar to the one shown in figure 3, except for two things. The wholesale price of sugar was added to measure the competitive effects of certain items and, because most of the time effects show up in the constant value in the regression equation, time was omitted as a variable. The unexplained residuals were plotted against time in the lower section of this chart to indicate the degree to which they appear to be random. This analysis was based on the years 192040 and it appears to give a satisfactory fit for the postwar years.

These three variables explained 71 percent of the year-to-year variation in consumption of shelled peanuts for the years included in the

Table 9.- Peanuts, shelled: Domestic disappearance per capita which normally would be associated with given levels of prices and disposable income in current years i/

| D1sposable income per capita | Price of shelled peanuts, P.O.b. mill, cents per pound 2/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
| D01. | Lb. | $\underline{\mathrm{Ib}}$ | Lb. | Lb. | Lb. | Lb. | Lb. | Lb. | Lb. | $\underline{L b .}$ |
| 1,200 | : 3.94 | 3.85 | 3.76 | 3.68 | 3.60 | 3.53 | 3.47 | 3.41 | 3.35 | 3.30 |
| 1,250 | : 4.01 | 3.92 | 3.83 | 3.75 | 3.67 | 3.60 | 3.53 | 3.47 | 3.41 | 3.36 |
| 1,300 | : 4.08 | 3.99 | 3.90 | 3.81 | 3.73 | 3.66 | 3.59 | 3.53 | 3.47 | 3.42 |
| 1,350 | : 4.15 | 4.05 | 3.96 | 3.87 | 3.79 | 3.72 | 3.65 | 3.59 | 3.53 | 3.47 |
| 1,400 | : 4.22 | 4.12 | 4.03 | 3.94 | 3.86 | 3.78 | 3.71 | 3.65 | 3.59 | 3.53 |
| 1,450 | : 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.09 | 4.00 | 3.92 | 3.84 | 3.77 | 3.71 | 3.64 | 3.58 |
| 1,500 | : 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.06 | 3.98 | 3.90 | 3.83 | 3.76 | 3.70 | 3.64 |
| 1,550 | : 4.41 | 4.31 | 4.21 | 4.12 | 4.03 | 3.96 | 3.88 | 3.82 | 3.75 | 3.69 |
| 1,600 | : 4.48 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.18 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 3.94 | 3.87 | 3.80 | 3.75 |
| 1,650 | $: 4.54$ | 4.43 | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.15 | 4.07 | 3.99 | 3.92 | 3.85 | 3.79 |
| 1,700 | : 4.60 | 4.49 | 4.39 | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.12 | 4.05 | 3.98 | 3.91 | 3.85 |
| 1,750 | : 4.66 | 4.55 | 4.44 | 4.35 | 4.26 | 4.18 | 4.10 | 4.03 | 3.96 | 3.90 |
| 1,800 | $: 4.72$ | 4.60 | 4.50 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.23 | 4.15 | 4.08 | 4.01 | 3.95 |

1/ Based on regression equation shown in note 5, table 8, for the year 195l-52.
2/ See note 1, table 8, for method of computing the average price of shelled peanuts.

## PEANUTS, SHELLED: CONSUMPTION FOR EDIBLE USE PER CAPITA IN RELATION TO SPECIFIED FACTORS <br> Fram an analysis based an first-difference lagarithms for 1921.40






WHOLESALE PRICE OFSUGAR (\% OF PRECEDINGYR.) $X_{5}$

analysis. However, the unexplained variation of 29 percent, when expressed in pounds, does not increase proportionately to that for the preceding analysis, which explained 90 percent of the deviations from average in consumption of shelled peanuts. The relative magnitude of the unexplained variation for these two analyses is indicated by the size of the standard error of forecast, in pounds, as shown in table 8.

The analysis based on year-to-year change indicated that a l-percent change in both income and price had a greater effect on consumption than did the analysis based on deviations from average. For the first-difference analysis, a change of 1 percent in price was associated with a change in the opposite direction of 0.5 percent in consumption; and a l-percent change in income, with a change in the same direction of 0.6 percent in consumption.

Sugar is an important ingredient in jams and jellies, which compete with peanut butter, and in "soft-center" candies, which compete with peanut candy and salted peanuts. Thus the price of sugar could be expected to affect consumption of peanuts in the three major outlets. This may account for the fact that this effect is statistically measurable, whereas the effects of other items which influence only a single outlet for peanuts could not be measured by statistical analyses of the factors affecting consumption of shelled peanuts in all uses. The effects of other factors may be measurable when a fairly long series of data becomes available for use of peanuts in individual outlets. If prices of sugar actually did not affect consumption of peanuts, an effect equal to or larger than that indicated by the analysis would be expected to appear in about 14 percent of all possible samples of this size purely because of chance. Thus, the results obtained would not be considered statistically significant by the usual standards. However, the relationship is apparently logical; hence prices of sugar were retained as a factor in this analysis. The analysis indicates that a change of 1 percent in the price of sugar would, on the average, result in a change in the same direction of 0.2 percent in consumption of peanuts. The direction of change is consistent with expectations, as an increase in the price of a competitive product would tend to increase the consumption of the product itself. For some uses, sugar would be a complementary product, that is, one that is used in combination with peanuts. Peanut candy is an instance of this type. However, the analysis indicates that on balance the competitive aspects outweigh the complementary aspects. The sugar prices from which the first differences for this analysis were derived are shown in table 8. The other variables used in this analysis are the same as those shown in table 8, except that the analysis was based on year-to-year changes in the logarithms.

Table 10 indicates the net effect of each of these factors separately on per capita consumption of shelled peanuts. The rath of each variable to the preceding year is shown over a considerable range, together with the related change in consumption. If the effect of changes in several variables at a time is desired, this can be obtained by multiplying together the

Table 10.- Peanuts, ahelled: Relation between year-to-year changes in domestic disappearance per capita and price of shelled peanuts, disposable incose per capita, and price of sugar

|  |  |  | Ratio to preceding year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

1/ Computed from the following equation when all variables are expressed as firstedifferences of logarithms:

$$
x_{1}=.0153=.510 x_{2}+.606 x_{3}+.243 x_{5}
$$

The following values relate to this analysis:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{b}_{12.35}}=.081 & r^{2}{ }_{12.35}=.715 \\
s_{b_{13.25}}=.209 & r^{2}{ }_{13.25}=.344 \\
s_{b_{15.23}}=.150 & r^{2}{ }_{15.23}=.141 \\
{ }^{s_{b_{1.235}}}=.0368 & R^{2}{ }_{1.235}=.715
\end{array}
$$

The variables on which this analysis was based are shown in table 8.
Note: The constant value in the regression equation does not differ significantly from zero.
indicated ratio for each item. For example, suppose that the price of peanuts increases by 10 percent, disposable income increases by 5 percent, and the price of sugar decreases by 5 percent. As indicated by the table, consumption of peanuts would decrease by 3 percent. This result is obtained as follows: A ratio of peanut prices to the preceding year of 1.10 would be associated with a consumption ratio of 995 . A 1.05 ratio for income is associated with a consumption ratio of 1.03 . A ratio for sugar of .95 is associated with a consumption ratio of 99 . The combined consumption ratio equals .97. This is equivalent to a decrease of 3 percent in per capita consumption of shelled peanuts. When the percentage change from the preceding year, as indicated by this table, is multiplied by actual consumption in the preceding year to give an estimate of expected consumption in the year for which a forecast is being made, there is a 65- to 70-percent chance that the estimate will differ from actual consumption by not more than about 0.5 pound per capita, and a 95 -percent chance that it will differ by not more than 1 pound. For more exact estimates of the probable degree of error, see the last column of table 8 .

Figure 4 indicates that the increase in consumption of peanuts in 1942 over that in 1941 and the decrease in 1946 consumption over 1945 was considerably larger than would have been expected from the analysis. These years reflect shifts in demand because of factors not included in the analysis. Figure 3 indicates that consumption in the years 1942-45 was materially higher than normal in relation to prices, income, and the time trend. This is believed to reflect mainly shortages of various competitive items. Figure 4 indicates that year-to-year variations in consumption at this high level in $1943-45$ were affected normally by changes in the price of peanuts, disposable income, and the price of sugar. Shifts to and from this level cannot be explained on the basis of the analysis.

A first-difference analysis was run for consumption of cleaned peanuts, but this explained only 33 percent of the year-to-year variation in consumption.

## Statistical Considerations Relating to These Analyses

In the above paragraphs, the major economic conclusions that can be drawn from the analyses of factors that affect consumption of cleaned and of shelled peanuts were discussed. In this section, certain statistical aspects which may be of interest to other research workers are analyzed. Readers who are not acquainted with the theory of multiple and partial correlation may prefer to omlt this section.

Measurements Relating to Validity of a Forecast - Regression equations must be used with particular care whenever an extrapolation beyond the range of observations included in the analysis is involved. As a measure of the
degree of extrapolation involved for any given year, Waugh and Been (25) have suggested the computation of a chi-square value (a coefficient used in connection with tests of significance) for each combination of independent variables used in the regression analysis. 2/ When the values of all independent variables are at their means, chi-square equals zero. As the values depart from their means, the chi-square value increases. In addition, each chi-square indicates the probability of occurrence of a given combination of the independent variables, or one further from the grouping tendency, in campling from the universe implied by the scatter of the data upon which the analysis was based. Hence, the highest chi-square for the years included in the analysis defines the outside limitt of the scatter of the data used in computing the regression equation. Forecasts based on the equation for years having a bigher chi-square value represent an extrapolation and should be used with extreme caution. The chi-square values for the three analyses are shown in tables 6 and 8.

The standard error of a forecast provides a method of estimating the probable statistical error involved in a forecast for any given year. This allows for the statistical precision of the regression relationship and the extent to which each independent variable differs from its mean in that year. If for the period forecasted no change has occurred in the nature of the relationshipe prevailing in the period on which the analysis was based, there is a 67-percent chance that actual consumption for any given year will be within a range equal to the estimated value plus or minus the standard error of forecast, and a 95 -percent chance that actual consumption will be within a range equal to the estimated value plus or minus twice the standard error of forecast. The standard errors of forecast for the years 1941 through 1950 are shown in tables 6 and 8 on both a percentage and a per pound basis.

Comparison of Results from Alternative Analyses - Research workers may be interested in the effects of including or excluding the postwar years and of including or excluding the price of sugar as a variable. The highest order partial regression coefficiente obtained from the several analyses, together with their standard errors, are shown in table ll. In general, the differences between the results obtained from the various analyses are not statistically significant. All analyses indicate that consumption is inelastic both with respect to price and to income, although the magnitude of the coefficients differ slightly from one study to another. The only statistically significant coefficient obtained for sugar was for the study based on deviations from average, using the prewar years only. The multiple coefficient of determination for the four analyses based on deviations from average ranged from 0.90 to 0.93 . This coefficient for the analyses

[^1]Table 11.- Highest order partial regression coefficients obtained from alternative analyses of factors affecting domestic disappearance of shelled peanuts per capita I/


1/ Figures following the tign are standard errors of the respective regression coefficients.
based on first difference was 0.71 inciuding sugar and 0.62 excluding sugar. As would be expected, prices of sugar are correlated to a considerable degree with prices of peanuts and consumer income, particularly for the analyses based on deviations from average.

## TRENDS IN PRODUCTION

The peanut is native to Brazil and neighboring countries on the south. According to Clay (2, p. 2-3), Runners and Virginia peanuts were introduced into Africa, and from there into the United States, as a result of the slave trade. The Spanish peanut is said to have been introduced into Virginia from Spain in 2871. Production and consumption in the United States before the Civil War were confined chiefly to a small part of eastern Virgiaia. After the war, the culture of peanuts spread rapidly into other Southern States, probably by soldiers who had fought in the Virginia campaigns. Soils and climate in many parts of the South are well suited to cultivation of peanuts. Factories for cleaning peanuts Here established in New York and Norfolk, in 1876. By 1890 factories were operating in several producing and consuming centers, including Cincinnati and St. Louis.

Production of peanuts was first officially estimated in 1868. The annual report of the United States Commissioner of Agriculture (19) for that year reported an output in Virginia of about 300,000 bushels (probably about 7 million pounds). Succeeding Government reports estimated production for the United States at 1.4 miliion bushels in $1878,3.5$ million bushels in 1889 , and 12 million bushels in 1899 (probably about 300 million pounds).

Production of picked and threshed peanuts in 1909 is estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economice at 355 million pounds. After 1909 the trend in production of picked and threshed peanuts continued upward (fig. 5). Output during and for a few years after both World Wars was substantially above the trend. In 1948 a record output of 2,336 million pounds was reached. This was more than six times the 1909-13 average production. Output declined in 1949, 1950, and 1951, reflecting the effects of acreage allotments.

In 1878 Virginia produced 63 percent of the United States total, Tennessee 31 percent, and North Carolina 6 percent. In 1899 Virginia still ranked first in production of peanuts, with 32 percent of the United States crop. North Carolina was second with 30 percent and Georgia third with 12 percent. These States were followed by Alabsma, Florida, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Thirty other States produced peanuts but production in these States constituted only 2.5 percent of the total crop.

By 1929 Georgia had moved into first place, with 27 percent of the United States tutal. North Carolina was second, with 25 percent; Virginia

## THE U.S. PEANUT CROP*

| BIL. LBS. |
| :--- | :--- |

was third, with 16 percent; and Alabama was fourth, with 13 percent. Eight other States produced the remaining 19 percent. Production in the Southeast expanded rapidly during the 1930's and the early 1940's, while a rapid expansion occurred in the Southwest in 1942, with a continuation of large production in eubsequent years. In 1950 Georgis continued as the leading State, with 34 percent of the United States total. Texas wes second, with 16 pescent; Alabama was third, also with 16 percent; while North Carolina and Virginia had dropped to fourth and fifth place, respectively, with 12 and 11 percent. Eight other States produced the remaining $l l$ percent.

Virginia-Carolina Section - Acreage and production of peanuts in the Vireinia-Carolina section (comprising Virginia, North Caroline, and Tennesse) have increased relatively slowly since 1909 (table l2). Production of picked and threshed peanuts in this section reached a peak of 588 million pounds in 1940, compared with the 1909-1.3 average of 243 million pounds, an average incresse of II million pounds a year. The "Virginia" type of peanut has 3lwnys been the chief type grown in this section. These peanute are reiatively large, with two or three kernels in a pod. The kernels are larger than in other types and are relatively long and flat. The Virginia type supplies most of the peanuts sold in the shell and most of the larce salted kernels. Smaller kernels from Virginia-type peanut,s are largely used in peanut candy, although No. l Virginias were formerly used also for salting.

Southeastern Section - In the Southeastern section, which is Georgia, Alakama, Florida, South Carolina, and Miseiseippi, production of picked and threshed peanuts has increased comparatively rapidly since 1914. Production reached a peak in 1943 of 1,324 million pounds campared with the 1909-13 average of 89 million pounds, an average increase of 37 milifon pounds a year. In World War I, production of peanuts in the Southeast rose to a peak of more than 500 miliion pounds and accounted for more than half of the United States total. This rapid expansion was due largely to a strong demand for peanuts for crushing for oil. Crushing of peanuts in carlots began in the Southeast in 1914, but the first shelling plant did not begin operations until 1916. The boll-weevil also arrived in the Southeast at this time. It severely reduced the yield of cotton, especially in the humid Coastal Plains, and caused some farmers to turn from cotton to peanuts. When the exceptional demand for peanuts for crushing disappeared after mid-1919, acreage and production of peanuts in the Southeastern section declined, although they remained more than twice as large as before World War I. Acreage of peanuts is concentrated mainly in southeastern Alabama and southern Georgia. In the Coastal Plains, where the humid climate favored the boll-weevil, the prevalent sandy soils were especially well adapted to peanuts, and a substantial shift of acreage from cotton to peanuts took place. In the less humid Pledmont, however, methods of controlling the boll-weevil were worked out by the mid-1920's. Also the

Table 12.- Peanuts: Total acreage, acreage harvested for nuts, yield per acre, and production, United States and by sections, 1909-date

| Cropyear | : Acreage <br> grown <br> alone <br> - for all <br> ;purposes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Acreage } \\ & \text { : pleked } \\ & \text { : and } \\ & \text { :threshed } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yield } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \text { acre } \\ & \text { 1/ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Produc } \\ & \text { tion } \\ & \text { : picked } \\ & \text { : and } \\ & \text { threshed } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Acreage picked and : threshed as a percentage or total : grown alone | :: Acreage <br> :: grown <br> $::$ alone <br> $:$ : Por all <br> :purposes | : Acreage <br> : picked and <br> :threshed | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yield } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { acre } \\ 1 / \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Produc- } \\ & \text { tion } \\ & \text { : picked and } \\ & \text { :threshed } \end{aligned}$ | Acreage <br> picked and <br> : threshed as <br> : a percentage <br> : of total <br> : grown alone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { acres } \end{aligned}$ | Pounds | Million pounds | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { acres } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { acres } \end{aligned}$ | Pounds | Million pounds | Percent |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1909 | : | 537 | 660 | 355 |  |  | 344 | 677 | 233 |  |
| 1910 | : | 464 | 827 | 384 |  |  | 305 | 894 | 273 |  |
| 1911 | : | 472 | 775 | 366 |  |  | 299 | 797 | 238 |  |
| 1912 | : | 480 | 753 | 362 |  |  | 296 | 765 | 226 |  |
| 1913 | : | 465 | 824 | 383 |  |  | 275 | 895 | 246 |  |
| 1914 | : | 526 | 801 | 421 |  |  | 307 | 819 | 251 |  |
| 1915 | : | . 617 | 779 | 481 |  |  | 322 | 831 | 268 |  |
| 1916 | : | 878 | 758 | 666 |  |  | 358 | 915 | 328 |  |
| 1917 | : | 1,314 | 752 | 989 |  |  | 315 | 919 | 289 |  |
| 1918 | : | 1,326 | 713 | 946 |  |  | 287 | 1,030 | 295 |  |
| 1919 | : | 957 | 719 | 688 |  |  | 267 | 1,080 | 288 |  |
| 1920 | : | 995 | 699 | 696 |  |  | 265 | 917 | 243 |  |
| 1921 | : | 980 | 692 | 678 |  |  | 303 | 900 | 273 |  |
| 1922 | : | 821 | 637 | 523 |  |  | 289 | 785 | 227 |  |
| 1923 | : | 797 | 713 | 568 |  |  | 298 | 1,041 | 310 |  |
| 1924 | 1,394 | 1,084 | 658 | 713 | 78 | 338 | 333 | 854 | 284 | 99 |
| 1925 | 1,279 | 996 | 725 | 722 | 78 | 359 | 350 | 1,089 | 381 | 97 |
| 1926 | 1,154 | 860 | 770 | 662 | 75 | 362 | 358 | 1,035 | 371 | 99 |
| 1927 | 1,489 | 1,086 | 777 | 844 | 73 | 404 | 391 | 978 | 382 | 97 |
| 1928 | 1,636 | 1,213 | 695 | 844 | 74 | 387 | 379 | 1,023 | 388 | 98 |
| 1929 | 1,627 | 1,262 | 712 | 898 | 78 | 400 | 389 | 1,014 | 395 285 | 97 |
| 1930 | 1,433 | 1,073 | 650 | 697 | 75 | 369 | 357 410 | 799 | 285 455 | 97 |
| 1931 | 1,773 | 1,440 | 733 | 1,056 | 81 | 423 | 410 408 | 1,110 | 455 388 | 97 |
| 1932 | 2,042 | 1,501 | 627 | 941 | 74 | 427 | 408 320 | 951 942 | 388 301 | 96 94 |
| 1933 | 1,717 | 1,217 | 673 | 820 | 71 | 339 | 320 392 | 942 1,035 | 301 406 | 94 97 |
| 1934 | 2,015 | 1,514 | 670 | 1,014 | 75 | 406 394 | 392 377 | 1,035 1,083 | 406 | 97 96 |
| 1935 | 1,972 | 1,497 | 770 | 1,153 | 76 | 394 412 | 377 393 | 1,083 1,048 | 408 | 96 |
| 1936 | 2,127 | 1,660 | 759 | 1,260 | 78 78 | 412 | 393 381 | 1,048 1,287 | 412 | 95 95 |
| 1937 | 1,967 | 1,538 | 802 | 1,233 | 78 | 401 | 381 389 | $\begin{array}{r}1,287 \\ \hline 992\end{array}$ | 490 | 95 95 |
| 1938 | 2,236 | 1,692 | 762 | 1,289 | 76 74 | 408 | 389 399 | 992 1,189 | 386 474 | 95 95 |
| 1939 | 2,563 | 1,908 | 636 861 | 1,213 1,767 | 74 79 | 418 | 399 <br> 422 | 1,189 | 474 588 | 95 97 |
| 1940 | 2,599 2,451 | 2,052 | 861 776 | 1,767 1,475 | 79 78 | 437 383 | 422 | 1,394 | 588 449 | 97 96 |
| 1942 | 4,329 | 3,355 | 654 | 2,193 | 78 | 450 | 427 | 1,208 | 516 | 95 |
| 1943 | 4,775 | 3,528 | 617 | 2,176 | 74 | 491 | 469 | 1,049 | 492 | 96 |
| 1944 | 3,851 | 3,068 | 678 | 2,081 | 80 | 481 | 459 | 1,183 | 543 | 95 |
| 1945 | 3,853 | 3,160 | 646 | 2,042 | 82 | 510 | 486 | 945 | 459 | 95 |
| 1946 | 3,883 | 3,141 | 649 | 2,038 | 81 | 474 | 450 | 1,041 | 468 | 95 |
| 1947 | 4,094 | 3,377 | 646 | 2,182 | 82 | 480 | 459 | 1,094 | 502 | 96 |
| 1948 | 3,824 | 3,296 | 709 | 2,336 | 86 | 485 | 464 | 1,263 | 586 | 96 |
| 1949 | 2,765 | 2,308 | 808 | 1,865 | 83 | 391 | 373 | 1,179 | 440 | 95 |
| 1950 | 2,669 | 2,264 | 893 | 2,022 | 85 | 398 | 380 | 1,240 | 471 | 95 |
| 1951 | 2,593 | 1,990 | 802 | 1,595 | 77 | 398 | 380 | 1,359 | 517 | 95 |
| 1952 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12.- Peanuts: Total acreage, acreage harvested for nuts, yield per acre, and production, United States and by sections, 1909-date e- continued


1/ Based on picked and threshed acreage and production.
Buresu of Agricultursl Economics, 1909-43 (ㅇ), 1944-49 (ㄱ), 1950-51 (6).
prevalent clay soils were relatively less favorable to peanuts. Since 1923, the trend in peanut production in the Southeast has again been upward.

The Spanish and Runner types of peanuts account for nearly all of the production in the Southeast. The pods of Spanish-type peanuts are small, and the kernels are small and round. This type of peanut is used by peanut-butter manufacturers, candy makers, and nut salters. The Runner type (which was originally grown for hogging off) is also used in the manufacture of peanut butter and to some extent in peanut candy.

Southwestern Section - In the southwestern States of Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arkansas, and Louisiana, production of picked and threshed peanuts rose from a 1909-13 average of 38 million pounds to a peak of 572 million pounds in 1942, an average increase of 17 million pounds a year. In 1909 production in this section was only 9 percent of the United States total, but in 1942 it accounted for 26 percent of the total production. Production has fluctuated considerably in this section, but since 1940 it has been substantially above that of any earlier year. Output has declined moderately since the 1942 peak. Texas accounts for more than 75 percent of the production in this section. The Spanish type of peanut is almost the only kind grown in the Southwestern eection, except in New Mexico where a substantial proportion of Valencia peanuts are grown.

In the Southwestern section, a large percentage of the tutal acreage of peanuts formerly was cut for hay or "hogged off." The latter refers to its use as pasture for hogs. In 1924 to 1941 an average of about 40 percent of the total acreage in the Southwest was used for these purposes. In World War II, the percentage declined to 17 percent. From 1946 to 1950 it was further reduced, falling to 9 percent, but in 1951 it increased to 28 percent.

## TRENDS IN CONSUMPTION AND FOREIGN TRADE

Total consumption of peanuts in the United States has increased along with production. The peak in domestic disappearance was reached in the year beginning September 1944, at 1,481 million pounds (kernel basis) compared with a 1909-13 average of 262 million pounds. Since 1944, domestic use has deciined, but exports have been relatively large. Until 1929, imported peanuts were a fairly substantial part of domestic use-- up to 13 percent in some years. Exports of peanuts were small until 1945, when for the first time a large quantity was shipped abroad to be crushed. Exports continued large through 1948 but declined sharply in 1949 and 1950, although they continued above the prewar level.

Picked and threshed peanuts in the United States are used for edible products, crushing, and seed (figure 6). Minor quantities are fed to livestock on farms. In 1937-41, total domestic disappearance averaged 944


Figure 6.
million pounds (kernel basis). Edible uses accounted for 609 million pounds a year; crushing, 203 million pounds; seed, 114 million pounds, and feed for livestock, 18 million pounds. Consumption per capita in edible uses in 1950-51 was about 4.4 pounds (kernel basis) compared with a 1909-13 average of about 2.4 pounds. However, civilian consumption was higher during the war years, reaching a peak of 6.5 pounds in 1945-46.

Imports - Imports of peanuts from 1909 to 1928 averaged about 39 million pounds (kernel basis) annually. This was equal to about 10 percent of domestic production and about 12 percent of disappearance for edible use. Before World War I, peanuts were imported into the United States mainly from the Far East (China, Japan, and the Dutch East Indies), and also from Spain and French Africa. Approximately two-thirds of the imported peanuts were in the shell. During and after World War I nearly all of the imported peanuts were from the Far East and were mainly of Chinese origin. They were predominantly shelled peanuts similar to the Virginia type and were used mostly by nut salters and candy makers.

Imports of peanuts into the United States were unusually large in 1917-19, when a strong demand for vegetable oils resulted in the crushing of a substantial quantity of domestic peanuts. Imported peanuts were used
to supplement the domestic supply for edible purposes. Relatively large imports in some other years, notably 1924, apparently were associated with a small domestic crop of extra-large Virginia-type peanuts. 3/

From 1929 to 1950 imports of peanuts were negligible, except in 1944, when Argentine shelled peanuts were brought in for crushing. Imports in 1929-50 averaged less than 1 percent of either domestic production or disappearance. The virtual elimination of peanut imports after the 1929 marketing year apparently resulted from a severe decline in prices of peanuts and from increases in 1929 and 1930 in import duties on peanuts. The tariff on shelled peanuts was increased in February 1929, from 4 to 6 cents a pound and in June 1930, to 7 cents (table 13). The tariff on unshelled peanuts was raised in February 1929, from 3 to 4.25 cents a pound. These rates continue in effect. Imports of shelled and unsbelled peanuts have been prohibited since April 2, 1943.

Exports - From 1909 to 2942, exports of peenuts (kernel basis), from the United States averaged 5 million pounds a year or about 1 percent of domestic production. About 90 percent of these were cleaned and shelled goods for edible use in Canada. A downward trend in exports of peanuts, from 19 million pounds in 1916 to 1 million pounds or less during most of the 1930's, resulted from competition in Canada with lower-priced peanuts from the Far East. Before World War II, the United States was a net importer of peanuts, but during World War II and since, it has been a net exporter. Beginning in 1943, exports to Canada increased substantially, as Far Eastern peanuts were no longer available. Immediately after the end of World War II, the world shortage of fats and oils resulted in a strong demand from Europe for United States peanuts for crushing. Reflecting this demand, total exports of peanuts from the United States rose from 44 million pounds (kernel basis) in 1945, to 173 million pounds in 1946, and a peak of 533 million pounds in 1948. This accounted for 33 percent of the domestic production in that year. In 1946-48 exports were mostly No. 2 shelled peanuts. The principal countries of destination were France, Italy, Germany and Japan. Exports of peanuts declined considerably in 1949, 1950, and 1951 as the world supply of fats and oils improved and production of peanuts declined in the United States.

Domestic Crushing - Crushings of peanuts were negligible before World War I. In 1916, however, there was an estimated crush of about 218 million pounds (kernel basis), and crushings rose to a peak estimated at 294 million pounds in the 1918-19 crop-year. From 1919 to 1933 crushings averaged only 42 million pounds (kernel basis), or 8 percent of total domestic disappearance. Beginning with 1934, Government programs to support prices to producers diverted substantial quantities of surplus peanuts to crushing. The average for $1934-48$ was 248 million pounds (kernel basis), or 23 percent of the total domestic disappearance.

Table 13. - Peanuts: Import duties, United States, 1883 - date


[^2]Before the Government programs were initiated, the quantity of peanuts crushed depended upon the quality of the crop and the relative profitability of shelling and crushing. In 1916-18, the oil-and-meal value of peanuts apparently was as high as the value for food uses. This was true again in the 1947 crop-year and nart of the 1948 crop-year. Crushers in those years were able to enter the market and to bid against the edible peanut trade for substantial quantities of peanuts. In most years, however, the price of peanuts in edible uses is materially higher than the prices based on the crushing value.

In ail years, a few low-grade farmers' stock peanuts and a small percentage of the kernels produced in shelling operations are not suitable for food uses. These are crushed. Data for 1938-42 indicated an average outtum of "oilstock" peanuts equal to 4 percent of the total weight of farmers' stock peanuts shelled.

From 1919 to 1933, when crushings consisted largely of low-grade peanuts unsuitable for edible uses, the average annual crush of farmers' stock peanuts was 19 million pounds. The average yearly crush of shelled peanuts was a little more than 28 million pounds, equivalent to 43 million pounds on a farmers' stock basis. Under Government programs for peanuts, crushings of farmers' stock rose to an average of 256 million pounds a year in 1934-43. Crushings of shelled peanuts in $1934-43$ remained relatively smail, averaging 39 million pounds annually. Beginning in August 1947, the Government programs were designed to permit CCC to purchase surplus production largely in the form of No. 2 grade shelled peanuts rather than as farmers' stock peanuts. This resulted in a substantial increase in crushings of shelled peanuts, with an accompanying reduction in the crush of farmers' stock peanuts. From 2945-50, crushings of farmers' stock peanuts declined to an average of 147 million pounds annually, while crushings of shelled peanuts rose to 263 million pounds annually. This program was discontinued with the 1951 crop.

## GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

In each year since 1933, with the exception of 1936-37, the Department of Agriculture has had a program in effect to support the price received by producers for peanuts. Details of the programs have varied greatly from year to year, reflecting changes in production trends and in the relative demands for peanuts for direct use in edible products and for crushing for oil and meal. The principal provisions of the programs in each year are outlined in the following paragraphs, and the major statistical details are shown in table 14.

1933 Crop - Under suthority of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, a marketing agreement and license for peanut millers became effective on January 27, 1934, well after the marketing season for

Table 14.- Peanuts: Statistics relating to pricesupport programs, 1935-52


1/ From 1937 through 1940, CCC made nonrecourse loans to peanut cooperatives to finance purchase, storage, and diversion or sale of farmers' stock peanuts by these cooperatives in order to facilitate a surplus-removal program of the Department.
2/ Farmers' stock basis. The difference between purchases and sales is accounted for by inventory adjustments, principally normal shrinkage. Government purchase programs for peanuts in 1943 to 1945 were for purposes other than price support and hence are not included here.

3/ Under the Agricultural Conservation Program.
I/ Support level originally announced at 85 percent of parity, or 6.2 cents per pound, but revised October 3, 1942, before substantial movement of eligible peanuts took place.
5/ Marketing quotas and acreage allotments under Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 suspended.

6/ Net gain.
I/ Less than 500,000 pounds.
8/ Preliminary.
9/ Through December 31, 1951. Inventory on this date was 302 million pounds.
Fiscal and Fats and Oils Branches, Production and Marketing Administration.
the 1933 crop had started. Processors of peanuts agreed to pay growers not less than minimum prices varying around $\$ 60$ a ton ( 3 cents a pound) according to type and grade. These prices represented about twice the season average price for the 1932 crop. Processors soon discontinued purchase on the grounds that they were unable to sell at prices based on $\$ 60$ a ton for farmers' stock peanuts. However, they continued processing for farmers on a toll basis. The season average price to farmers for the 1933 crop was about $\$ 56$ a ton.

1934 Crop - On April 7, 1934, by an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, peanuts, along with certain other commodities, were designated a basic agricultural commodity. On September 29, 1934, an adjustment program for peanuts was announced. This program was designed to support the price of peanuts by diverting a part of the 1934 crop into crushing for oil and meal. It was designed also to limit the acreage of peanuts in 1935 through production-adjustment contracts with peanut growers. This program was financed by a processing tax of a cent a pound, collected by processors on farmers' stock peanuts.

Payments of 0.5 to 1.0 cents per pound were offered growers for peanuts they sold for crushing, up to 20 percent of their production. Only a few farmers took advantage of the offer. Payments also were offered to processors to buy and crush farmers' stock peanuts. The average payment to processors for the $1934-35$ season: was $\$ 9.82$ a ton. An adjustment payment of 8 dollars a ton of peanuts harvested in 1934 was also made to growers who agreed to limit their 1935 acreage of peanuts picked and threshed to the average for 1933 and 2934. Acreage picked and threshed in 1935 was reduced 1 percent, but owing to an increased yield per acre, production in 1935 was 14 percent higher than in 1934.

During the 1934 season, approximately 154 million pounds of farmers' stock peanuts were diverted to crushing for oil. This equaled 15 percent of the production of peanuts picked and threshed. The season average price to farmers was 3.3 cents a pound compared with 2.8 cents in the previous year.

1935 Crop - The diversion program for peanuts produced in 1935 was essentially the same as for the 1934 crop. In addition, diversion payments on shelled peanuts were offered, provided processors paid not less than the stipulated minimum prices to growers and did not divert kernels equivalent to more than 15 percent of their total purchases of farmers ${ }^{\text {® }}$ stock peanuts. Only a negligible guantity of shelled peanuts was diverted.

The production-control and processing-tax provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act was invalidated on January 6, 1936, by the Supreme Court's decision in the Hoosac Mills case. Diversion payments on peanuts were resumed in 1937, however, with funds authorized by Section 32 of

Public Law 320, 74 th Congress, approved August 24, 1935.
During the 1935 season, approximately 6 percent of the production of peanuts picked and threshed were diverted to crushing (table 14). In the 1934 and 1935 diversion seasons, more than 80 percent of the diversions were made in the Southeastern area. These were mostly of Spanish- and Runner-type peanuts.

1936 Crop - In 1936-37, prices of peanut oil and meal were high enough to permit crushers to bid in the market for lower-grade peanuts. This held prices for good grades at a relatively high level. Also, an unusually large part of the crop of Southeastern Runners had to be crushed because of poor quality. No diversion program was put into effect for the 1936 crop.

Under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which became effective in February 1936, peanuts picked and threshed were designated a soil-depleting crop but were not listed as a basic cummodity. Growers who diverted acreage in 1936 from peanuts picked and threshed to soilconserving crops were eligible for payments of $\$ 25$ a ton on the normal yield per acre diverted, up to 20 percent of the base acreage. A base acreage was established for each farm on the basis of acreages picked and threshed in previous years.

Cooperative Marketing Associations - In 1937 four regional growers' cooperative marketing associations were organized to participate in the peanut-diversion programs. In 1940 these associations were reduced to three -o one for each of the major sections.

These associations were authcrized by the Secretary of Agriculture to buy peanuts from growers, up to a stated maximum guantity, at a schedule of prices established by the Department of Agriculture. From 1937 to 1940, these prices returned an average of 3.3 to 3.4 cents a pound to growers. The price schedule was established each year after conferences between the Department and representatives of growers, processors, and peanutconsuming industries. Only minor revisions in the price schedule, which chiefly affected differentials among the various types and grades of peanuts, were made in 1937-40. Quantities to be diverted were estimated by the Department at the beginning of each season, mainly by comparing expected deliveries to mills by farmers with consumption of peanuts in food uses in previous years. As the season progressed, the total quantity to be diverted was revised in accordance with the latest indications of deliveries and consumption. This was done by instructing the cooperatives to buy additional quantities of peanuts or to sell part of their already accumulated stocks to cleaners and shellers.

Peanuts acquired by the cooperatives and not disposed of to cleaners and shellers were sold for crushing for oil. This involved a loss, which was absorbed by the Department of Agriculture, together with reasonable allowances based on costs of handling and storage.

1937-40 Crops - Payments to growers for diversion of acreage of peanuts picked and threshed to soil-conserving crops were continued in 1937, at a rate of $\$ 25$ per acre diverted but only up to 15 percent of the base acreage. In addition, penalties were imposed upon growers who harvested more than their base acreages. These penalties were in the form of deductions of $\$ 25$ a ton on the normal yield per acre harvested in excess of the base acreage. From 1938 to 1942, payments were made to producers on the basis of the normal yield per acre and the farm peanutacreage allotment, with deductions for acreages harvested in excess of allotments. In 1941 and 1942, marketing quotas were in effect and excess peanuts were subject to a penalty of 3 cents a pound unless they were delivered to agents of the Secretary of Agriculture for crushing. The rate of payment per ton under the agricultural conservation program varied from $\$ 4.00$ in 1938 to $\$ 1.45$ in 1942. Deductions from the total benefit payments due farmers varied from $\$ 40.00$ a ton in 1938 to $\$ 14.50$ in 1942. If the deduction exceeded the payment otherwise due, the balance was owed by the farmer to the Secretary of Agriculture.

These payments and deductions, which applied only to farmers who participated in the agricultural conservation program, kept participating growers from expanding their acreage of peanuts picked and threshed. However, nonparticipants brought about an expansion of acreage, particularly in the Southwest. In 1940 a slight increase in acreage of peanuts harvested by nonparticipants and a record United States yield of 861 pounds per acre picked and threshed resulted in a production 37 percent higher than in any previous year. As a result, diversion of peanuts to crushing for oil rose to a new peak in 1940-41 more than twice that in any previous year.

1941 Crop - This experience led to the enactment of new legislation on April 3, 1941, which amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to authorize marketing quotas for peanuts and reestablish peanuts as a "basic commodity." In a referendum held on April 26, 1941, growers approved marketing quotes for the 1941, 1942, and 1943 crops. Under the quota system, mandatory supports became effective for the first time and the designated cooperative associations stood ready to pay growers full support prices for peanuts produced on farm-acreage allotments. Nonquota or "excess peanuts" (those produced on acreage in excess of allotments) could also be marketed through the designated agencies, but only at a price equal to the market value of peanuts for oil and meal less estimated handling, storage, and selling costs. Excess peanuts marketed in otber ways than through the designated agencies were subject to a penalty of 3 cents a pound.

1942 Crop - The entry of the United States into war in December 1941 made it imperative to increase the output of oils and fats from domestic materials. In setting up production goals for oilseeds in 1942, the Department of Agriculture proposed that the acreage allotment for peanuts for direct edible use be maintained at the 1941 level of 1.9 million harvested acres, but that an additional 1.9 million acres of peanuts be grown for oil. On January 16, 1942, the total acreage goal for peanuts was further increased to 5 million acres.

As authorized by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1, 1941 (the so-called "Steagall Amendment"), the Secretary of Agriculture made a public announcement encouraging the expansion of production of the 1942 crop of peanuts for oil and stating that the price of this commodity would be supported at 85 percent of the "comparable"price. This level was about the same as prices actually received for the 1941 crop of peanuts for oil. Under the Act of May 26, 1941, support was made available on the 1942 crop of peanuts for cleaning and shelling at the rate of 85 percent of parity. Before substantial movement of eligible peanuts took place, the Stabilization Act of 1942, approved October 2, 1942, increased the level of price support for peanuts for oil and for peanuts for cleaning and shelling to 90 percent of the comparable and parity prices, respectively.

Total acreage picked and threshed increased 77 percent to 3.4 million, far above that of any earlier year. Largely because of the expansion of acreage to new localities and to farms on which peanuts had not been grown before, the yield per acre declined materially. In 1942 production increased 49 percent to 2.2 billion pounds.

As discussed earlier, demand for peanuts for edible uses increased substantially soon after our entry into World War II. Food uses of peanuts (farmers' stock basis) increased from about l. 0 billion pounds in 1940 and 1941 to 1.3 billion pounds in 1942, restricting the use of peanuts for crushing so that the output of peanut oil was below expectations.

1943 Crop - In view of the national emergency, the national marketing quota and acreage allotment for 1943-crop peanuts was terminated on June 10 , 1943 , and a war-crop goal of 5.5 million acres was established. A single schedule of support prices for all peanuts of the 1943 crop was announced, based on 90 percent of the parity price.

In June 1943, CCC Order 4, making the Cormodity Credit Corporation the sole purchaser of farmers' stock 1943-crop peanuts, was issued. Under this order, shelling and crushing mills and cooperative associations of peanut producers became agents of the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and dispose of the peanuts. Purchases from growers were made at uniform
prices averaging $\$ 140$ a ton for Spanish and Virginia types and $\$ 130$ a ton for Runner type, with appropriate differentials for grades. These peanuts were sold to shellers and cleaners at from $\$ 26$ to $\$ 35$ more per ton than prices paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation, depending upon the type and location of peanuts. Profits made by the Comodity Credit Corporation on these sales were applied against the losses on sales of peanuts for crushing.

In the late summer and fall of 1943, an effort was made to restrict the use of peanuts in food products, in order to reserve more of the increased output for oil. However, the proposed program met with strong opposition; it was discontinued before it became effective. 4/

In 1943, production of peanuts picked and threshed was slightly smaller than a year earlier, as a decline in yield per acre more than offset an increase of 4 percent in acreage picked and threshed.

Crushings in the 1943 -marketing year were 408 million pounds, an increase of 4 percent over those of 1942, while commercial food uses in 1943 were 1 percent larger than in 1942 and 46 percent above the 1937-41 average. In marketing the 1943 crop, the Commodity Credit Corporation made a net gain of 7.4 million dollars.

During fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943, Section 32 funds were used to buy peanut butter for direct distribution to schools and welfare agencies. The cost by fiscal years was as follows: 1941-\$193,000, 1942 - $\$ 462,000,1943$ - $\$ 1,050,000$.

1944 Crop - On August 23, 1943, a departmental committee again proposed a goal of 5.5 million acres of peanuts to be picked and threshed in 1944 , and the support price for peanuts was placed at $\$ 140$ to $\$ 150$ per ton, depending upon type. On March 4, 1944, this support price was raised to $\$ 145$ to $\$ 160$ per ton. Food Order 100, superseding Order 4, was issued by the War Food Administration. This Order again made the

[^3]CCC the only autnorized buyer and seller of 1944 -crop peanuts. Despite efforts made to increase production of peanuts, the acreage of picked and threshed peanuts in 1944 was 44 percent below the goal and 12 percent less than in 1943. In 1944, 322 million pounds of peanuts were diverted to crushing at a loss of about 7.5 million dollars to the Government.

Peanut-Butter Subsidies - As part of the wartime progran to lower the cost of living, price ceilings for a few products were reduced in the summer and fall of 1943. The price ceiling of peanut butter at retail was reduced on October 2, 1943, from the July level of 33.1 cents to about 26.5 cents per pound, tine level of September ly42. With the price or peanuts used by peanut-butter manufacturers maintained by the price-support progras, the War Food Administration, on October 27, 1943, announced that payments at the rate of $4 \frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound would be rade to manufacturers of peanut butter on peanut butter shipped on and after November 1, 1943, to primary distributors, wholesalers, or retailers. This payment was limited to peanut butter sold for consumer use in continental United States and packed in containers of 2 pounds or smaller, as distinguished from peanut butter sold for use by industrial, institutional, and Government agencies. These payments were reduced to 4 cents a pound on September 1, 1945, and terminated on October 1, 1945. Payments for the whole period of the program totaled about 19.5 million dollas.

1945 Crop - The 1945 peanut progran was essentially the same as in 1944. War Food Order 130, replacing WFO 100, was issued on May 17, 1945, designating the Comnodity Credit Corporation as the sole buyer and seller of the 1945 crop of farmers' stock peanuts. The acreage of picked and threshed peanuts in 1945 was 3 percent higher than in 1944, but because of a lower yield per acre, production was 2 percent below 1944.

Although hostilities ended in August 1945, domestic demand for peanut products continued strong. Production of many foods was up frcm wartime levels, but with export demand for these foods continuing strong and price ceilings in effect, even though rationing was discontinued, many ioods were difficult to get in retail stores. Peanuts, however, remained plentiful and easy to obtain, and commercial use for food remained at the wartime level of around 1.2 billion pounds (farmers' stock basis). Crushings of peanuts also remained at about the wartime average. Total diversion of 304 -million pounds of farmers' stock peanuts brought a loss of 6.6 million dollars to the Comodity Credit Corporation.

1946 Grop - In accordance rith the polies of discontinuing vartime regulations and controls, oxclusive authority of the Comodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell peanuts was discontinuod for the 1946 crop. On December 12, 1946, the Department of Agriculture announced the termination of War Food Order 130, as all peanuts from the 1945 crop had been disposed of. The price of the 1946 peanut crop was supported by purchases through designatod cooperative associations, as before the war. All peanuts were supported at a schedule of prices ranging from $\$ 157$ to $\$ 174$ a ton for base-grados and designod to return an average price to farmers of 8.6 cents a pound, 90 percent of the August 2 parity price (the begiming of the marketing jear).

On Septomber 24, 1946, a program to encourage diversion of Ho. 2 shelled peanuts to oil was announced. Jnder this program, crushers of No. 2 shelled peanuts could apply to the Comedity Credit Corporation for a payment based on tonnage crushed. This program was designed to encourage use of inferior peanute in production of oil and meal and use of No. 1 sholled peanute for edible uses only. The quantity of farmers' stock peanuts to bo diverted to crushing mills was thereby reduced. Subsidy payments for crushing No. 2 shelled peanuts ranged from $\$ 88$ a ton for Runners to $\$ 106$ a ton for Virginias. No purchases or subsidy payments by the Conmodity Credit Corporation was necessary in 1946, as prices of peanut oil and meal sere high enough to permit crushers to buy farmers' stock and No. 2 shelled peanuts for crushing for oil and meal in the open market at the support-price level. A similar program was in effect in 1943 on a voluntary basie. In 1944-45 it was compulsory under the War Food Orders, with the Comodity Credit Corporation paying shollers and crushers the difference between the odible and the crushing value.

Commercial use of peanuts for food in 1946 was down to about 1.0 billion pounds (farmers' stocis basis) from the wartime level of 1.2 billion pounds. During the same season exports were 252 million pounds, compared with 63 million pounds for the year before. During the 1946 crop-jear, 263 million pounds of farmers' stock and 186 million pounds of No. 2 and oil-stocir peanuts were crushod.

1947 Crop - The 1947 crop-support program was essentially the same as that for the 1946 crop. The acreage of picked and threshed peanuts for the crop-jear 1947 was 3.4 million, the second highest on record. Production of pioked and threshed peanuts was 2.2 billion pounds, about the war-production level. However, domestic food uses for 1947 were 27 percent lower than the average for the war years 1942-45, but increased exports of shelled No. 2 peanuts for crushing abroad more than offset the decline in domestic food uses. In order to keep the price of peanute at the price-support level, the Commodity Credit Corporation bought, through the cooperative aesociations,

283 and 171 million pounds of farmors' stock and No. 2 shollod peanuts, respoctively, wille 175 gillion pounde of farmors' stock and 53 million pounds of shelled No. 2 peanuts were diverted to crushing.

1948 Grop - In a referendum hold 0otober 9, 1947, peanut grovers roted in favor of marketing quotas for the 1948, 1949, and 1950 crops. However, on January 2, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture terminated quotes for the 1948 crop in View of the critical world shortage of food fats and oils. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amonded, gave the Secretary of Agriculture authority to terminate or to increase quotas in case of a nationsl emergency or if it was determined that export demand for peanuts had materially increased. Quota acreage in 1948 would have been $2,359,000$ acres, 30 percent less than the acreage picied and threshod in 2947. Production of picked and threshod peanuts in 1948 was 2,336 milion pounds, the highest on record. Approximately a third of the production was exported. Support prices of farmors' stock peanuts ranged from $\$ 195$ per ton for Runners to $\$ 215$ for Virginias. Shelled No. 2 peanuts were purchased at $\$ 325$ per ton for Virginias, $\$ 315$ for Spanish, and $\$ 307.50$ for Runners. In 1948 the Conmodity Crodit Corporation bought 313 million pounde of farmers' stock peanuts and 596 million pounds of No. 2 shelled peanuts. Of the farmers' stock peanate purchased, 169 mililion pounds were sold for crushing, 19 million vere sold for edible use, and 125 willion wore shelled for export. Of the 596 million pounds of Ho. 2 shelled peanuts bought by the Conmodity Credit Corporation, 221 million were sold for crushing and 375 million wore sold for oxport.

1949 Crop - In anticipation of a vanishing dow ind fram Burope for united States' poanuts for crushing and the consequent roduction of the export mariet to a relatively amall quantity for edible uses, acreage allotmonts and marketing quotas were proclaimed for the 1949 crop. On Hovember 30, 1948, the Department of Agricuiture announced a marketing quota of 1.7 bilifon pounds of 1949-crop peanuts and a national allotment of 2.6 million acres. This was 21 percent below the 1948 national acreage of 3.3 million acres.

In 1949, 2.3 million acres were picked and threshed, and production totaled 1.9 billion pounds. Support prices were ostablished for base grades, with discounts and premiums for other grades. To be ellgible for the full support price, a producer could not pick or thresh poanuts in excess of the allotmont established for his farm. If he picked and threshed in excess of his allotwent, he was ineligible for price support on any peanuts produced. Moreover, he was subject to a penalty of 50 percent of the basic price-support rate on the marketings of his excess peanuts.

Exports of peamuts in the 1949-50 crop-year declined to 131 million pounds (farmers' stock basis). Disappearance into domestic food use remained about the same as a year earlier, at slightly more than 900 million pounds.

1950 Crop - On November 30, 1949, the Department of Agriculture announced a marketing quota of 1,286 million pounds of 1950-crop peanuts and a national allotment of 2.1 million acres, a 19-percent reduction from the 1949 acreage allotment. Public Law No. 272 , enacted in August 1949, provided that the national acreage allotment for peamuts picked and threehed in 1950 could not be less than 2.1 million acres. The allotment was later increased to 2.2 million acres by Public Law 471, approved March 31, 1950. The support price remained at 90 percent of the parity price. Penalties at half of the support price were assessed against marketings in excess of established quotas.

A two-price system for peanuts, similar to that in effect for the 1941 and 1942 crops, was established for the 1950 and succeeding crops by Public Law No. 471. Under this system, so long as a farmer did not have a larger picked and threshed acreage than in 1947, he could market peanuts, without penalty, for acreage in excess of his farm allotment, provided the peanuts picked and threshed from the excess acreage were marketed at their value for crushing for oil and meal through an agency designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. 011 peanuts grown on "excess" acres could be sold by designated agencies for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary, for edible use at prices not less than those established for quota peanuts under any peanut-diversion, peanut-loan, or peanutpurchase program, or for seed at prices established by the Secretary. If it was determined by the Secretary that the supply of any type of peanuts was not sufficient to meet the demand for edible use at prices not less than 105 percent of the support price for edible use, plus reasonable carrying charges, he was authorized under the law to declare such types in short supply and to sell such peanuts at not less than this price. The profit realized from these sales was prorated among producers who delivered peanuts of the types in short supply to the designated agencies. Prices of peanuts produced on the allotted acreage were supported at 90 percent of parity by means of producer loans and purchases through CCC receiving agencies and by purchases by shellers operating under contracts with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Production of picked and threshed peanuts in 1950 was 2.0 billion pounds, including 125 million pounds produced from excess acreage, an increase of 8 percent above that of the previous year. The increase mainly reflected the all-time high yield of 893 pounds per acre harvested.

Total purahases of peanuts by the Commodity Credit Corporation and its agencies through December 31, 1951, amounted to 840 million pounde (farmers' stock basie).

1951 Grop - The Dopartment of Agriculture announced on October 26, 1950, a marketing quota of 1,300 million pounde of 1951 -crop peanuts and a national allotmont of 1,771 thousand acres. On Decomber 14 of the same year, as previously announced by the Department of Agriculture, a referendur on markoting quotas for the 1951, 1952, and 1953 crops was held. Approximately 71 -percent of the peanut grovers who voted in the referendum favored the marketing quotas. To be effoctive, quotas mast be approved by a two-thirds majority vote. The national quota of 1,300 inllion pounds for 1951 representod the quentity of peanuts equal to the average quantity harvestod for nuts during the 1945-49 5-year average, adjustod for current trends and prospective demand.

On April 17, 1951, an increase in acreage allotments for the 1951 orop was announced in accordance with Public Law Fo. 17, which was signed by the President on April 12. This action increased the national allotmont to $1,889,000$ acres. This law changed the method of apportioning the allotment to States that produce types of peanuts for which production proves to be insufficient to moet the demand for edible uses.

Farmers' stock peanuts produced in 1951 on allottod acreage were supported at an average price of $\$ 230.56$ per ton, equal to 88 percent of the August 1, 1951, parity price. The support price wes the minimum level dotermined under the sliding-scale provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949. As in previous years, prices for such peanuts were supported by moans of producer loans and purahases and by purchases by shellors operating under contracts with CCC. However, the 1951 sheller contract did not include a No. 2 shelled-peanut-purchase program as providod in preceding years. As in 1950, a two-price syster prevailed under which peannts produced on excess acreage by oligible producers and delivered to the Coumodity Credit Corparation were paid for at a price equivalent to the prevailing market value of peanuts for crushing for oil and meal, less the estimated costs of storing, handling, and selling.

1952 Gron - The marketing quota for 1952 crop, announced November 26, 1951, was the samo as in the preceding year, but the acreage allotment was reduced to $1,673,000$ acres. This reduction reflected the use of a higher normal gield per acre and the fact that the original 1950 allotmont had boen increased to allow for an increased production of Virginioand Valencia-type peanuts wich otherwise would have been in short supply. On January 28, 1952, the 1952 acreage allotmont was increased to $1,706,000$ acres to assure that supplies of Virginia-and Valenciatype peanuts would not be short. .

Public Law No. 285, signed by the President March 28, 1952 repoaled the legislation which permitted farmers to market peanuts through a designated agency in excess of acreage allotments without penalty. Thus, the two-price system for peanuts is no longer in effect.

It was announced March 19, 1952, that 1952 farmors stock peanuts produced on allotted acreage would be supported at a minimum average price of $\$ 239.40$ per tom, $\$ 8.84$ per ton more than the support for the 1951 crop. This minimum average support price equals 90 percent of the Narch 1, 1952 parity price. The minimpum support will be raised to 90 percent of the parity price on August 1 (the start of the marketing yoar) if parity on that date is higher than on March 1.

Price support on 1952-crop peanuts will be available through CCC loans and purchase agreemonts instoad of through a progrem of direct purchases as in recent gears. Loans will be available not only to producers but also to peanut cooperative assooiations which operate in the main peanut-producing areas. Producers, either individually or through cooperative associations, will assume respensibility for storage and certain storage conts (as is done by producers of other basic commodities).

Discontinuation of the purchase program as the pripary mothod usod in price support for peanuts is in line with the Commodity Credit Corporation's general policy of using the loan-and-purchase-agroemont mothod of support in connection with all storable commoditios whenever effective weys of adjusting production to demand are available.

## STATISTICAL TABLES

Certain statistical tables relating to peanuts are includod in the appendix. The data in a number of these have not been published proviously; others have been available only in soattered sources.

## Supply and Disposition

Tables 15 to 22 give consistont set of data relating to the annual supply and disposition of peenuts. When possible, these tables have been carried back to 1909, the firet jear for vhich production was roported by the Crop Reporting Board. Some tables begin with 1920, the first year for which estimates of commercial disappearance for food uses are available. Other tables begin with other jrars dopending upon the availability of statistical information. In all cases, data are for a maricting year covering approximately the period from September through August.

The items making up the supply of peanuts are production of picked and threshed peanuts, beginning stocks and leports. Items making up the disposition of peanuts consist of exports; crushings for oil and meal;
use on farme (other than odible), including seed for planting, farm animal feeding and losses on farms; mill shrinkage; and commercial and farm food uses.

Production figures have been published, beginning with 1909, by the Crop Reporting Board of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (6, 工, 8) and are based upon reports from farmers in all peanut-growing sections of the Onited States. They include only peanuts harvested for nuts and do not include peanuts cut for hay or left to be hogged off. Stocks of peanuts in all commercial positions were not collected before September 1938. Only stocke at crushing mills and, for a fow years, at coldstorage warehouses were available before that date. Stocks of peanuts at crushing mills on an October 1 basis were collectod by the Bureau of Consus (13) begiming with 1919. Stocks in cold storage were compiled from a report of the Federal Trade Comenssion (21). Beginning with Sopterber 1938, stocks of peanuts in all comercial positions vere collocted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economice (10, 11,12 ).

Inports and exports of peanute are on a September-August jear basis. They were compiled from the monthly Sumary of Foreign Commerce of the Unitod States (15). Belore 1922, the ixport figures represent general imports minus re-exports. Begiming with Soptember 22, 1922, the Ifgures ropresent inports for consumption.

Before January 1945, exports of shelled and unshelled peanuts wore not reportod soparately. An estimatod breakdown is shown in table 16. As Firtually all of these exports wore to Cansda, whore consuming habits prosmably are about the sam as in the United States, this estimate was based on the assumption that shelled peanuts accounted for the same percentage of total exports as of the total domestic disappearance. Tram 1943 through July 1951, the export figures include shipments to Unitod States torritorios. Before 1943 and after July 1951, comploto flemes on shipmints to Unitod Statos torritorios are not available.

For the years before 1938, crushings of peanuts were compled from reports of the Bureau of the Consus (13). This roport gives the crushings of hulled and in-the-hull peanuts, by quartors and calendar jeare. As no monthly figures on crushinge wore arailable, the sume of the quarterly figures from October 1 through Septenber 31 were used for the crop-years. Fullod peanuts roported crushed by the Bureau of the Consus inolude oflstock peanute. 0ilstook peanuts are a byproduct of the pea-nut-uhelling industry. Bogiming in Soptombor 1938 monthly crushings aro available from reports of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (10, 11, 12).

Domstic food use of peanute inclules: (1) Peanute cocoumed by fam houevholde there grom, publiched by the Crop Reporting Buard (9). (2) Local and direct selo by farmor for edible use, inich is inoluded in the total sale of peannts by farmere, publishod by the Grop Roport= ing Board. This series wes computod by mubtrating from total sales those peanuts sold back to farmors for seod and estimatod quantitios moving into commoreial channols. (3) Compreial food uses, nich include peanute used in peanut butter, candy, and salting, and peanute roastod in the shell. From 1920 to 1937, the figurem vere estimated by the Markot Fews Divisica, Fruit and Vegetable Branch, Productice and Markoting Admanistration, based on movemonts of peanuts from mills and direct information on quantities used by producing firm. These ostimates vere raised slightly to the sam avorage lovel as commercial production (the total quantity cleaned, shelled, or crushed) estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Rocnondes, then adjustod for importe and exports. From 1938 to 1950, the 11gures represent disappearance of cleanod and shelled poanuts reportod in the Peamut Stocke and Procoselag Report (10), adjustod for Ilports and exports.

Monthly data on peanuts issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Foonomice were sumarised in two reports, each ontitlod statiotice on Commercial Poanuts (11, 12). The IIret, published in February 1945, covered the marketing jears boginning 1938-44. The second, publiehod in June 1951, covered the yoars beginning 1945-49.

Data relating to production, acreage, and yield of peanute, picked and threshed, for the United States and by Stater for the crope of 1909-48 were published in Fluctuations in Crops and Weather, 1866-1948 (8). Data for the period 1944-49 were revised in a subsequent publication (1). Data are not available before 1909 except for Census jears.

## Monthly Prices

Tables 23 to 48 in the Appendix give the major price series available for peanuts at several stages of processing. Tables 23 and 24 show average prices recolved by farmers for all peanuts and the equivalent parity price. These date are publishod in Agricultural Prices (2). They represent prices at the point of Pirst salo out of farmers: hands as of the middle of each month. Tables 25 to 28 show prices received by growers for farmers: stock peanuts by major types. Tables 29 to 35 give shipping-point prices for the major-types of peanuts at eack of the three major geographic sections. Tables 36 to 42 show prices for less than carlot sales by wholesalers for the major types of peanuts at Chicago, and tables 43 to 48 give similar
late at $\bar{H} 0$ Y Fork: 5/ The lest four groupe of tables wore conpiled from recorde of the Fruit and Vegetable Branch, Production and Marioting Adrinistration, and from the Weekly peanut Roport (22). Monthly averago prices for Chicogo and How York hato act boon previously publishod. Sindlar data by wooks are includod in the Weokly Peanut Report for a number of other impartant markets.

In all cases, annual average prices are show for the poanut marketing jear begining in Xoveaber in Virginia-North Carolina, in August in the Southwost, and in Soptenber in the Southeast. A maricoting joar bogiming in Soptember vas used for all prices at Mev Yort and Chicago.
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[^5]Table 16.- Peanuts: Imports, re-exports, exports, and net trade, 1909 to date

|  | Imports $1 /$ |  |  | Re-exports 1/ |  |  | Exports $2 /$ |  |  | Shipnentsto U. S.territories(kernelbasis) 3 / | Net imports or exports (-) (kernel babis) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year <br> beginning <br> September | Cleaned in the $:$ shell : | Shelled | Total (kernel basis) 3/ | Cleaned <br> in the shell | Shelled |  | Cleaned in the shell | Shelled | Total (kernel basis) 3/ |  |  |
|  | $: 1,000 \mathrm{lb} .$ | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 lb . | 1,000 16. | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 Ib. | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 16. | 1,000 lib. | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 1b. |
| 1909 | : 27,080 | 3,870 | 22,827 | 273 | 1,141 | 1,332 | 2,155 | 2,264 | 3,772 |  | 17,723 |
| 1910 | : 15,607 | 2,403 | 13,328 | 86 | 968 | 1,028 | 2,762 | 3,087 | 5,020 | --- | 7,280 |
| 1911 | : 12,592 | 2,266 | 11,081 | 88 | 278 | 339 | 2,899 | 3,448 | 5,477 |  | 5,265 |
| 1912 | : 12,377 | 9,843 | 28,507 | 76 | 285 | 338 | 3,158 | 3,998 | 6,209 |  | 11,960 |
| 1913 | : 18,471 | 26,543 | 39,474 | 244 | 478 | 649 | 3,209 | 4,327 | 6,573 |  | 32,252 |
| 1914 | : 14,256 | 9,301 | 19,281 | 38 | 1,325 | 1,352 | 2,403 | 3,452 | 5,134 |  | 12,795 |
| 1915 | : 8,460 | 19,182 | 25,104 | 342 | 1,085 | 1,324 | 3,852 | 5,902 | 8,598 | --- | 15,182 |
| 1916 | : 7,674 | 36,588 | 41,960 | 83 | - 279 | 1,337 | 8,208 | 13,420 | 19,166 | ---- | 12,457 |
| 1917 | : 2,417 | 65,444 | 67,136 | 25 | 273 | 290 | 4,858 | 13,488 | 11,889 | --- | 54,957 |
| 1918 | : 3,151 | 25,501 | 27,707 | 36 | 91 | 116 | 5,314 | 9,929 | 13,649 | --- | 13,942 |
| -1919 | 11,048 | 217,506 | 125,240 | 303 | 627 | 839 | 3,915 | 7,839 | 10,579 | --- | 113,822 |
| 1920 | : 4,671 | 36,361 | 39,631 | 302 | 145 | 356 | 4,287 | 9,208 | 12,209 |  | 27,066 |
| 1921 | : 3,136 | 7,523 | 9,718 | 47 | 94 | 127 | 4,055 | 9,064 | 12,202 |  | -2,611 |
| 1922 | :4/ 3,759 | 32,692 | 35,323 | --- | -- | --- | 2,028 | 5,044 | 6,464 |  | 28,859 |
| 1923 | : 3,156 | 47,149 | 49,358 | --- | --- | --- | 1,033 | 2,773 | 3,496 |  | 45,862 |
| 1924 | 8,876 | 63,568 | 69,781 | --- | --- | --- | 724 | 2,106 | 2,613 |  | 67,168 |
| 1925 | 4,161 | 34,861 | 37,774 | --- | --- | --. | 985 | 3,112 | 3,802 | --- | 33,972 |
| 1926 | 3,784 | 38,436 | 41,085 | --- | --- | -.- | 1,030 | 3,546 | 4,267 |  | 36,818 |
| 1927 | 10,076 | 35,397 | 42,450 | --- | --- | -.. | 1,081 | 4,078 | 4,835 | -- | 37,615 |
| 1928 | - 5,408 | 31,661 | 35,447 | --- | --- | --- | 1,096 | 4,553 | 5,320 | -.- | 30,127 |
| 1929 | : 1,957 | 8,213 | 9,583 | --- | --- | --- | 610 | 2,807 | 3,234 | --- | 6,349 |
| 1930 | : 2,809 | 2,135 | 4,101 | --- | --- | --- | 353 | 1,813 | 2,060 | --- | 2,041 |
| 1931 | 1,164 | 408 | 1,223 | --- | --- | --- | 804 | 4,640 | 5,203 | --- | -3,980 |
| 1932 | 172 | 25 | 145 | --- | --- | --- | 410 | 2,694 | 2,981 | --- | -2,836 |
| 1933 | 287 | 263 | 464 | --- | --- | --- | 142 | 813 | 912 | -.. | -448 |
| 1934 | 252 | 24 | 200 | --- | --- | --- | 39 | 228 | 255 | --- | -55 |
| 1935 | 314 | 68 | 288 | --- | --- | --- | 33 | 221 | 244 | --- | 44 |
| 1936 | 759 | 1,152 | 1,682 | --- | --- | --- | 45 | 320 | 352 | --- | 1,330 |
| 1937 | 456 | 2,713 | 3,032 | --- | --- | --- | 85 | 573 | 633 | -... | 2,399 |
| 1938 | 334 | 6,079 | 6,310 | --- | --- | --- | 80 | 542 | 597 | --- | 5,713 |
| 1939 | 255 | 5,684 | 5,866 | --- | --- | --- | 74 | 535 | 588 | --- | 5,278 |
| 1940 | : 146 | 3,280 | 3,384 | --- | --- | --- | 73 | 578 | 630 | --- | 2,754 |
| 1941 | : 79 | 907 | 963 | --- | --- | --- | 640 | 5,453 | 5,908 | --- | -4,945 |
| 1942 | : 404 | 2,504 | 2,795 | --- | --- | --- | 225 | 3,044 | 3,206 | 71 | -411 |
| 1943 | : 1,725 | --- | 1,218 | --- | --- | --- | 2,031 | 20,366 | 21,800 | 1,713 | -22,295 |
| 1944 | : --- | 58,986 | 58,986 | - | --- | --- | 1,310 | 16,751 | 17,705 | 2,248 | 39,033 |
| 1945 | : 2 | --- | 1 | --- | --- | --- | 4,499 | 39,950 | 43,265 | 1,058 | -44,322 |
| 1946 | : 2 | 1 | 2 | --- | --- | --- | 17,987 | 159,105 | 172,083 | 1,112 | -173,193 |
| 1947 | : 9 | 11 | 18 | --- | --- | --- | 10,046 | 329,914 | 337,288 | 5/ 402 | -337,672 |
| 1948 | : 2 | 1 | 3 | --- | --- | --- | 9,899 | 526,086 | 533,361 | 5/ 116 | -533,474 |
| 1949 | : 2 | 6 | 7 | --- | --- | --- | 4,415 | 89,7 ${ }^{1}+7$ | 93,041 | 5/ 109 | -93,143 |
| 19506 | : 2 | 5 | 6 | --- | --- | --- | 1,690 | 49,646 | 50,895 | 5/ 98 | -50,987 |
| 1951 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1/ Before July 1911 flyports and re-exparts of shelled and unshelled peamuts were not reported separately. The percentage of total peanut imports consisting of shelled peanuts was computed each month from September 1911 to Auguat 1912. This percentage was applied to total inmorta in corresponding months from September 1909 to August 1911 to estimate how much of the total consisted of shelled peanuts. From 1909 to 1921 figures are general inports; from $19 \supseteq 2$ to date, fmports for consumption.
2/Before January 1945 exports of shelled and unshelled peamuts were not reported separately. The percentage which shelled peanuts were of total domestic disappearance (estimated 1919-1938; actual 1938-1944) was computed each year from 1919 to 1944 inclusive. This percentage was applied to total exports in corresponding years to estimate exports of shelled peanuts. For 1909 to 1918 the percentage of shelled peamuts in total domestic disappearance was estimated from a freehand trend for the period 1919-32 extended back to 1909 . The trend percentages for each year were used to break down the total exports of peanuts into shelled and unshelled.

3/ To convert to a kernel beais, cleaned in the shell peamits were first converted to farmars' stock by multiplying by 1.05 , and then to kernels by multiplying by . 6667 from 1909 to 1937 ; from 1938 to date, the conversion factor to kernels shown in table 15 was used for each year.

4/ September 22, 1922, to August 31, 1923.
5 Beginning with April 1ول8, shipments are for Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands only; shipments to Hswail and Alsaka are not reported.
6/ Prellminery.
U. S. Bureau of the Census (15).
Table 17.- Peanute: Stocks at crushing mille and in cold atorage and other warehouees, 1919 to dato

| Year | Crushing mills, October 1 |  |  | Cold-atore | - mrehtouses | All commercial positions, Soptomber 1 |  |  |  | Total (kornol basis) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { the } \\ & \text { hull } \end{aligned}$ | Eullod | Total (kernol basia) | $\begin{array}{cc} : & \text { Boginning } \\ : & \text { of } \\ : & \text { poriod } \end{array}$ | $:$ Ind <br> $:$ of <br> $:$ period | : Farmors <br> : etock | $\begin{array}{ll} : & \text { Cloaned } \\ : & \text { roasting } \\ : & \text { etock } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Shelled } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shollod } \\ & \text { : onl-stock } \\ & \text { : and No, } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : \text { Boginning } \\ & : \quad \text { of } \\ & : \quad \text { poriod } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | End  <br> $\vdots$ of <br> period  |
|  | $1,0001 \mathrm{~b}$ | 1,000 1b. | 1.0001 b . | 1,000 1b. | 1.0001 b . | 1.000 lb . | 1.000 lb | $1,0001 \mathrm{~b}$. | $1.0001 \mathrm{~b}_{2}$ | 2,000 1b. | 1,0001 |
| 1919 | 3,574 | 834 | 3,217 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 3,217 | 4,988 |
| 1920 | 3,490 | 2,661 | 4,988 | --- | - | - | - | - | - | 4,988 | 3,719 |
| 1921 | 2,668 | 1,940 | 3,719 | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- | 3,719 | 2,218 |
| 1922 | 2,754 | 382 | 2,218 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 2,218 | 369 |
| 1923 | 248 | 204 | 369 | -- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 369 | 1,979 |
| 1924 | 682 | 1,524 | 1,979 | ---- | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- | 1,979 | 2,595 |
| 1925 | 488 | 2,270 | 2,595 | 1/16,714 | 1/24,421 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 19,309 | 27,025 |
| 1926 | 420 | 2,324 | 2,604 | 2/28,698 | 2/15,969 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 31,302 | 17,182 |
| 1927 | 104 | 1,144 | 1,213 | 2/15,969 | 2/48,713 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 17,182 | 50,048 |
| 1928 | 416 | 1,058 | 1,335 | 2/48,713 | 2/63,519 | --- | --- | --. | --- | 50,048 | 66,158 |
| 1929 | 512 | 2,298 | 2,639 | 3/71,511 | 3/45,459 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 74,150 | 46,540 |
| 1930 | 40 | 1,054 | 1,081 | $3 / 45,459$ | 4/3/25,459 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 46,540 | 26,909 |
| 1931 | 348 | 1,218 | 1,450 | --. | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | 1,450 | 7,211 |
| 1932 | 9,382 | 956 | 7,211 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 7,211 | 2,549 |
| 1533 | 134 | 2,460 | 2,549 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 2,549 | 3,697 |
| 1934 | 22 | 3,682 | 3,697 | --- | -.- | --- | --- | --- | -- | 3,697 | 3,749 |
| 1935 | 358 | 3,510 | 3,749 | --- | --- | -- | --- | - | - | 3,749 | 1,401 |
| 1936 | 920 | 788 | 1,401 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 1,401 | 2,989 |
| 1537 | 1,702 | 1,854 | 2,989 | --- | --- | --- |  |  |  | 2,989 | 2,870 |
| 1938 | 1,770 | 1,690 | 2,870 | --- | --- | 41,381 | 8,699 | 62,123 | 1,468 | 96,804 | 57,685 |
| 1939 | - | , | - | --- | --- | 26,607 | 8,598 | 32,807 | 1,448 | 57,685 | 121,719 |
| 1940 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 75,392 | 8,923 | 61,532 | 2,448 | 121,719 | 130,498 |
| 1941 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 48,467 | 12,615 | 87,423 | 1,289 | 130,498 | 78,123 |
| 1942 | --- | --- | --- | --- |  | 30,942 | 6,478 | 51,073 | 1,475 | 78,123 | 148,178 |
| 1943 | --- | --- |  |  |  | 58,063 | 10,894 | 98,275 | 2,162 | 148,178 | 165,421 |
| 1944 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 55,259 | 15,157 | 105,332 | 12,246 | 165,421 | 167,230 |
| 1945 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 39,671 | 12,526 | 94,366 | 5/36,200 | 167,230 | 197,068 |
| 1946 | --. |  | -.- |  |  | 35,539 | 19,551 | 150,541 | 7,178 | 197,068 | 137,871 |
| 1947 | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- | 29,448 | 7,577 | 101,989 | 10,178 | 137,871 | 122,286 |
| 1948 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 38,599 | 10,387 | 79,736 | - 7,941 | 122,286 | 83,527 |
| 1949 : | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 27,046 | 8,914 | 52,143 | 5,903 | 83,527 | 83,797 |
| 1950 6/: | --- | --- | --- | --- |  | 17,103 | 11,170 | 51,264 | 12,039 | 83,797 | 177,670 |
| 1951 6/: | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 66,600 | 20,357 | 102,260 | 13,484 | 177,670 |  |
| 1952 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1]$ October 1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soptomber 1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $3 / \mathrm{July} 1$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimatod. 469 er |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $5 /$ Inoluding 21,469 thousend pounde imported in August 1945 and apperently not included in reported stocks. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North and middle Woet only. Those holdinge were reported in bage of approximately 125 pounds of dometic peenute and los convert into pounds, 100 pounds per bas were used, assuming that eome Chinese peanute and eome peanute in the shell were |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 18. - Peanuts: Crushings for oil and meal, 1916-to date

| Crop year | : | Farmers ${ }^{\text {: }}$ stock | : Shelled | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \vdots & \text { Total } \\ \vdots(\text { kernel basis }) & : \\ : \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crop } \\ & \text { year } \end{aligned}$ |  | Farmers ${ }^{\prime}$ stock | Shelled | $\begin{array}{lc} : & \text { Total } \\ :(\text { kernel basis }) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 1b. | $\underline{1,00016} .:$ |  |  | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 1b. |
| 1916 | : | 176,502 | --- | 117,673:: | 1936 |  | 165,368 | 56,266 | 166,450 |
| 1917 | : | 322,263 | --- | 214,853:: | 1937 |  | 170,891 | 37,826 | 151,759 |
| 1918 | : | 441,545 |  | 294,378:: | 1938 |  | 260,855 | 25,882 | 197,394 |
| 1919 | : | 10,936 | 16,786 | 23,477: : | 1939 |  | 72,666 | 31,735 | 81,235 |
| 1920 | : | 75,116 | 24,442 | 74,522 : | 194 C |  | 557,855 | 29,549 | 407,273 |
| 1921 | : | 83,888 | 20,846 | 76,774 : | 1941 |  | 220,217 | 27,160 | 176,379 |
| 1922 | - | 13,348 | 12,186 | 21,085 : | 1942 |  | 390,690 | 39,575 | 307,940 |
| 1923 |  | 1,556 | 11,122 | 12,159 : | 1943 |  | 408,186 | 46,584 | 320,967 |
| 1924 |  | 10,246 | 38,726 | 45,557: | 1944 |  | 119,494 | 216,526 | 299,467 |
| 1925 | : | 7,606 | 28,310 | 33,381 : | 1945 |  | 90,204 | 202,132 | 265,437 |
| 1926 | : | 1,430 | 22,384 | 23,337:: | 1946 |  | 263,280 | 186,462 | 367,388 |
| 1927 | : | 19,524 | 27,528 | 40,545 : | 1947 |  | 286,124 | 133,986 | 334,015 |
| 1928 | . | 7,252 | 32,530 | 37,365: | 1948 |  | 160,097 | 226,165 | 338,217 |
| 1929 | : | 28,942 | 61,214 | 80,510:: | 1949 I/ |  | 28,348 | 414,949 | 435,093 |
| 1930 |  | 12,086 | 38,362 | 46,420 : | 1950 I/ |  | 52,586 | 414,541 | 451,556 |
| 1931 |  | 8,640 | 28,550 | 34,310: | $1951{ }^{-}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1932 | : | 8,404 | 38,014 | 43,617:: | 1952 |  |  |  |  |
| 1933 | : | 2,520 | 28,320 | 30,000 : | 1953 |  |  |  |  |
| 1934 |  | 158,910 | 53,634 | 159,579:: | 1954 |  |  |  |  |
| 1935 | : | 156,020 | 38,538 | 142,557 :: | 1955 |  |  |  |  |
| 1/Preliminary: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1916 <br> peanu <br> (repo <br> 1919 <br> crush | - | Estimated P timated at as "peanuts ureau of the for the yea | n peanut oil <br> .5 percent) <br> the hull") <br> Census: 1938 <br> beginning S | production, U. S. 1919 -date: Farm 1938-date, from -date BAF. Census ptember. | iff Comm Stock au of Ag ushings | 10 | ion (24),(0 1919-37, fro cultural Eco for the ye | yield from Bureau of incs (10, 1 beginning | farmers' stock e Census (13) , 12) ; Shelledctober; BAE |

Table 19. - Peanuts: Domestic disappearance for food uses, total and per capita, 1920 to dato

| Crop year 1/ |  | Commercial disappearance 2/ .___ |  |  |  | Farm household ues and local sales (farmors' stock basis) 3/ | Total <br> disappoarance for food uses (kernel basis) |  | : | Por capita disappoerance $4 /$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | Sholled | Cloaned roasting etock | $\begin{array}{lc} : & \text { Total } \\ : & \text { (kernel } \\ \vdots & \text { basis) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | Sholled |  | Cleaned roasting stook | : | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { commercial } \\ \text { (kernel basis) } \end{gathered}$ | ```Total food uses :(kernel beale)``` |
|  | : | M11. 1b. | Mil. 2b. | M11. 1 b . |  | M12. 2 b . |  | M11. 1 b . |  |  | Lb. |  | $\underline{L E}$ |  | $\underline{L L}$ | $\underline{L t}$ |
| 1920 | : | 232 | 97 | 300 |  | 32 |  | 321 |  | 2.14 |  | 0.90 |  | 2.77 | 2.96 |
| 1921 | : | 216 | 77 | 270 |  | 34 |  | 293 |  | 1.96 |  | . 70 |  | 2.45 | 2.66 |
| 1922 | : | 222 | 84 | 281 |  | 33 |  | 303 |  | 1.99 |  | . 75 |  | 2.51 | 2.71 |
| 1923 | : | 272 | 100 | 343 |  | 33 |  | 365 |  | 2.39 |  | . 88 |  | 3.01 | 3.20 |
| 1924 | : | 316 | 89 | 379 |  | 37 |  | 403 |  | 2.73 |  | . 77 |  | 3.27 | 3.48 |
| 1925 | : | 326 | 97 | 394 |  | 37 |  | 418 |  | 2.77 |  | . 83 |  | 3.35 | 3.56 |
| 1926 | : | 306 | 97 | 374 |  | 36 |  | 398 |  | 2.57 |  | . 81 |  | 3.14 | 3.34 |
| 1927 | : | 377 | 96 | 444 |  | 43 |  | 473 |  | 3.13 |  | . 80 |  | 3.68 | 3.92 |
| 1928 | : | 360 | 94 | 426 |  | 44 |  | 455 |  | 2.95 |  | . 77 |  | 3.49 | 3.74 |
| 1929 | : | 410 | 83 | 468 |  | 46 |  | 499 |  | 3.33 |  | . 68 |  | 3.81 | 4.05 |
| 1930 | : | 326 | 59 | 367 |  | 38 |  | 392 |  | 2.62 |  | . 47 |  | 2.95 | 3.15 |
| 1931 | : | 461 | 79 | 517 |  | 55 |  | 553 |  | 3.68 |  | . 63 |  | 4.13 | 4.42 |
| 1932 | : | 429 | 62 | 473 |  | 67 |  | 518 |  | 3.41 |  | . 50 |  | 3.76 | 4.11 |
| 1933 | : | 371 | 65 | 417 |  | 57 |  | 455 |  | 2.93 |  | . 51 |  | 3.29 | 3.59 |
| 1934 | : | 339 | 58 | 379 |  | 67 |  | 424 |  | 2.65 |  | . 46 |  | 2.97 | 3.32 |
| 1935 | : | 427 | 64 | 472 |  | 63 |  | 514 |  | 3.33 |  | . 50 |  | 3.67 | 4.00 |
| 1936 | : | 499 | 71 | 549 |  | 63 |  | 590 |  | 3.86 |  | . 55 |  | 4.24 | 4.57 |
| 1937 | : | 479 | 72 | 529 |  | 55 |  | 566 |  | 3.68 |  | . 55 |  | 4.06 | 4.35 |
| 1938 | : | 481 | 71 | 529 |  | 58 |  | 567 |  | 3.66 |  | . 54 |  | 4.03 | 4.33 |
| 1939 | : | 491 | 67 | 539 |  | 57 |  | 578 |  | 3.71 |  | . 51 |  | 4.07 | 4.37 |
| 1940 | : | 561 | 72 | 612 |  | 66 |  | 657 |  | 4.20 |  | . 54 |  | 4.58 | 4.92 |
| 1941 | : | 575 | 67 | 623 |  | 79 |  | 677 |  | 4.27 |  | . 50 |  | 4.62 | 5.02 |
| 1942 | : | 796 | 59 | 838 |  | 94 |  | 903 |  | 5.83 |  | . 43 |  | 6.14 | 6.62 |
| 1943 | : | 770 | 78 | 825 |  | 95 |  | 889 |  | 5.57 |  | . 56 |  | 5.97 | 6.44 |
| 1944 | : | 850 | 103 | 925 |  | 86 |  | 985 |  | 6.07 |  | . 74 |  | 6.60 | 7.04 |
| 1945 | : | 764 | 80 | 823 |  | 70 |  | 872 |  | 5.40 |  | . 57 |  | 5.82 | 6.17 |
| 1946 | : | 602 | 64 | 649 |  | 77 |  | 702 |  | 4.19 |  | . 45 |  | 4.52 | 4.89 |
| 1947 | : | 560 | 67 | 610 |  | 78 |  | 665 |  | 3.83 |  | . 46 |  | 4.17 | 4.55 |
| 1948 | : | 544 | 68 | 594 |  | 60 |  | 637 |  | 3.66 |  | . 46 |  | 3.99 | 4.28 |
| 1949 | : | 552 | 64 | 600 |  | 50 |  | 636 |  | 3.65 |  | . 42 |  | 3.96 | 4.20 4.39 |
| 1950 | : | 590 | 66 | 639 |  | 52 |  | 676 |  | 3.83 |  | . 43 |  | 4.15 | 4.39 |
| 1951 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1952 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1rg |  | na 80 |  |  | to dato, | $1 /$ Yoar boginning 1920-37, Southwoetern section, August 1; Southeastern section, Septomber l; Virginia-Carolina eection, November l; 1938 to dato, Soptomber 1. $2 /$ Commorcial dieappearance includes peanuts used in peanut butcm, from rail movemont of peanuts from mills and information supplied based on estimates made by Market Nows Division, Fruit and Vegetable Branch, PMA, from rail movemont of peanuts from of cleaned and shelled peanute by peanut-consuming firms. roportod in Peanut Stocke and procose1ng (10, 11, 12 ) adjustod ( Computed from population on December 31. (


Table 20. - Shelled peanuts (all grades): Production, stocks, trade, and domestic disappearance, 1938-to date

| YearbeginningSeptember | : | Production | Imports | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Beginning } \\ & \text { stocks } \end{aligned}$ | Exports 1/ | Domestic disappearance |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : |  |  |  |  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Crushings } \\ 2 / \end{gathered}$ | : Edible use : $3 /$ |
|  | : | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 lb . | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 1b. | 1,000 1b. |
| 1938 | : | 474,330 | 6,079 | 63,591 | 542 | 509,203 | 28,683 | 480,520 |
| 1939 | : | 549,088 | 5,684 | 34,255 | 535 | 524,512 | 33,581 | 490,931 |
| 1940 | : | 617,867 | 3,280 | 63,980 | 578 | 595,837 | 34,641 | 561,196 |
| 1941 | : | 572,779 | 907 | 88,712 | 5,453 | 604,397 | 29,152 | 575,245 |
| 1942 | : | 887,526 | 2,504 | 52,548 | 3,044 | 839,097 | 43,546 | 795,551 |
| 1943 | : | 863,260 | --- | 100,437 | 21,608 | 824,511 | 54,058 | 770,453 |
| 1944 | : | 1,017,511 | 58,986 | 117,578 | 18,511 | 1,066,467 | 216,526 | 849,941 |
| 1945 | : | 1,055,083 | --- | 109,097 | 40,749 | 965,712 | 202,132 | 763,580 |
| 1946 | : | 902,827 | 1 | 157,719 | 159,761 | 788,619 | 186,462 | 602,157 |
| 1947 | : | 1,000,099 | 11 | 112,167 | 330,173 | 694,427 | 133,986 | 560,441 |
| 1948 | : | 1,266,959 | 1 | 87,677 | 526,193 | 770,398 | 226,165 | 544,233 |
| 1949 | : | 1,062,186 | 6 | 58,046 | 89,819 | 967,116 | 414,949 | 552,167 |
| 1950 | : | 1,107,142 | 5 | $63,303$ | 49,719 | 1,004,987 | 414,541 | 590,446 |
| 1951 | : |  |  | $115,744$ |  | 1,004,88 | , | - 1 |
| 1952 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^6]| Year beginning Seritember | : | Candy $1 /$ | : | Salted | : | Peanut butter $2 /$ | : | Other | : : : | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tctel } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | M12. 16. |  | M11. 1b. |  | M11. 1b. |  | M11. 1h. |  | M11. 1b. |
| 1944 | : | 173 |  | 247 |  | 300 |  | 18 |  | 738 |
| 1945 | : | 159 |  | 172 |  | 333 |  | 15 |  | 679 |
| 1946 | : | 146 |  | 151 |  | 259 |  | 12 |  | 568 |
| 1947 | : | 120 |  | 11.7 |  | - 251 |  | 5 |  | 493 |
| 1948 | : | 107 |  | 120 |  | 250 |  | 7 |  | 484 |
| 1949 | : | 126 |  | 118 |  | 256 |  | 9 |  | 510 |
| 1950 | : | 118 |  | 133 |  | 273 |  | 6 |  | 531 |
| 1951 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1952 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1/ Includes peanut butter made by manufacturers for their cwn use in candy, estimated. at 25 mfllion pounds before 1946. Use of peanuts in candy wes reported by the U. S. Department of Conmerce (20)
 candy.
Compiled from Statistics on Commercial Peanuts (11, 12) and Peanut Stocke and Processing (10).
Table 22. - Cleaned peanuts (roasting stock): Production, stocks, trade, and domestic disappearance, 1938-to date


Table 23.-Peanuts, in the shell: Average price per pound, received by farmers, United States, by months, 1909-date


1/ Monthly prices by Stetes, veighted by production to obtain monthly prices for the United States. Seagon average prices for each State based on monthly pricos vighted by estimates of monthly sales during the crop-marketing seasen.

Compiled fron Apricultural Prices (5).

| Yoar | : | Jan. | Fob。 | : Mar. | : | Apr. | : | Nay | : | Juno | : | July | : | Aug. | $\begin{gathered} \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Sopt. |  | oct. | $\begin{aligned} & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Nov. | ! Doc. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Average } \\ & : \quad 3 / \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | Conte | Conts | Conts |  | Conts |  | Conts |  | Cents |  | Conts |  | Conts |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Conts | Conts | Conts |
| 1924 | : | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 7.9 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.0 |
| 1925 | : | 8.1 | 8.2 | 8.2 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.1 |
| 1926 | : | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| 1927 | : | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.9 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| 1928 | : | 7.9 | 7.9 | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| 1929 | : | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| 1930 | : | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.6 |  | 7.6 |  | 7.5 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.6 |
| 1931 | : | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.0 |  | 6.9 |  | 6.9 |  | 6.8 |  | 6.7 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.7 |
| 1932 | : | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.1 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 5.9 |  | 5.9 |  | 5.9 |  | 5.8 |  | 5.8 | 5.7 | 6.0 |
| 1933 | : | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.4 |  | 5.5 |  | 5.5 |  | 5.5 |  | 5.7 |  | 5.9 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.7 |
| 1934 | : | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.1 |
| 1935 | : | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.1 |
| 1936 | : | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.1 |
| 1937 | : | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.4 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 | 6.1 | 6.3 |
| 1938 | : | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| 1939 | : | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 |  | 5.9 |  | 5.9 |  | 5.9 |  | 5.9 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.9 |
| 1940 | : | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| 1941 | : | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.3 |
| 1942 | : | 6.9 | 6.9 | 7.0 |  | 7.1 |  | 7.1 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.3 | 7.4 | 7.2 |
| 1943 | : | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.5 |  | 7.6 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.8 |  | 7.8 |  | 7.8 |  | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.7 |
| 1944 | : | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.1 |
| 1945 | : | 8.2 | 8.2 | 8.2 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.3 |  | 8.3 |  | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.2 |
| 1946 | : | 8.4 | 8.5 | 8.5 |  | 8.5 |  | 8.7 |  | 8.9 |  | 9.4 |  | 9.6 |  | 9.5 |  | 9.8 |  | 10.0 | 10.1 | 9.2 |
| 1947 | : | 10.3 | 20.6 | 10.8 |  | 10.9 |  | 10.9 |  | 10.9 |  | 10.9 |  | 11.1 |  | 11.3 |  | 11.4 |  | 11.5 | 11.7 | 11.0 |
| 1948 | : | 12.0 | 11.9 | 11.8 |  | 11.9 |  | 12.0 |  | 12.0 |  | 12.0 |  | 12.0 |  | 12.0 |  | 11.9 |  | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.9 |
| 1949 | : | 11.8 | 11.7 | 11.7 |  | 11.8 |  | 11.7 |  | 11.7 |  | 21.7 |  | 11.6 |  | 11.5 |  | 11.5 |  | 11.5 | 21.5 | 11.6 |
| 1950 | 3/: | 11.6 | 11.6 | 11.7 |  | 11.7 |  | 11.9 |  | 11.9 |  | 12.0 |  | 12.1 |  | 12.3 |  | 12.3 |  | 12.4 | 12.5 | 12.0 |
| 1951 | : | 12.8 | 12.8 | 13.0 |  | 13.1 |  | 13.1 |  | 13.2 |  | 13.1 |  | 13.1 |  | 13.1 |  | 13.2 |  | 13.2 | 13.2 | 13.1 |
| 1952 | : | 13.3 | 13.3 | 13.3 |  | 13.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/ Base period August 1909-July $1914=4.8$ cents per pound. Colculated with the correctod index as published through Decomber 1949. <br> 2/ Average for years prior to 1924 wore as follows: 1915-4.5, 1911-4.8, 1912-4.8, $1913-4.9,1914-4$. $1916-6.0$, $1917-7.1,1918-8.3,1919-9.5,1920-9.7,1921-7.9,1922-7.9,1923-8.0$. <br> 3/ Effective parity prico based on oll formula, January 1950 ts date. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


Table 26.- Peanuts, Southwestern Spanish: Price of farmers stock to growers, by months, 1920 to date $1 /$

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Yoar } \\ \text { beginning } \\ \text { Ara. } \end{gathered}$ | : Aug. | : Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. | : Jen. | Feb. | $\begin{aligned} & : ~ M a r . ~ \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & : \\ & \text { : Apr. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : \text { May } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & : \\ & \text { : June } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : ~ J u l y \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Average } \\ & : \quad 3 / \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : Cents | Cents | Conts | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Conts | Conts | Conts | Cents | Cents |
| 1920 | : | --- | --- | 3.5 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.7 | --- | 2.7 | --- | --- | 2.8 |
| 1921 | : --- | 2.8 | --- | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 2.5 |
| 1922 | : --- | 3.6 | --- | 4.4 | 4.8 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 6.8 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 5.3 |
| 1923 | : --- | --- | --- | 6.2 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.3 | --- | --- | --- | 5.7 |
| 1924 | : --- | --- | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 4.5 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 4.4 |
| 1925 | : --- | --- | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 4.3 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 3.7 |
| 1926 | : --- | 5.0 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.8 | --- | --- | --- | 5.1 |
| 1927 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | --- | --- | 3.8 |
| 1928 | : --- | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.6 | --- | --- | --- | 3.7 | --- | 3.5 |
| 1929 | : --- | 3.5 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.1 | --- | --- | 2.5 |
| 1930 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 2.5 | --- | 3.1 | 3.1 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 3.3 |
| 1931 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | . 9 | . 9 | --- | 1.4 |
| 1932 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 1.1 | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.6 | --- | --- | 2.8 | 1.5 |
| 1933 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | --- | --- | 2.8 |
| 1934 3/ | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 4.5 | --- | --- | --- | 3.9 | 3.5 |
| 1935 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 3.2 | --- | --- | 2.8 |
| 1936 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 4.7 | --- | 4.7 | --- | --- | --8 | 3.6 |
| 1937 | : 2.9 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.3 | --- | 3.3 | --- | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| 1938 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.0 | --0 | --- | --- | --- | 3.3 | 2.9 |
| 1939 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.6 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 3.1 | 3.2 |
| 1940 | $: 2.7$ | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.7 | --- | 3.1 |
| 1941 | $: 4.4$ | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 4.7 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 4.5 |
| 1942 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.4 | --8 | --- | 7.4 |
| 1943 | . | 6. | 7.1 | 6.8 | E. 8 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| 1944 | : --- | --- | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 8.1 | --- | --- | 8.2 |
| 1945 | --- | - | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | --- | --- | 8.3 |
| 1946 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 8.4 |
| 1947 | : 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 9.9 |
| 1948 | : 10.4 | 10.6 | 10.5 | 10.7 | 10.7 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 10.6 |
| 1949 | : 9.9 | 10.0 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 10.5 | 10.4 | 10.1 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 10.2 |
| 1950 | : 10.4 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 10.4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 10.5 |
| 1951 4/ | 10.9 | 10.8 | 10.3 | 10.9 | 10.7 | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1952 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| for the quantity of peanuts harvested in 1934, or not less than $\$ 2.00$ an acre of the allotted peanut acreage on contract. 4/ Preliminary.. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Production and Marketing Administration, 1920-31 and 1935-42, Price to erowers f.o.b. country shipping-point basis growers f.o.b. delivery-point basis; 1943 to date, most trading based on percentage of sound meat content, dama |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 27. - Peamuts, Southeastern Spanish: Price of farmers stock to growers, by months, 1920 to date l/

| Year beginning September | , | Sept. | : | Oct. |  | Nov. |  | Dec. | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | Jan. | $\qquad$ | Feb. | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & : \\ & : \end{aligned}$ | Mar. |  | Apr . |  | May |  | June |  | July | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & : \\ & : \end{aligned}$ | Aug. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Average } \\ 2 / \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | Cents |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Cente |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Cents |
| 1920 | : | 5.2 |  | 4.2 |  | 4.0 |  | 2.6 |  | 2.9 |  | 2.8 |  | 2.2 |  | 2.2 |  | 2.1 |  | 2.0 |  | 1.8 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.9 |
| 1921 | : | 2.8 |  | --- |  | 2.8 |  | 2.5 |  | 2.6 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.9 |  | 4.6 |  | 4.4 |  | 3.3 |
| 1922 | : | 3.6 |  | --- |  | 5.3 |  | 5.6 |  | 6.4 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.0 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.8 |  | 8.0 |  | --- |  | --- |  | 6.5 |
| 1923 | : | --- |  | --- |  | 7.0 |  | 6.6 |  | 7.0 |  | 7.1 |  | 6.8 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.8 |  | 7.1 |  | 6.7 |
| 1924 | : | 5.2 |  | 4.4 |  | 4.4 |  | 4.4 |  | 4.4 |  | 4.6 |  | 4.4 |  | 4.2 |  | 4.0 |  | 3.8 |  | 3.8 |  | 3.6 |  | 4.27 |
| 1925 | : | 4.0 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.4 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.9 |  | 4.8 |  | 4.7 |  | 4.6 |  | 5.2 |  | 5.3 |  | 5.5 |  | 4.47 |
| 1926 | : | 5.2 |  | 4.6 |  | 5.2 |  | 5.4 |  | 5.9 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.8 |  | 6.7 |  | 6.2 |  | 5.8 |  | 5.8 |  | 4.0 |  | 5.68 |
| 1927 | : | 3.6 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.9 |  | 4.6 |  | 4.6 |  | 4.3 |  | 4.1 |  | 4.0 |  | 3.8 |  | 4.0 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.96 |
| 1928 | : | 3.6 |  | 3.6 |  | 4.3 |  | 4.4 |  | 4.4 |  | 4.2 |  | 3.8 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.78 |
| 1929 | : | 3.4 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.0 |  | 2.6 |  | 2.8 |  | 3.1 |  | 2.9 |  | 2.8 |  | 2.8 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.00 |
| 1930 | : | 3.6 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.1 |  | 2.8 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.2 |  | 2.8 |  | 3.27 |
| 1931 | : | 1.5 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.4 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.0 |  | . 8 |  | . 8 |  | 1.3 |  | 1.17 |
| 1932 | : | 1.7 |  | 1.4 |  | 1.3 |  | 1.1 |  | 1.3 |  | 1.3 |  | 1.4 |  | 1.6 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.6 |  | 2.9 |  | 2.9 |  | 1.82 |
| 1933 | : | 2.4 |  | 2.6 |  | 2.7 |  | 2.7 |  | 3.0 |  | 2.9 |  | 3.0 |  | 2.8 |  | 2.8 |  | 2.9 |  | 2.9 |  | 2.9 |  | 2.79 |
| 1934 3/ | : | 3.0 |  | 2.9 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.6 |  | 4.2 |  | 5.2 |  | 5.5 |  | 4.9 |  | 4.8 |  | 4.2 |  | 3.6 |  | --- |  | 4.10 |
| 1935 | : | 3.3 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.1 |  | 2.9 |  | 2.9 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.17 |
| 1936 | : | 3.4 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.3 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.6 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.7 |  | 4.6 |  | 4.3 |  | 3.7 |  | 3.7 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.92 |
| 1937 | : | 2.9 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.3 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.22 |
| 1938 | : | 3.1 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.3 |  | 3.3 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.16 |
| 1939 | : | 3.3 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.3 |  | 3.1 |  | 2.9 |  | 2.8 |  | 2.9 |  | 3.26 |
| 1940 | : | 3.2 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.2 |  | 3.3 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.7 |  | 3.7 |  | 3.8 |  | 3.9 |  | 4.2 |  | 4.4 |  | 3.61 |
| 1941 | : | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 5.0 |  | 5.4 |  | 5.4 |  | 6.2 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.2 |  | 7.5 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.18 |
| 1942 | : | 6.4 |  | 7.0 |  | 7.3 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.5 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.4 |  | -- |  | --- |  | --- |  | 7.95 |
| 1943 | : | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.40 |
| 1944 | : | 8.2 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.5 |  | 8.5 |  | 8.7 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.3 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.0 |  | --- |  | 8.33 |
| 1945 | : | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.6 |  | --- |  | 8.60 |
| 1946 | : | 8.9 |  | 9.2 |  | 9.5 |  | 10.0 |  | 8.9 |  | 9.1 |  | 9.4 |  | 9.8 |  | 10.0 |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | 9.42 |
| 1947 | : | 10.5 |  | 10.5 |  | 10.5 |  | 10.5 |  | 10.5 |  | 10.5 |  | -- |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | 10.50 |
| 1948 | : | 11.0 |  | 11.1 |  | 11.1 |  | 11.0 |  | 10.6 |  | 10.8 |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | 10.93 |
| 1949 | : | 10.7 |  | 10.8 |  | 10.7 |  | 10.8 |  | 10.8 |  | 10.8 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | -- |  | - |  | 10.77 |
| 1950 | : | 11.2 |  | 11.0 |  | 11.0 |  | 11.1 |  | --- |  | - |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | --- |  | 11.08 |
| 1951 4/ | : | 11.1 |  | 10.8 |  | 10.8 |  | 10.9 |  | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1952 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | contracts, as most commercial producers did, were eligible to receive in addition from the Department of Agriculture 0.4 cents a pound for the quantity of peamuts harvested in 1934, or not less than $\$ 2.00$ an acre of the allotted peanut acreage on a farm covered by contract. 4/ Preliminary Production and Marketing Administration. 1920-31, Prices to growers f.0.b. country shipping-point basis; 1932-42, Price to growers factors as show on the CCC support Schedule of Prices, delivered to customary or established receiving point.


 1/Simple average between high and low pricee reported each woek. $2 /$ Average for monthe shown. $3 /$ Farmers signing acreage-reetriction
1932-42, Price to erovers P.O.b. Production and Marketing Administration 1920-31, Prices to growors 1.0.0. country delivery-point basis, 1943 to date, most trading based on porcentage of ore established receiving point. contracts, as most comercial producere did, were eligible to receive in adole of the allotted peanut acreage on a farm covered by for the quantity of peanuts harveeted in 1934, or not $108 s$ then $\$ 2.00$ an acre of tho and peatur ack delivery as shown on the CCC Support Schedule of Prices, delivered to cuetomary or entablished receiving point.


Table 31. - Peanuts, sholled, Virginias, extra large: Price por pound f.o.b. shipping points Virginia-North Carolina section, by monthe, 1920 to dato

| Year beginning: November : | Nov. | Dec. | Jan. | Feb. |  | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & : \text { Sept. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : \text { oct. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { : Average } \\ : 1 / \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Conts | Cents | Conts | Cents |  | Cents | Cents | Cents | Conts | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Conts |
| 1920 | 12.50 | 11.62 | 12.25 | 12.75 |  | 12.50 | 12.38 | 12.62 | 12.38 | 12.25 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 11.75 | 12.25 |
| 1921 | 10.62 | 8.75 | 8.88 | 8.50 |  | 8.75 | 8.12 | 7.75 | 7.50 | 7.62 | 8.38 | 8.25 | 8.38 | 8.46 |
| 1922 | 9.50 | 12.00 | 14.50 | 13.38 |  | 12.75 | 12.50 | 12.38 | 12.25 | 12.00 | 11.50 | 11.12 | 11.38 | 12.10 |
| 1923 | 10.88 | 9.75 | 10.12 | 10.38 |  | 10.38 | 10.62 | 10.38 | 10.38 | 11.62 | 12.75 | 12.62 | 12.38 | 11.02 |
| 1924 | 12.00 | 11.88 | 12.75 | 13.75 |  | 13.75 | 13.50 | 12.25 | 13.25 | 13.00 | 12.62 | 12.50 | 11.38 | 12.72 |
| 1925 | 9.50 | 9.00 | 9.25 | 9.38 |  | 9.25 | 9.25 | 9.00 | 9.50 | 9.88 | 9.75 | 9.62 | 9.25 | 9.39 |
| 1926 | 9.12 | 9.00 | 9.38 | 9.88 |  | 10.25 | 10.12 | 9.75 | 10.00 | 11.38 | 13.00 | 14.12 | 14.00 | 10.83 |
| 1927 | 11.88 | 13.25 | 13.62 | 12.25 |  | 11.62 | 11.50 | 11.62 | 11.75 | 12.00 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.00 | 12.00 |
| 1928 | 10.62 | 10.75 | 11.25 | 11.62 |  | 11.25 | 10,75 | 10.62 | 10.62 | 10.62 | 10.38 | 10.75 | 10.62 | 10.82 |
| 1929 | 10.00 | 9.38 | 8.88 | 8.62 |  | 8.75 | 8.75 | 8.62 | 8.62 | 8.25 | 8.00 | 9.00 | 9.00 | 8.82 |
| 1930 | 7.75 | 7.00 | 7.25 | 7.38 |  | 7.88 | 8.50 | 8.38 | 8.12 | 8.12 | 7.62 | 6.88 | 6.12 | 7.58 |
| 1931 | 6.75 | 6.75 | 5.88 | 4.62 |  | 4.38 | 4.00 | 3.50 | 3.25 | 3.12 | 4.00 | 4.38 | 4.00 | 4.55 |
| 1932 | 3.88 | 2.62 | 2.62 | 2.62 |  | 2.88 | 3.00 | 4.12 | 4.38 | 5.12 | 5.38 | 5.25 | 5.12 | 3.92 |
| 1933 | 5.62 | 6.00 | 6.25 | 6.62 |  | 6.88 | 7.00 | 6.75 | 6.75 | 6.62 | 7.00 | 7.62 | 2/ 9.00 | 6.84 |
| 1934 | 8.38 | 9.25 | 10.12 | 10.25 |  | 10.12 | 9.62 | 9.38 | 8.62 | 8.75 | 7.88 | 8.88 | 8.38 | 9.14 |
| 1935 | 7.88 | 7.50 | 6.38 | 6.12 |  | 6.12 | 6.38 | 6.75 | 8.12 | 9.88 | 10.75 | 10.62 | 9.62 | 8.01 |
| 1936 | 6.75 | 8.38 | 9.50 | 9.00 |  | 8.88 | 9.00 | 8.62 | 7.88 | 8.38 | 8.12 | 7.38 | 7.00 | 8.24 |
| 1937 | 6.62 | 6.38 | 6.62 | 6.75 |  | 6.88 | 6.50 | 6.62 | 7.88 | 8.50 | 8.38 | 8.00 | $7 \cdot 12$ | 7.19 |
| 1938 | 7.00 | 8.00 | 8.12 | 8.00 |  | 7.75 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.62 | 8.12 | 9.25 | 8.38 | 7.90 |
| 1939 | 7.75 | 8.00 | 8.75 | 8.50 |  | 8.00 | 7.88 | 8.12 | 8.00 | 8.00 | 8.10 | 8.05 | 7.75 | 8.08 |
| 1940 | 7.00 | 6.85 | 7.12 | 7.40 |  | 7.80 | 8.00 | 9.00 | 10.75 | 11.12 | 11.25 | 10.75 | 10.25 | 8.94 |
| 1941 | 10.00 | 10.20 | 11.25 | 12.50 |  | 14.15 | 14.07 | 13.25 | 12.25 | 13.75 | 14.62 | 14.75 | --- | 12.80 |
| 1942 | 15.50 | 16.50 | 16.90 | 17.00 | 3/ | 16.25 | 16.25 | --- | $\cdots$ | 16.25 | --- | --- | 16.25 | 16.36 |
| 1943 | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 | , |  |  |  |  | ---- | - | --- | --- | 16.25 | 16.25 |
| 1944 | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 |  | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 | --- | --- | 16.25 | 16.25 |
| 1945 | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 |  | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 | 16.25 | ---0 | --- | 20.50 | 16.68 |
| 1946 | 21.20 | 20.00 | 21.40 | 22.00 |  | 23.10 | 23.25 | 22.50 | 22.50 | 22.50 | 23.20 | 23.20 | --- | 22.26 |
| 1947 | 19.75 | 20.00 | 21.25 | 21.12 |  | 20.62 | 20.75 | 20.38 | 20.62 | 24.00 | 21.00 | 21.50 | 22.25 | 21.10 |
| 1948 | 19.62 | 19.62 | 20.00 | 20.75 |  | 20.75 | 21.38 | 21.00 | 21.12 | 21.38 | 24.00 | 24.38 | 24.38 | 21.53 |
| 1949 | 21.25 | 26.50 | 27.38 | 27.12 |  | 29.12 | 29.50 | 29.50 | 29.75 | 29.50 | 29.88 | 29.75 | 26.75 | 28.00 |
| 1950 | 24.50 | 26.00 | 25.75 | $25.25$ |  | $24.25$ | $24.12$ | 23.50 | 22.75 | 22.50 | 22.50 | 22.37 | 22.75 | 23.85 |
| 1951 | 23.50 | 22.50 | 22.50 | 23.25 |  | 22.87 | 23.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1952 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


Table 32. - Peanuts, Virginias, Ho. 1, she

Table 33. - Peanutb, Spanish, No. l, shelled:

Table 34. - Peanuts, Spanish, No, 1, shelled: Average price por pound, f.o.b. shipping points,

| Year : beginning: September: | Sopt. |  | Nov. | Dec. | Jan. | Fob. | : Mar. | Apr. | may | June | July | Aug. | Averago |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | Cents | Conts | Conts | Conts | Conts | Conts | Conts | Conts | Conts | Conts | Cents | Conts | Conts |
| 1920 | 10.38 | 8.25 | 7.25 | 5.62 | 5.75 | 5.75 | 4.88 | 4.88 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.88 | 5.91 |
| 1921 | 5.88 | 5.88 | 5.38 | 5.00 | 5.12 | 5.50 | 6.00 | 5.98 | 6.12 | 7.12 | 7.75 | 8.25 | 6.16 |
| 1922 | 7.50 | 6.88 | 9.25 | 9.50 | 10.75 | 11.75 | 11.38 | 12.12 | 12.50 | 12.62 | 12.75 | 12.50 | 10.79 |
| 1923 | 12.25 | 11.88 | 11.75 | 11.50 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.38 | 11.12 | 11.00 | 11.00 | 11.62 | 12.12 | 11.59 |
| 1924 | 10.38 | 8.75 | 8.25 | 8.12 | 8.12 | 8.50 | 8.75 | 8.00 | 7.75 | 7.75 | 7.50 | 7.38 | 8.27 |
| 1925 | 7.25 | 6.75 | 6.75 | 6.62 | 7.62 | 8.38 | 8.50 | 8.25 | 8.38 | 9.00 | 9.25 | 9.25 | 8.00 |
| 1926 | 9.38 | 8.38 | 9.00 | 9.25 | 10.00 | 10.75 | 10.38 | 10.75 | 10.62 | 10.38 | 10.25 | 9.50 | 9.93 |
| 1927 | 6.75 | 6.38 | 6.62 | 7.75 | 7.88 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.38 | 7.00 | 6.88 | 6.50 | 6.38 | 7.04 |
| 1928 | 6.75 | 6.62 | 7.25 | 7.62 | 7.62 | 7.38 | 6.88 | 6.38 | 6.50 | 6.50 | 6.25 | 6.12 | 6.82 |
| 1929 | 6.50 | 6.12 | 5.75 | 5.50 | 5.38 | 5.50 | 5.62 | 5.50 | 5.38 | 5.50 | 5.62 | 6.12 | 5.71 |
| 1930 | 6.62 | 6.12 | 5.75 | 5.50 | 6.00 | 6.62 | 6.50 | 6.75 | 6.75 | 6.50 | 6.25 | 5.75 | 6.26 |
| 1931 | 4.25 | 2.88 | 3.00 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2.62 | 2.98 | 2.62 | 2.25 | 2.12 | 2.05 | 2.88 | 2.75 |
| 1932 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 2.38 | 2.25 | 2.38 | 2.25 | 2.62 | 2.88 | 3.88 | 4.25 | 4.75 | 5.00 | 3.18 |
| 1933 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.62 | 4.75 | 5.00 | 5.12 | 5.38 | 5.12 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 4.91 |
| 1934 | 5.50 | 1/6.25 | 6.62 | 7.25 | 8.38 | 9.50 | 9.88 | 9.50 | 9.12 | 8.12 | 7.88 | 7.12 | 7.93 |
| 1935 | 7.00 | 6.38 | 6.25 | 6.25 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.88 | 5.12 | 5.12 | 5.12 | 6.25 | 6.00 | 5.70 |
| 1936 | 5.62 | 5.12 | 5.38 | 6.50 | 7.38 | 7.38 | 7.50 | 7.38 | 7.00 | 6.12 | 6.12 | 5.12 | 6.38 |
| 1937 | 4.88 | 5.25 | 5.38 | 5.38 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.62 | 5.12 | 5.00 | 5.25 | 5.38 | 5.12 | 5.28 |
| 1938 | 5.00 | 5.08 | 5.15 | 5.25 | 5.25 | 5.30 | 5.10 | 5.00 | 4.90 | 5.12 | 5.05 | 5.62 | 5.15 |
| 1939 | 5.75 | 5.88 | 5.88 | 6.10 | 6.20 | 6.00 | 5.62 | 5.40 | 5.30 | 4.88 | 4.90 | 5.00 | 5.58 |
| 1940 | 5.10 | 5.00 | 5.15 | 5.20 | 5.25 | 5.45 | 5.50 | 5.55 | 5.62 | 6.15 | 6.75 | 6.90 | 5.64 |
| 1941 : | 7.05 | 7.25 | 8.62 | 9.12 | 9.15 | 10.80 | 13.75 | 13.88 | 13.12 | 10.75 | 11.20 | 12.10 | 10.57 |
| 1942 | 11.00 | 11.88 | 12.50 | 14.16 | 14.50 | 14.70 | 2/14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 13.69 |
| 1943 | 14.15 | 14.00 | 14.12 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.21 |
| 1944 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 |
| 1945 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.75 | 14.38 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.25 | 14.30 |
| 1946 | 14.31 | 14.65 | 15.30 | 15.18 | 14.88 | 15.38 | 17.62 | 17.62 | 15.88 | 15.50 | 16.12 | 16.50 | 15.74 |
| 1947 | 16.25 | 16.00 | 16.12 | 16.25 | 16.62 | 16.88 | 16.75 | 16.88 | 16.88 | 17.00 | 17.12 | 17.00 | 16.65 |
| 1948 | 16.58 | 16.50 | 16.38 | 16.38 | 16.75 | 16.88 | 17.12 | 17.25 | 17.00 | 17.12 | 17.25 | 17.12 | 16.86 |
| 1949 | 16.75 | 16.38 | 17.00 | 17.38 | 17.50 | 17.25 | 17.12 | 17.25 | 17.25 | 17.38 | 17.62 | 18.38 | 17.27 |
| 1950 | 17.62 | 16.88 | 16.88 | 16.75 | 16.88 | 16.88 | 17.00 | 17.00 | 17.00 | 17.00 | 17.25 | 17.37 | 17.04 |
| 1951 | 18.50 | 19.13 | 20.75 | 20.87 | 21.13 | 21.87 | 21.87 | 21.88 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1952 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/ From October 1, 1934 to January 6, 1936, prices include processing tax of 1.5 cente per pound on shelled pean ceiling price effoctive February 27, 1943-Soptember 1946. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compiled from records of the Production and Markoting Administration and Weokiy Peanut Report (e). Data based on from cleaners, shollers, and brokers. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 35.- Peanuts, Runnors, No. 1, shelled: Average price por pound, f:0.b. shipping points,

Table 36. - Peenuts (cieaned): Price per pound of Virginias, Jumbo, Chicago, by months, 1920-to date

| Year : September: | Sopt. | oct. | Nov. | Dec. | Jan. | Fob. | Mar. | $\begin{aligned} & : ~ A p r . ~ \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | June | $: \text { July }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Aug. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Avorage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : | Conts | Cents | Cents | Conts | Conts | Conts | Conts | Cents | Conts |  | Conts | Conts | Cents | Cents |
| 1920 : | 13.5 | 14.8 | 15.9 | 2/13.7 | 13.7 | 12.8 | 12.1 | 11.5 | 11.7 |  | 12.7 | 13.9 | 13.3 | 13.1 |
| 1921 : | 12.8 | 12.5 | 11.5 | 10.0 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 7.8 | 7.0 |  | 7.1 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| 1922 : | 6.8 | 7.2 | 9.1 | 10.4 | 11.4 | 11.6 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 2/11.4 |  | 11.4 | 11.4 | 11.0 | 10.4 |
| 1923 : | 10.9 | 11.0 | 10.9 | 10.1 | 9.5 | 3/10.1 | 9.8 | 9.5 | 9.4 |  | 9.4 | 10.3 | 11.9 | 10.2 |
| 1924 : | 11.1 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 10.5 | 11.1 | 11.9 | 12.1 | 11.9 | 11.9 |  | 11.9 | 11.9 | 21.8 | 11.5 |
| 1925 : | 11.9 | 11.7 | 11.1 | 10.2 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 8.5 |  | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.7 | 9.6 |
| 1926 : | 8.5 | 3.5 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 8.5 |  | 9.9 | 3/9.5 | 10.7 | 8.9 |
| 1927 : | 11.3 | 21.3 | 11.0 | 11.9 | 12.9 | 12.3 | 12.2 | 12.1 | 12.1 |  | 12.3 | 12.6 | 12.5 | 12.0 |
| 1923 : | 12.5 | 12.2 | 11.9 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 11.0 | 10.8 | 10.4 | 9.9 |  | 9.8 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 10.8 |
| 1929 : | 9.2 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 8.3 |  | 8.6 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| 1930 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 10.9 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 9.6 | 9.5 |  | $9 . ?$ | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.6 |
| 1931 | 2/9.0 | 4/9.0 | 3/8.0 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 4.2 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 6.0 |
| 1932 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 5.9 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.9 |  | 4.9 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 5.9 |
| 1933 | 5.9 | 3/4.9 | 2/5.? | 6.2 | 6.5 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 6.3 |  | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.1 |
| 1934 | 3/7.4 | 3/8.2 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 8.3 | 8.0 |  | 7.9 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 8.1 |
| 1935 | 8.2 | 3.5 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.2 |  | 8.7 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 8.2 |
| 1936 | 9.8 | 9.6 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 8.9 | 8.5 | 8.4 |  | 8.0 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.6 |
| 1937 | 2/8.3 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.9 | 7.0 |  | 7.7 | 7.8 | 8.1 | 7.5 |
| 1938 | 8.0 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 8.2 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 8.9 |  | 8.1 | 8.5 | 9.1 | 8.1 |
| 1939 | 10.1) | 10.0 | 8.9 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 8.3 |  | 8.1 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.6 |
| 1940 | ?. 3 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 8.0 |  | 8.5 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 7.9 |
| 1941 | 8.6 | 8.2 | 8.5 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 9.8 | 10.5 | 11.0 | 10.5 |  | 10.2 | 11.0 | $4 / 11.3$ | 9.8 |
| 1942 | 2/25.5 | .-. |  |  | 5/16.0 | 5/15.9 | -- | --- | -- |  | --- | --- | --- | 15.8 |
| 1943 | - | --- | 2/16.6 | 2/16.6 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 16.9 |  | 16.9 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 16.8 |
| 1944 | 3/16.9 | 5/16.9 |  | 3/16.8 | 16.9 | $3 / 16.8$ | --- | $3 / 16.8$ |  |  | --- |  | --- | 16.8 |
| 1945 |  |  | 4/15.3 | --- | 4/16.9 | --- | 5/16.9 | 5/16.9 | 16.9 |  | 16.9 | 2/16.9 | 16.9 | 16.7 |
| 1946 | : 3/16.9 | 2/17.0 | 4/17.9 | 17.3 | 5/17.0 | 17.4 | $4 / 17.9$ | --- |  |  | 4 |  | 2 | 17.3 |
| 1947 1948 | : $\quad 22.6$ | 22.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.9 | 19.2 | $4 / 21.0$ 19.5 | 21.0 19.8 |  | 21.4 20.0 | 22.1 $2 / 19.8$ | 22.4 | 21.6 19.9 |
| 1949 | : | --- | --. | --- | --- | --- | --- | , | --- |  | --- | --- | --. | . 9 |
| 1950 | : | - | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |  |  |  | --- | -.. | --- | --- |
| 1951 | : | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1952 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^7]Table 37. - Peanuts (cleaned): Price por pound of Virginias, Fanoy, Chicago, by months, 1920 to date

Table 38.- Peanuts (sheliod): Price per pound of Virginias, Bxtra Large, Chicago, by months, 1920 to date


[^8]
2/ Average computed from data for 3 weeks
4 Average computed from data for 4 weeks when 5 weeks reporting possible.
5 Average computed from data for 2 weeks.
Compiled from Weekly Peamut Report (22). No quotations given prior to 1939.



| Yoar beginning Sopt. | : | Sopt. | : | Oct. | : | Nov. |  | Dec. | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Jan. | : | Fob. | : | Mar. | : | Apr. | : | May | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | June | : | July | $\begin{aligned} & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Aus. | ! | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & 1 / \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | Conte |  | Conts |  | Conts |  | Contif |  | Conti |  | Cents |  | Cents |  | Conts |  | Conto |  | Conts |  | Conts |  | Conte |  | Cents |
| 1920 | : | 11.8 |  | 10.2 |  | 9.4 |  | 2/7.3 |  | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.0 |  | 5.9 |  | 5.7 |  | 6.0 |  | 7.4 |
| 1921 | : | 6.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.9 |  | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.7 |  | 9.0 |  | 7.1 |
| 1922 | : | 8.6 |  | 8.0 |  | 9.8 |  | 10.4 |  | 11.4 |  | 12.4 |  | 12.4 |  | 12.8 |  | 2/13.4 |  | 13.4 |  | 13.5 |  | 13.0 |  | 11.6 |
| 1923 | : | 13.4 |  | 13.4 |  | 12.9 |  | 12.4 |  | 12.6 |  | $3 / 12.9$ |  | 12.7 |  | 12.3 |  | 12.0 |  | 12.0 |  | 2/12.7 |  | 13.0 |  | 12.7 |
| 1924 | \% | 12.2 |  | 10.3 |  | 9.7 |  | 2/9.6 |  | 9.6 |  | 9.6 |  | 9.6 |  | 9.2 |  | 9.1 |  | 9.1 |  | 9.0 |  | 8.4 |  | 9.6 |
| 1925 | : | 8.2 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.8 |  | 7.9 |  | 8.7 |  | 9.2 |  | 9.4 |  | 9.3 |  | 9.4 |  | 9.7 |  | 9.9 |  | 9.9 |  | 8.9 |
| 1926 | : | 9.9 |  | 9.9 |  | 10.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 10.9 |  | 21.6 |  | 11.7 |  | 11.5 |  | 11.2 |  | 11.2 |  | 10.7 |  | 9.7 |  | 10.7 |
| 1927 | : | 8.3 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.8 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.8 |  | 8.5 |  | 8.5 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.3 |  | 8.0 |  | 7.8 |  | 7.6 |  | 8.2 |
| 1928 | : | 7.5 |  | 7.5 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.9 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.1 |  | 7.9 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.5 |  | 7.1 |  | 7.9 |
| 1929 | : | 7.4 |  | 7.1 |  | 6.9 |  | 6.8 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.9 |  | 7.3 |  | 6.7 |
| 1930 | : | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.1 |  | 6.8 |  | 7.0 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.5 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.1 |  | 6.6 |  | 7.2 |
| 1931 | : | 5.3 |  | 4.2 |  | 4.4 |  | 4.1 |  | 4.0 |  | 3.9 |  | 3.9 |  | 3.8 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  | 3.2 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| 1932 | : | 4.3 |  | 3.9 |  | 3.7 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.7 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.9 |  | 5.1 |  | 5.4 |  | 5.7 |  | 4.3 |
| 1933 | : | 6.0 |  | 5.7 |  | 5.8 |  | 5.8 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.0 |
| 1934 | : | 6.4 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.5 |  | 8.3 |  | 9.3 |  | 10.5 |  | 10.8 |  | 10.6 |  | 2/10.6 |  | 9.7 |  | 2/9.1 |  | 8.5 |  | 9.0 |
| 1935 | : | 8.5 |  | 7.8 |  | 7.5 |  | 7.4 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.4 |  | 7.3 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.0 |
| 1936 | : | 6.8 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.4 |  | 7.6 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.5 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.2 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.4 |  | 6.5 |  | 7.6 |
| 1937 | : | 6.2 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.8 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.5 |
| 1938 | : | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.4 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.7 |  | 6.2 |
| 1939 | - | 7.1 |  | 6.9 |  | 7.1 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.3 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.0 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.8 |
| 1940 | ! | 6.4 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.2 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.3 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.7 |  | 6.7 |  | 7.1 |  | 7.7 |  | 7.9 |  | 6.7 |
| 1941 | $:$ | 8.1 |  | 8.1 |  | 9.2 |  | 10.2 |  | 10.3 |  | 11.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 15.0 |  | 14.3 |  | 12.6 |  | 12.6 |  | 13.0 |  | 11.7 |
| 1942 | ! | 12.3 |  | 13.2 |  | 13.7 |  | 15.3 |  | 15.9 |  | 16.0 |  | , |  | --- |  | 4/16.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 13.0 |  | 14.6 |
| 1943 | : | 5/15.5 |  | 15.4 |  | 15.5 |  | 15.8 |  | 15.8 |  | 15.9 |  | 15.8 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 15.8 |
| 1944 | ! | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 15.9 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 4/16.0 |  | . |  |  |  | , |  | , |  | , |  | 16.0 |
| 1945 | : | , |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.1 |  | 16.1 |  | 16.1 |  | 16.1 |  | 16.1 |  | 16.2 |  | 16.1 |
| 1946 | , | 5/16.0 |  | 16.0 |  | 16.5 |  | 16.4 |  | 16.4 |  | 16.6 |  | 18.3 |  | 2/19.4 |  | 5/27.6 |  | 17.4 |  | 27.7 |  | 17.8 |  | 17.2 |
| 1947 | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ | 3/17.9 |  | 17.6 |  | 17.7 |  | 17.9 |  | 18.2 |  | 18.2 |  | 18.2 |  | 18.5 |  | 18.8 |  | 18.8 |  | 19.0 |  | 19.0 |  | 18.3 |
| 1948 | 8 | 18.7 |  | 18.3 |  | 18.2 |  | 18.3 |  | 18.5 |  | 18.7 |  | 19.0 |  | 19.1 |  | 19.0 |  | 19.0 |  | 19.1 |  | 19.0 |  | 18.7 |
| 1949 | : | 18.4 |  | 18.1 |  | 18.4 |  | 19.4 |  | 19.3 |  | 19.3 |  | 19.4 |  | 19.4 |  | 19.4 |  | 19.4 |  | 19.4 |  | 20.0 |  | 19.2 |
| 1950 | : | 19.5 |  | 19.0 |  | 18.8 |  | 18.8 |  | 18.8 |  | 18.8 |  | 18.8 |  | 18.7 |  | 18.6 |  | 18.8 |  | 19.1 |  | 19.4 |  | 18.9 |
| 1951 | : | 20.2 |  | 21.1 |  | 22.9 |  | 22.4 |  | 22.6 |  | 23.5 |  | 23.4 |  | 23.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 19.1 |  | 9. |  |  |
| 1952 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| $\begin{gathered} \text { Yoar } \\ \text { beginning } \\ \text { Sopt. } \end{gathered}$ |  | Sopt. | $: \text { Oct. }$ | Nov. | $\begin{array}{ll} : \\ : & \text { Doc. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : ~ J a n . ~ \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & : \\ & : \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Mar. } \\ & \text { : } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Apr. | : May | June | July | : Aug. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & : 1 / \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | Conts | Cents | Cents | Cents | Conts | Conts | Cents | Conts | Cents | Conts | Cents | Conts | Conts |
| 1920 | : | 14.5 | 14.2 | 14.0 | 12.9 | 12.5 | 12.3 | 11.8 | 11.4 | 11.7 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 12.6 | 12.7 |
| 1921 | : | 12.8 | 12.4 | 11.4 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 8.4 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 8.7 |
| 1922 | : | 6.8 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 10.2 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 2/11.3 | 11.2 | 11.1 | 11.0 | 10.5 | 10.1 |
| 1923 | : | 10.3 | 10.4 | 10.0 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 10.9 | 9.7 |
| 1924 | : | 11.0 | 10.8 | 10.5 | 10.4 | 10.7 | 11.4 | 11.8 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 12.2 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 11.4 |
| 1925 | : | 12.0 | 11.6 | 9.8 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.0 | 7.9 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 9.0 |
| 1926 | : | 8.4 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 10.2 | 8.4 |
| 1927 | $\therefore$, | 10.9 | 11.2 | 10.3 | 11.1 | 12.0 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 12.1 | 12.2 | 12.4 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 11.8 |
| 1928 | : | 12.2 | 11.9 | 10.4 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 10.2 |
| 1929 | : | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.2 |
| 1930 | : | 9.9 | 9.8 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 9.0 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 8.9 |
| 1931 | : | 8.4 | 8.1 | 6.8 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 5.2 |
| 1932 | : | 5.1 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 4.5 |
| 1933 | : | 4.9 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.4 | 6.0 |
| 1934 | : | 6.9 | 8.5 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.9 |
| 1935 | : | 8.1 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 7.6 | 9.0 | 9.3 | 7.7 |
| 1936 | : | 9.3 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.8 | 7.7 | '7.8 | 7.6 | 8.1 |
| 1937 | : | 7.4 | 7.3 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 7.1 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.0 |
| 1938 | : | 7.4 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 7.6 |
| 1939 | : | 10.0 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 8.0 |
| 1940 | : | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 7.5 |
| 1941 | : | 8.4 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 9.4 | 10.8 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 10.5 | 10.7 | 11.2 | 9.7 |
| 1942 |  | /11.5 | --- | 2/14.0 | 15.4 | 16.8 | 16.3 | 17.3 | 17.0 | 17.2 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 16.0 |
| 1943 | : | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 16.9 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 |
| 1944 | : | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 16.9 |
| 1945 | : | 16.9 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | $3 / 17.0$ | 3/17.0 | 2/17.0 | 2/17.0 | 17.0 | 2/17.0 | 2/17.0 | --- | 17.0 |
| 1946 | : | --- | --- | 19.8 | 19.2 | 18.6 | $4 / 18.5$ | 4/19.5 | 20.8 | 2/21.0 | 21.5 | 23.1 | 24.0 | 20.6 |
| 1947 | : | 24.0 | 5/24.0 | 21.6 | 5/21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | - 21.6 | 21.8 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 21.8 |
| 1948 | : | 22.0 | 21.9 | 21.4 | 21.2 | 20.5 | 19.9 | 20.1 | 22.2 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.2 | 20.8 |
| 1949 | : | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 22.0 | 23.7 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 24.0 | 23.7 | 23.9 | 25.0 | 25.9 | 23.0 |
| 1950 | : | 29.1 | 28.0 | 25.7 | 24.2 | 23.9 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 23.4 | 23.6 | 23.0 | 23.2 | 24.6 |
| 1951 | : | 23.0 | 23.4 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.1 | 22.1 | 22.0 | 22.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1952 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1755 | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Table 46. - Peamuts (shelled): Price per pound of Virginias, medium, New York, by months, 1939 to date


[^9]Table 47.- Peanute (shelled): Price por pound of Virginias, \# 1, New Yoris, 1920 to date


[^10]Table 48. - Peanute (shollod): Price per poind of Spanish, \# 1, Wov Jork, by monthe, 1920 to date



[^0]:    1/ 1947 income, atter Federal income taxes, per urban housekeeping family of 2 or more persons. Includes almonis, Brazil nuts, cashews, English walnuts, filberte, pecans, and cocoanuts.
    Shelled equivalent of consumption equals 1.18 times the consumption of peanut butter, plus 0.699 times consumption of peanuts in the shell, plus consumption of shelled peanuts. This differs from the total equivalent as given in the original source.

[^1]:    2) For a brief discussion and furmulation of the chi-square suggested see Amore and Burtis (1, p. 7-9).
[^2]:    1/ Duty-free from the Philippines. Prevailing rate.

[^3]:    4 An amendment to CCC Order 4 was made on August 18, 1943, restricting the use of peanuts from the 1943 crop for cleaning and shelling to 1,400 million pounds. On September 1 of the same year, FDO 78 was put into effect. It limited the use of peanuts for domestic civilian consumption in any quarter to 140 percent of use in the corresponding quarter of 1942 for peanut butter, and to 100 percent for other edible products. Quotas were suspended October 1, and were terminated December 14. A new order, FDO 89, was issued December 15. It permitted the Director of Food Distribution to establish quotas. However, no action was taken under this order except to require monthly reports from manufacturers of edible peanut products.

[^4]:    Sh Pricos of Rumers, Ho, 1, are given for Chicago but not at New a representative quotátions at Mor York are too scattored to provide

[^5]:    Year beginning August in ths Southwestern section; September in the Southeastern section; and November in Virginia-Carolina Ssction.
    Psrcentage y feld of kernels (both edible and oil stock) from sheliling of farmers' stock psanuts. Yisid in years prior to 1938 estimated at 66.67 percent. From table 16. Year beginning Septembar.

    From tabls 17. 1920-37, mostly ysars beginning October; 1938-dsts, year beginning September.
    
    Not available.
    Estimated from peanut oil production.
    Less than 500,000 pounds.
    Prsliminary
    

[^6]:    I/ Including shipmonts to Hawei1, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands, 1943-47; to Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands only beginning 1948.

    2/ Total dieappearance of ofl-stock peanuts, 1938-43. This was alightly larger than crushings, as it included small quantities for poultry feed and other miscellaneous uses. 3/ Including some peanuts sold for seed.

    Compiled from Feanut Stocks and Proceseing (10, 11, 12) and reports of Bureau of the Census (13, 15).

[^7]:    3/ Average conputed from data for the 3 weeks, 4 Average computod from data for 1 weok. 5/ Average computed from data for 2 weoks. Complled from Wookly Poanut Report (22).

[^8]:    / Avorago conputed from data for 4 woek whon 5 wooke roporting poesible. 5/Average computod from data for 3 wooks.
    Compilod from Weokly Peanut Roport (22).

[^9]:    2/ Average computed from data for 3 weeks.
    3 Average conputed from data for 2 weeks.
    5/ Average computed from data for 4 weeks when 5 weeks reporting possible.
    Compiled from Heekly Peamut Report (22). No quotations given prior to 1939.

[^10]:    1/ Average computod for monthe shova. 2/ Average coneputed from data for 3 woeks. 3/ Average computsd from data for 2 woeke. 4/ Average computed from data for 1 woek. $5 /$ Avorage computed from data for 4 weoke when 5 woeks reporting possible. Compilod from Yeokly Peanut Report (22)

