UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

33

Upon the request of the Committee on Graduate Study the under-signed have examined a thesis entitled

~~The~~ Effect of Industrial Development on Rural Welfare in Tennessee

presented by Robert McAlphin

candidate for the degree of Master of Science, and hereby certify that it is worthy of acceptance.

H B Stephens

Examiners.

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Upon the request of the Committee on Graduate Study the under-signed have examined a thesis entitled

THE EFFECT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ON RURAL WELFARE IN TENNESSEE.

presented by Robert McAlpin

candidate for the degree of Master of Science in Agriculture, and hereby certify that it is worthy of acceptance.

R E Allred

Examiners.

THE EFFECT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ON RURAL WELFARE IN TENNESSEE.

****

By

Robert McAlpin

***

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the University of Tennessee for the degree of Master of Science in Agriculture.

June 1928

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

Special acknowledgment is due Professor C. E. Allred, Head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Tennessee, who conceived the idea, formulated the plans, and supervised writing of this manuscript.

Thanks are due Messrs. Jerry C. Fitch and Luther C. Harris, for the use of data secured by them in previous studies. Thanks are also due the teachers, county superintendents, agricultural agents, and home demonstration agents of the counties and communities studied, for their assistance in securing needed information.

N.L.D 31 Dec. 1928 1.00

35213

CONTENTS.

PART I.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER I

AGRICULTURE.

Page

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Size of farm ---------- 1

Number of owners ---------- 5

Number of tenants ---------- 8

Amount of farm labor ---------- 10

Wage paid for farm labor ---------- 11

Non-resident land owners ---------- 14

Per cent of land that is idle ---------- 15

Number of empty houses ---------- 17

Number of acres of alfalfa ---------- 18

Value of land per acre ---------- 18

Modern machinery ---------- 21

Number of purebred livestock ---------- 23

Number of silos ---------- 24

Number of acres lf land that has been limed ---------- 25

Number of markets available ---------- 26

CONTENTS..

Page.

Number of cooperative organizations ---------- 27

Cooperative buying - cooperative selling ---------- 27

Home supplies ---------- 28

Type of farming now; formerly; cause of change ---------- 29

Organized movements to improve farming ---------- 30

Number of farmers' needs ---------- 31

CHAPTER II

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Total mileage of highways ---------- 32

Total miles of hard surface highways ---------- 34

Miles of asphalt, macadam, graveled, graded, and ungraded roads ---------- 36

Number of bridges and ferries ---------- 38

Percentage of people served by rural mail carriers ---------- 39

Number of automobiles ---------- 41

Number of farm trucks ---------- 43

Railroad: distance to; condition of roads to; efficiency of service ---------- 44

Telephones: number; extent available; percentage efficient ---------- 48

CHAPTER III

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Farm bureaus, and farmers' unions ---------- 51

CONTENTS.

Page.

Local farmers' institutes ---------- 52

Number of livestock associations ---------- 53

Number of social clubs; fraternal orders ---------- 54

Number of volumes in community library ---------- 56

Consolidated schools ---------- 56

Recreational clubs ---------- 57

CHAPTER IV.

FINANCIAL OPPORTUNITIES.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Credit facilities available ---------- 59

Even distribution of wealth: number rich people; number poor people ---------- 61

Market of bulky products: extent available; extent used ---- 62

Extent local industry was developed:

Number of employees at local industry ---------- 64

Condition of work ---------- 65

Daily wage paid ---------- 65

Amount of capital and weekly payroll ---------- 66

Outside work: extent available; people so working;-length of time each works ---------- 67

CONTENTS.

PART II.

SOCIOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

CHAPTER V.

POPULATION.

Page.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Number and increase in population ---------- 69

Number of foreigners ---------- 72

Number of negroes ---------- 73

Percentage increase in population ---------- 75

Cause of increase or decrease in population and where removals have gone ---------- 76

Percentage of removals who left the county ---------- 76

Character and sex of removals ---------- 77

Number of people moving into community from outside the county ---------- 77

Number moving into community ---------- 78

CHAPTER VI.

EDUCATION.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Kind of school house ---------- 79

Number of rooms in school ---------- 79

Investment in elementary buildings and equipment ---------- 80

Value of school equipment ---------- 82

Number of single desks ---------- 83

CONTENTS.

Page

Number of double desks per community ---------- 84

Enrollment per teacher ---------- 84

School water supply ---------- 85

Number of volumes in school library ---------- 85

Number of schools having medical inspection ---------- 87

Number of schools having dental inspection ---------- 88

Distance to high school ---------- 88

Amount invested in high school facilities ---------- 89

Percentage of elementary enrollment in high school ---------- 90

Number in college ---------- 91

Special school needs ---------- 92

CHAPTER VII.

RURAL HEALTH.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Local hospital facilities and distance to hospital ---------- 93

Number and age of physicians ---------- 94

Distance to a physician and percentage of the people having telephone connection with physician ---------- 96

Number of dentists, age, distance to, percentage of people having telephones to, and communities visited by ---------- 97

Amount of infectious diseases ---------- 99

Number of harmful effects ---------- 97

CHAPTER VIII.

CHURCHES.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Number of churches ---------- 101

CONTENTS.

Page

Per cent of people church members ---------- 102

Percentage condition of the church buildings ---------- 104

Number of resident ministers ---------- 104

Total church membership; membership per church ---------- 105

Frequency of church services per month ---------- 106

Total Sunday school enrollment and enrollment per church ------- 107

Number of singing services per month ---------- 108

Annual budget (current expenses) and investment in buildings and equipment ---------- 109

Number of abandoned churches ---------- 111

Education of pastor: number of grades finished and per cent adequate ---------- 111

Special needs of church; and number of needs reported ---------- 112

CHAPTER IX.

RURAL RECREATION.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Number of church socials per year ----------114

Number of school entertainments per year ---------- 115

Number of ice cream and pie suppers per year ---------- 115

Number of ball games and picnics per year ---------- 116

Number of fairs per year ---------- 117

Number of card parties and dances per year ----------118

CHAPTER X.

MISCELLANEOUS.

WHAT EFFECT HAD INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Home conveniences: (a) % homes having running water ---------- 119

CONTENTS.

Page.

(b) Percentage of homes having light other than oil ---------- 119

(c) Percentage of homes having furnace heat ------ 119

Musical instruments: (a) Percentage of homes having pianos or organs ---------- 120

(b) Percentage of homes having radios ---------- 120

(c) Percentage of homes having phonographs ------- 120

Morals: Number of centers of immorality ---------- 122

Percentage of law enforcement ---------- 122

Trading center: distance to; percentage satisfactory- 123

Tax rate per $100 ---------- 124

Percentage of community planning ---------- 125

Community loyalty or spirit, percentage adequate ---- 125

Other changes due to manufacturing:

Harmful ---------- 126

Beneficial ---------- 126

PART III.

CHAPTER XI.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS ---------- 127

INDEX TO APPENDIX.

PART I.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

Table No.	Pages
CHAPTER I.	
AGRICULTURE.	
1 - 31	143 - 218
CHAPTER II.	
TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.	
32 - 62	219 - 250
CHAPTER III.	
FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.	
63 - 93	251 - 281
CHAPTER IV.	
FINANCIAL OPPORTUNITIES.	
94 - 124	282 - 311

PART II.

SOCIOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

CHAPTER V.	
POPULATION.	
125 - 155	312 - 373

INDEX TO APPENDIX.

Table No.		Pages.
	CHAPTER VI.	
	EDUCATION.	
156 & 186		374 - 435
	CHAPTER VII.	
	RURAL HEALTH.	
187 - 217		436 - 466
	CHAPTER VIII.	
	CHURCHES.	
218 - 248		467 - 503
	CHAPTER IX.	
	RURAL RECREATION.	
249 - 257		504 - 512
	CHAPTER X.	
	MISCELLANEOUS.	
258 - 288		513 - 561

PROCEDURE IN SECURING DATA.

The large amount of natural resources in the South undeveloped, the low price received for farm products in the South, the high price for manufactured goods, the high freight rates on farm products going to the Northeast, and on the manufactured goods coming South have caused people to want some of these plants brought South.

When we consider the bringing of manufacturing into a region where it has never been before, this causes much talk and some thought. There are those who think the coming of manufacturing plants is one of the best things that can happen, while there are those who think it one of the worst things that could happen.

The purpose of this study is not to prove that manufacturing is good or that it is bad, but to try to find its effect on rural welfare.

To find the effect of industrial development on rural welfare, we selected four counties, selected eight school communities in each county; and made a careful, first hand study of each of them. We secured data on Hawkins and Sullivan for both 1914 and 1925, and on Anderson for 1906 and 1926, and on Knox for 1896 to 1926.

To find what effect industry has had on these communities, we must know something about them before and after the industrial development. To get at the exact effect industrial development has had on rural welfare, we must take each phase of rural community welfare, such as: population, agriculture, schools, churches, etc. and see what effect manufacturing has had on each of them. This is just what we did.

Half of the communities studied were more accessible than were the

others; that is, they could be more easily reached by this influence of industrial development. Therefore we could reasonably expect the more accessible communities to be affected to a greater extent than the less accessible; so we divided the counties into the most and the least accessible communities.

In determining whether a community is accessible or not, there are certain factors that connect the rural community with the manufacturing and the town, these factors not being of equal importance. Below are listed the factors, or agencies, in the order of their importance, as used in this study, to determine whether a community is accessible or non-accessible to the influence of the industrial development, and the town.

(1) Highways (past and present); (2) number of autos; (3) distance from industry; (4) laborers working in town; (5) miles of improved roads within the community; (6) railroads; (7) bus service; (8) telephones; (9) tourists; and (10) country homes of city men.

Because all of the communities were located in one division of the state, we thought the results of these communities might not be true for the whole state, so we divided all the counties of the state into three groups, according to the amount of manufacturing in the county. We then tabulated the available data on such items as schools, churches, agriculture, etc.

Further, in order that this study might be true for more states than Tennessee, we divided all the states of the Union into two groups, according to the amount of manufacturing, and then tabulated the available data on each item, such as: agriculture, population, etc.

In collecting the data for this study, men from the University spent several weeks out in the communities. They had definite questions to ask, a blank to fill out, and went to the best informed people of the community for information. Arguments were avoided, and answers from those having prejudiced viewpoints were so recorded. The data on as many points as possible were checked with the Government reports, to be sure that they were correct.

When we began to tabulate the data we found there were other phases on which information was needed, and we proceeded to get this information by means of letters written to teachers, or county officers of the various counties.

The fact that several weeks were spent in each county gave a good chance to the men to know several things by personal observation. This also gave a chance to appraise accuracy of the data collected.

The data secured on the counties of the state, and the different states of the Union, were taken from Government reports and various official sources.

Table a. LOCATION AS TO DISTRICT, DISTANCE TO KNOXVILLE, DISTANCE TO RAILROAD, KIND OF HIGHWAY, TOPOGRAPHY - KNOX.

Community	District	Distance to Knoxville	Distance to Railroad	Kind of Highway to Knoxville	Topography
Halls Cross Roads	7	9 mi.	9 mi.	Good macadam and good asphalt	Valley of Beaver Creek and ridge
Farragut	10	15 mi.	Local	Fine asphalt	Valley
Byington	9	13 mi.	"	Wornout macadam	Valley of Beever Creek and 2 ridges
Corryton	5	14 mi.	"	Fair macadam	Big and Little Flat Creek bottom and hills.
Riverdale	4	9 mi.	9 mi.	8 mi. fair macadam - 1 mi. good asphalt	Hills and French Broad Valley
Neubert	14	7 mi.	Local	3½ mi. macadam - 3½ mi. asphalt	Very hilly.
Heiskell	6	13 mi.	"	3 mi. wornout pike - 10 mi. good asphalt	2 ridges and 2 valleys
Midway	15	15 mi.	8 mi.	3 mi. very poor - 12 mi. fair macadam	Tuckahoe Creek bottoms and hills.
Average		11.88 mi.			

Table b . LOCATION AS TO DISTRICT, DISTANCE TO CLINTON, DISTANCE TO RAILROAD, KIND OF HIGHWAY, TOPOGRAPHY - ANDERSON

Community	District	Distance to Clinton.	Distance to Railroad	Kind of Highway to Clinton	Topography
Glen Alpine	3	5 1/2 mi.	5 1/2 mi.	Macadam (good)	Big valley - two ridges
Claxton	2	6 mi.	2 mi.	Graded (part surfaced)	Two ridges - two valleys
Coward	6	4 1/2 mi.	Local	1 mi. dirt 3½ mi. macadam	Ridges - two valleys
Andersonville	2	9 mi.	9 mi.	Madadam (good)	Big valley - two ridges
Blowing Springs	6	4 mi.	Local	Wornout pike. Good road under construction	Ridges and very narrow valleys.
Dutch Valley	12	6 mi.	2 mi.	Very poor dirt, a little pike	one ridge - two valleys
Mountain View	11	6 mi.	6 mi.	3 mi. dirt " " pike	Inarrow valley 2 ridges
Belmonte	2	15 mi.	15 mi.	11 mi. good 4 " rough	Edge big valley very ridgy
Average		7 mi.			

Table C. LOCATION AS TO DISTRICT, DISTANCE TO ROGERSVILLE, DISTANCE TO RAILROAD, KIND OF HIGHWAY, TOPOGRAPHY - HAWKINS.

Community.	District	Distance to Rogersville.	Distance to Railroad	Kind of Highway to Rogersville.	Topography.
E. & F. Springs	4	3 mi.	3 mi.	Macadam (fair)	Holston valley - hills.
Persia	1	6 mi.	Local	Macadam (fair)	Rugged hills, little creek bottom.
Burem	6	6 mi.	Local	Macadam (fair)	Holston valley - bordered by hills.
Yellow Store	5	7 mi.	3 mi.	Asphalt (good)	Part in Carters valley - part hill country.
Alumwell	3	7 mi.	7 mi.	Dirt; asphalt under construction.	Rugged hill country.
Lake View	2	7 mi.	7 mi.	Asphalt (good)	Medium hills rolling.
Altonville	2	8 mi.	8 mi.	Asphalt 6 mi. 2 mi. dirt.	Creek valley, rugged hills.
Pressmens Home	3	10 mi.	10 mi.	Dirt (asphalt under construction.	Narrow valley; hills very rough.
Average		6.75 mi.			

Table d . LOCATION AS TO DISTRICT, DISTANCE TO KINGSPORT, DISTANCE TO RAILROAD, KIND OF HIGHWAY, TOPOGRAPHY - SULLIVAN.

Community.	District	Distance to Kingsport.	Distance to Railroad.	Kind of Highway to Kingsport.	Topography
Bell Ridge	1	3 mi.	3 mi.	Macadam (fair)	Small valley - very rugged hills.
Bloomingdale	10	5 mi.	5 mi.	Macadam (fair)	Creek valley - rolling hills.
Harbour	7	5 mi.	5 mi.	Concrete (excellent)	Creek valley - some rough hills.
Horse Creek	13	6 mi.	6 mi.	Asphalt (good)	Holston valley - rugged hills.
Rock Springs	13	7 mi.	Local	Graded dirt (good)	Valley and part rugged hills.
Arcadia	10	7 mi.	7 mi.	Macadam (fair)	Creek valley - some hills.
Fordtown	14	10 mi.	Local	Graded dirt (good)	Holston valley.
Indian Springs	7	8.5 mi.	8.5 mi.	New concrete (excellent)	Valley and rugged hills.
Average		6.25 mi.			

PART I.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

CHAPTER I.

AGRICULTURE.

****

CHAPTER II

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

****

CHAPTER III

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

****

CHAPTER IV.

FINANCIAL OPPORTUNITIES.

CHAPTER I.

AGRICULTURE.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Size of Farms: In the eight communities of Knox in 1925 the farms are smaller than in the eight communities of Anderson, as shown in Table #1. Those of Knox average 76.88 acres while Anderson averaged 83.8 acres. The eight communities of Knox back in 1896 had very large farms, that is, an average of 159.3 acres. This is shown in Table #2. In 1906 the size of farms in Anderson was larger than in 1926, but not as much range as in Knox. The average in Anderson for 1906, Table #3, was 118.8 acres.

The most accessible communities of Knox in 1898 had very much larger farms (200 acres) than did the least accessible communities (118.8), Tables #4 and #6. The cause of this was the fact that the more accessible had more chances to pay for land, and then a large farm was very much desired.

The most accessible communities of Knox reduced the size of their farms from 200 acres to 81.25 acres from 1896 to 1926, Table #4. This is caused by people growing truck crops for the Knoxville market, and also by a number of men wanting to grow only a small amount of crop and work the rest of the time in town.

Tables #5 and #7 show that the size of the farms in the most accessible communities of Anderson was larger in 1906 than in the least accessible, being 131.25 and 108.25 acres respectively. There iss much less range in the most and least accessible communities in Anderson than there was in Knox.

As shown in Table #5, the size of farms for most accessible communities

of Anderson has been reduced from 131.25 in 1906 to 76.25 acres in 1926. There has been a much less change in Anderson than there was in Knox due to the fact that not as much work was available in Clinton as in Knoxville, and not so good a market. The change was come because of the more intensive method of cultivating, and by men wanting to live on the farm and some of their family working in town.

From 1896 to 1926 there was some change in the size of the farms in the least accessible communities of Knox, Table #6, their being reduced from 118.8 to 72.50 acres.

In the least accessible communities of Anderson the size of farms was reduced but little in size from 1906 to 1926, being only from 106.25 to 91.25 acres. This is shown in Table #7.

The size of the farms in the most accessible communities of Knox in 1926 was larger than that of the least accessible, the size being 81.25 and 72.50 acres respectively.(Table #8) The size of the most accessible was reduced from 200 acres to 81.25, while the least accessible reduced only from 118.8 acres to 72.5. There has been less demand for homes in the least accessible communities, and fewer people living on farms and working in town.

The size of farms changed much faster in the most accessible communities of Anderson (131.25 to 76.25 acres) than they have in the least accessible communities (106.25 to 91.25 acres). This is because of fewer people working in town from these communities and poorer market for truck crops.(Table #9)

Table #10 shows that the average size of farms of the four most accessible communities of Knox was larger (81.25 acres) than the average size of the four most accessible communities of Anderson (76.25). However the Knox communities were much larger in 1896 (200 acres) than was the Anderson communities (131.25 acres).

The least accessible communities of Knox in 1926 had smaller farms

(72.5 acres) than the least accessible communities of Anderson (91.25 acres). This was not true in 1896, when Knox had an average size of 118.8 and Anderson only 106.25. The Knox communities were much better suited for the intensive method of cultivation than Anderson, being near a good market (Table #11)

The size of farms was less in the most accessible communities of Knox (81.25 acres) than the size was in the least accessible communities of Anderson (91.25 acres). This is shown in Table #12.

The average size of farms was about the same in the least accessible of Knox (72.5 acres) and in the most accessible of Anderson (76.25), that of Anderson being 3.75 acres larger. (Table #13).

Table #14 shows that the size of farms in the four most accessible communities of Knox decreased 59.3% while the four least accessible decreased only 38.9% from 1896 to 1926. The decrease was 20.4% greater in the most accessible. This was because people can more easily go into Knoxville to work, and also to market the truck crops.

The decrease in size of farms between 1896 and 1926 in the most accessible communities of Knox was 59.3% while the decrease in the most accessible of Anderson was only 41.9% (Table #16) or 7.4% more in the Knox communities. This is caused by Knoxville furnishing work to more people who live on farms and come in to work than does Clinton. Also Knoxville furnishes a much better market for truck crops and dairy products, both of which require a little land to each man working.

The size of farms decreased 38.9% in the least accessible communities of Knox between 1896 and 1926, while the size of farms decreased only 14.1% in the least accessible of Anderson between 1906 and 1926 (Table #17). That is, 24.8% more in the Knoxville communities. This was because of more work in Knoxville and better market for truck crops.

Table #18 shows the comparison of the percentage decrease in the most

accessible of Knox and the least accessible of Anderson. This is really a contrast, as the size of farms has decreased 59.3% in Knox and only 14.1% in Anderson.

In Table #19 we find that the size of farms decreased less (38.9%) than had the size decreased in the most accessible communities of Anderson (41.9%)

Table #21 shows the size of farms to be smaller in the eight communities of Hawkins (115 acres) than in the eight communities in Sullivan (124 acres) in 1925. The farms were very much smaller in 1914 in Hawkins than they were in Sullivan that same year, being 123 acres in Hawkins and 154 acres in Sullivan.

The size of farms in Hawkins, as shown in Table #24, decreased but little from 1914 to 1925. That is, from 125 acres to 115 acres. This was because no industrial development came in to furnish work in town for people living on the farm, and they had very poor markets for truck crops.

Between 1914 and 1925 the farms of the eight communities of Sullivan decreased in size 154 acres to 124 acres. This is shown in Table #23. The industrial development at Kingsp rt furnished work, and the people preferred to live on small farms and go in to work. Sometimes some member of the family worked in town and the others worked on the farm.

In 1914 the farms were smaller in Hawkins County (123 acres) than they were in Sullivan County (154 acres). This is shown in Table #22. The soil is not as fertile in Sullivan as it is in Hawkins, and therefore when they were living by farming along it required larger farms to produce the same amount of crop. A large amount of their farming was raising beef cattle, and it required less land in Hawkins to pasture the same amount of cattle.

Hawkins County is still a strictly agricultural county. That is, they do not have industry near enough to give work to those living on farms in the season of the year that they are not busy. It is still important that they have large farms.

The most accessible communities of Hawkins had larger farms (122.4 acres) than the least accessible communities (103.3), Table #25. This was because the people in the least accessible communities had less money with which to pay for large farms.

The size of farms in the most accessible communities of Hawkins decreased in size 10.3% between 1914 and 1925, while the size of farms increased 1.6% in the least accessible communities. This was brought out in Table #26.

The farms in the most accessible communities of Hawkins decreased in size from 136.4 acres to 122.4 acres, or 14 acres from 1914 to 1925 (Table #27).

Between 1914 and 1925, as shown in Table #28, the farms in the least accessible communities in Hawkins increased in size from 101.7 acres to 103.3 acres. There is so little influence of industrial development in this area that they still feel the need of large farms.

Number of Farm Owners: The eight communities of Knox in 1926 had an average of 144.0 farm owners per community while the eight communities of Anderson had only an average of 100 farm owners. This is shown in Table #1.

The eight communities of Knox in 1896 had an average of 83.0 owners per community while in 1926 the number had increased to 144 owners. (Table #2)

As shown in Table #3, the number of owners in the eight communities of Anderson had increased from 63 to 100 between 1906 and 1926.

The average number of farm owners for the four most accessible communities of Knox had increased from 117 to 250 between 1896 and 1926, as shown in Table #4.

The average number of farm owners in the most accessible communities of

Anderson had increased from 87 to 141 between 1906 and 1926. (Table #5)

Table #6 shows that in Anderson the number of farm owners had increased only from 58 to 64, or an average of 6 owners per community from 1896-1926.

The least accessible communities of Anderson had increased from 46 farm owners in 1906 to 69 owners in 1926, or an increase of 23, as shown in Table #7.

The most accessible communities of Knox, as shown in Table #8, had 250 farm owners while the least accessible had an average of only 64, or a difference of 186 in favor of the most accessible communities. This is caused by the people in the most accessible communities having more money with which to pay for farms.

Table #9 shows that the most accessible communities of Anderson in 1926 had 141 farm owners, while the least accessible communities had only 69, or a difference of an average of 72.

The four most accessible communities of Knox had 250 farm owners while the four most accessible of Anderson had but 140 farm owners, or 110 more in Knox, as shown in Table #10.

Table #11 shows the least accessible communities of Knox to have had in 1926 an average of 64 farm owners and the four least accessible of Anderson to have had 69, or five more in the Anderson section.

There is a great contrast shown in Table #12 of 250 farm owners in the most accessible communities of Knox and only 69 in the least accessible of Anderson.

The least accessible communities of Knox had in 1926 only an average of 164 farm owners, while the most accessible communities in Anderson had an average of 141, or 77 more owners in the most accessible communities of Anderson. This is shown in Table #13. The number of farm owners in the most accessible communities of Knox increased 114.3% while the number in the least

accessible increased but 10.9%, or 103.4% greater increase in the most accessible. This is because they have a better chance to earn money to pay for their farms in the accessible areas. (Table #14).

Table #15 shows that the number of farm owners in the four most accessible communities in Anderson increased 61.5% between 1906 and 1926, while the number of farm owners for the least accessible was but 51.1, or 10.4% more in the most accessible communities.

As shown in Table #16, the most accessible communities of Knox increased in number of farm owners 114.3%, while the four most accessible in Anderson increased only 41.5% or 72.8% more in the most accessible of Knox. The greater increase is due to the people in Knox having a better opportunity to work in town, and a better market to sell their crops, giving them more money with which to buy farms.

The percentage increase of number of farm owners for the four most accessible communities of Knox in 1926 was 114.3%, while for the least accessible of Anderson it was only 51.1%, or 63.2% less in the Anderson section. This is shown in Table #18.

The average number of farm owners for the eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 was 35.25 and that of Sullivan was 45.38, or 10.13 more in the Sullivan section. At least some of this 10.3 was due to the industries of Kingsport furnishing work for some member of the family, enabling more of them to be able to pay for their farms. (Table #21)

The eight communities of Hawkins in 1914 had 33 farm owners, and the eight communities of Sullivan had an average of 41.57, or 8.57 more in Sullivan. This is shown in Table #22.

The eight communities of Sullivan increased in number of farm owners from an average of 41.57 to 45.38 between 1914 and 1925, or an average increase of 3.81 per community.(Table #23)

Table #24 shows that the number of farm owners in eight communities of

of Hawkins increased on an average of 33.0 to 35.25, or an average of 2.25 per community between 1914 and 1925.

The most accessible communities of Hawkins had an average of 42.2 farm owners in 1925 while the least accessible communities had only 23.3, or an average of 18.9 less in the least accessible communities. (Table #25) The income is very low in the least accessible communities, and it is hard for any one to pay for a farm.

The number of farm owners for the five most accessible communities of Hawkins increased on an average of 5.5% while those of the least accessible communities decreased 1.7% or an average of 7.2% greater increase in the most accessible communities between 1914 and 1925. This is shown in Table #26.

As shown in Table #27, the most accessible communities of Hawkins had increased in number of farm owners from 40 to 42.2 from 1914 to 1925, or an average increase of 2.2 owners per community.

The three least accessible communities of Hawkins, as shown in Table #28, decreased from an average of 23.7 to 23.3 farm owners, or an average decrease of 5 owners per community between 1914 and 1925.

Number of Tenants: The eight communities in Knox had an average of 55.6 tenants in 1926, while the eight communities in Anderson had only an average of 9.9 tenants. (Table #1)

There are two reasons for the fewer tenants in Anderson. First, the land was not as fertile, and therefore the tenants had a hard job to make a living on the thin land; and, second, in the Knox section more men owned farms and followedsome other line of work, leaving the farming to tenants.

The eight communities of Knox in 1896 had an average of 69.9 tenants, and in 1926 they had only an average of 55.6, or an average of 14.3 fewer

tenants in 1926. (Table #2). In 1926 people had more money with which to pay for farms.

Table #3 shows that the eight communities of Anderson in1906 had an average of 24.9 tenants while in 1926 they had only an average of 9.9.

As farming began to have more competition from industry the tenants on the marginal lands moved out of Anderson. Also there was more money with which to buy farms in1926. The number of owners increased faster than the number of tenants decreased, due to decreasing size of farms.

The number of tenants in the most accessible communities of Knox have been reduced from an average of 141.6 in 1896 to 118.3 in 1926, or a reduction of 23.3 per community. This is shown in Table #4. A greater prosperity in 1926 enabled a larger number of men to own farms; and the size of farms was reduced until tenants were not needed as badly as they were in 1896.

The number of tenants in the four most accessible communities of Anderson had been reduced from an average of 40 to an average of 7, or 33 fewer tenants per community. (Table #5)

Several things have caused the reduction in number of tenants: the competition with farming caused the marginal tenant to move out. The amount of work that people found in town and the market for dairy and truck crops caused farms to become smaller and a much larger number of owners. Thus there was very much less need for tenants.

The average number of tenants in the least accessible communities of Knox has been reduced from 12.5 in 1896 to 8.5 in 1926, or an average reduction of 4 tenants to each community. This is shown in Table #6. The reason for such few tenants in the least accessible communities of Knox was that the people living in these communities could not very easily go into town to work, and therefore they worked their own farms. Also, it is not easy to get truck crops in to market, and the farmers of these communities had to grow such crops as corn, which requires a large amount of land per man.

The average number of tenants for the least accessible communities of Anderson decreased from 13.5 in 1906 to 12.5 in 1926 (Table #7)

The thin land and distance from market caused each farm owner to cultivate a larger amount of land himself. The fact that there was only 13.5 tenants per community in 1906 gave but little chance for a reduction.

As shown in Table #8, the most accessible communities in Knox in 1926 had an average of 118.3, while the least accessible had only 8.5. A large number of the farm owners in the most accessible communities of Knox worked in town and left the farm work to tenants. This is not true to a very large extent in the least accessible communities of Knox.

Table #9 shows that the most accessible communities of Anderson in 1926 had fewer tenants than had the least accessible communities.(12.5)

The number of tenants in the most accessible communities of Knox had decreased 15.6% from 1896 to 1926, while the number in the least accessible communities of Knox had decreased 32.0%. (Table #14) The fact that so many men living in the most accessible communities wanted to work in town kept a demand for tenants, and that was why the number had not been reduced as much in the most accessible as in the least accessible communities.

The eight communities of Hawkins, as is shown in Table #21, had an average of 17.5 tenants and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 20.38 tenants.

In 1914 Hawkins had an average of 16 tenants and Sullivan had an average of 22 tenants. In 1925 Sullivan had 2 less tenants than in 1914 and Hawkins had 1 more in 1925 than in 1914.

Amount of Farm Labor. In each of the eight communuties in Knox County, both in 1896 and 1926, they had plenty of farm labor; therefore there was relatively no increase or decrease. In each of the eight communities in Anderson for both 1906 and 1926 the farmers also had plenty of farm labor, and again

there was no relative increase or decrease, or any difference between the most and least accessible communities. This is shown in all the nineteen tables on Knox and Anderson Counties.

All the communities of both Hawkins and Sullivan, for both 1914 and 1925, had plenty of farm labor, as shown in Tables #21 to #28. Hence there was no more relative increase or decrease in the most than in the least accessible communities. The whole county of Sullivan in 1925 showed that the percentage of supply of labor is 83% of the normal supply, and that Hawkins is 89% of normal, or 6% more in Hawkins. (Table #29)

Although the percentage shows to be below normal as reported by the crop reporting service, there is no shortage in the labor supply, except a few rush jobs that need extra labor for only a few days.

Table #30, taking the whole state of Tennessee divided into three sections, for 1925, the 1/3 counties with most manufacturing had the nearest to normal percentage of labor supply; that is, 89.8%. The medium manufacturing had 88.9% and the least manufacturing had 87.6%. There is no shortage of labor, but the price of labor being relatively high in the sub-marginal regions (poor lands far from market) makes it difficult to hire labor extensively in such an area and make a profit from it. Areas close to good markets pay slightly more for labor per day but the higher prices received and lower marketing expenses more than make up for it.

Wage Paid for Farm Labor. The average wage for farm labor per day for the eight communities of Knox in 1926 was slightly higher ($1.72 per day) than the average in the eight communities of Anderson ($1.56 per day). Table #1. This is only 16¢ extra per day. In a whole year it would amount to more than $40.00, provided the man were employed full time. But most farmers only employ labor a few months per year.

As shown in Table #2, the average wage paid farm labor in Knox in-

creased from $0.54 in 1896 to $1.72 in 1926, or an increase of more than three times the wage paid in 1896. The cost of living had caused some of this increase, but a large amount of it was due to the industrias wanting men to work in town.

The eight communities of Anderson raised the price paid for farm labor from $0.56 in 1906 to $1.56 in 1926, or 16¢ less than three times the amount paid in 1906. This is shown in Table #3.

The price paid for farm labor in the four most accessible communities of Knox in 1926 was 6¢ per day ($1.75) more than in the least accessible ($1.69) communities of Knox. This is shown in Table #8.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average wage for farm labor of $1.69 per day, and the four least accessible paid $1.44 per day, or 25¢ less per day in the least accessible.(Table #9) Table #10 shows that the most accessible communities of Knox pay an average of $1.75 per day for farm labor, and the most accessible of Anderson pay an average of $1.69 per day, or 6¢ per day less in the most accessible of Anderson.

The average wage paid farm labor in the four least accessible communities of Knox in 1926 was $1.69 while the average wage paid in the least accessible of Anderson was only $1.44 per day, or 25¢ less in Anderson. (Table #11)

The average wages paid farm labor in the most accessible communities of Knox in 1926 was $1.75 per day, while the average wage in the least accessible of Anderson was $1.44, or 31¢ per day more in the most accessible communities of Knox. This is shown in Table #12. As shown in Table #13 the average daily wage of farm labor is just the same in the least accessible of Knox that it is in the most accessible of Anderson. It is $1.69 per day in each.

The percentage increase in daily farm wage for the most accessible communities of Knox (from 1896-1926) was 259%, while the percentage increase

for the least accessible of Knox was only 187% or an increase of 72% greater in the most accessible communities. (Table #14)

From 1906 to 1926 the average daily wage for farm labor increased 200% in the four most accessible communities of Anderson, while the increase in the four least accessible of Anderson for the same time was only 155.5% or 44.5% less in the four least accessible communities of Anderson. This is shown in Table #15.

The percentage increase in the average daily wage of farm labor in the four most accessible communities of Knox was 259 and the increase for the most accessible in Anderson was only 200% or 59% greater increase in the most accessible communities of Knox. (Table #16).

The four least accessible communities of Knox have had 31.7 greater percentage increase in daily wage (187.2) than has the least accessible of Anderson (155.5%) This is shown in Table #17.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson, as shown in Table #19, had 12.8% greater increase in daily wage for farm labor than had the four least accessible communities of Knox.

Table #20 shows that in 1925 the labor by the day for the whole county of Anderson received an average wage of $1.60 per day, while Knox County as a whole paid an average wage of $2.00 per day. This is 40¢ per day more in Knox County.

The eight communities of Hawkins had an average daily wage for farm labor of $1.06 in 1925 while the eight communities of Sullivan had an average wage of $1.63 per day or an average of 57¢ per day more in Sullivan County. This is shown in Table #21.

The eight communities of Sullivan in 1914 paid 33¢ per day higher daily wages to farm labor (84¢) than did the eight communities of Hawkins with only an average of 51¢ per day. (Table #22)

The average daily wage for the eight communities of Sullivan increased from $0.84 per day in 1914 to $1.63 per day in 1925. This is shown in Table #23. In the eight communities of Hawkins County the wage paid for farm labor increased from 51¢ per day in 1914 to $1.06 per day in 1925, or an increase of 55¢ per day, or 4¢ more than double the wage in 1914. (Table 24)

As shown in Table #25, the most accessible communities of Hawkins paid a wage of 10¢ per day more ($1.10) than the least accessible communities. ($1.00)

Taking Sullivan County as a whole, the wages paid for farm labor in 1925 was 16¢ per day more ($1.66) than it was in Hawkins as a whole ($1.50) This is shown in Table #29.

As Table #30 shows, when we divide the counties of the state up into three groups, according to the amount of manufacturing, we find that in 1925 the wage was $1.60 per day in the most manufacturing counties, $1.50 per day for the medium, and $1.41 for the lowest in manufacturing. The state average was $1.50.

When the whole United States was divided into two groups according to most manufacturing and least manufacturing, the wage of the farm labor was $4.42 more per month in the most manufacturing states. The amount was $56.59 for the most manufacturing and only $52.17 for the least manufacturing.

Non-Resident Land Owners. The eight communities of Knox have an average of 1.25 non-resident land owners, while the eight communities of Anderson have an average of 2.25. The greater the industrial development, the less need there is for a land owner to go away to work, or live somewhere else. (Table #1)

As shown in Table #8, the four most accessible communities of Knox have

fewer non-resident land owners (0.25) than have the least accessible communities of Knox (2.25) It is more pleasant and profitable for a land owner to live in the more accessible communities, therefore they have not left to live at other places.

Table #9 shows that there was an average of only 0.5 of one non-resident land owners in the most accessible communities of Anderson, whereas the least accessible have an average of four. Again it is shown that owners do not leave the most accessible communities as often as they leave the least accessible.

The eight communities of Hawkins have an average of 1.4 non-resident land owners per community, while the eight communities of Sullivan have only 1.1. (Table #21)

There is less need for the owners to leave their farms to go elsewhere to work in the eight Sullivan communities.

The most accessible communities of Hawkins, as shown in Table #25, seems to be an exception to the rule that the fewer non-resident land owners live in most accessible communities. This is caused by a company buying up a few farms but not living there to work them.

Per Cent of Land That is Idle. The eight communities of Knox County had 19.75% of land idle in 1926 and the eight communities of Anderson had 25.63% idle or 5.88% more land idle in Anderson than there was in Knox. This is shown in Table #1. It is claimed by some who are opposed to industrial development and who have not studied conditions, that much of the farm land will be idle if industry comes in. This table shows that industrial development has, on the other hand, caused a demand for the land. As shown in Table #4, the most accessible communities of Knox have reduced their idle land from 6.25% in 1896 to 5.25% in 1926. This shows an increasing demand for land near the industrial developments.

The most accessible communities of Anderson had exactly the same percentage of idle land in 1926 that it had in 1906. That was 16.25% (Table #5)

The most accessible communities of Knox had only 5.25% of idle land in 1926 whereas the least accessible communities had 34.25%, or more than six times as much. (Table #8) This is a good illustration of the demand for land in accessible communities near an industrial center.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson had only 16.69% idle land, while the four least accessible communities had 35.0%. This is shown in Table #9.

In Anderson County there is some industrial development but not as much as in Knox, and we do not find as great a demand for the land in the most accessible communities in Anderson (16.25% idle) as there is in Knox (5.25%) (Table #10). We do find that there was less than 1/2 as much idle land in the most accessible communities, as there was in the least accessible of the same county.

There was in 1926 a greater demand for land in the least accessible communities of Knox than there was in the least accessible communities in Anderson. This is shown in Table #11, where Knox had 34.25 and Anderson 35.00.

Table #13 shows that the four most accessible communities in Anderson had less than 1/2 as much idle land as did the least accessible communities of Knox. It seems that people had rather live close to a small industrial development than to be further away from a larger industrial development.

From 1896 to 1926 the four most accessible communities of Knox decreased 16% in idle land, while the least accessible communities increased 57.4% for the same period. (Table #14)

Between 1906 and 1926, as shown in Table #15, the percentage of idle land remained the same in the most accessible communities, but the percentage

of idle land increased 70.7% in the least accessible communities.

As Table #21 shows, the eight communities of Hawkins had 11.9% more idle land (23.8) than did the eight communities in Sullivan (11.9). This smaller amount of idle land in Sullivan was caused by the industrial development at Kingsport.

Before the industrial development in 1914 at Kingsport the eight communities of Sullivan had a larger percentage of idle land (34.3) than did the eight communities of Hawkins (27.5). The comparison is shown in Table #22.

The amount of idle land was reduced in the eight communities of Sullivan from 34.3% in 1914 to 11.9% in 1925. (Table #23) This reduction was caused by the industrial development at Kingsport.

There has been but a slight reduction in the percentage of idle land in the eight communities of Hawkins from 1914 to 1925. The amount in 1914 was 27.5% and in 1925, 23.8%. There has been but little influence of the industrial development, that being a better market at Kingsport, as there was no industry in Hawkins. (Table #24)

The slight reduction that has come in percentage of idle land for the communities in Hawkins came in the most accessible communities. Table #26 shows that the most accessible reduced 20% and the least accessible remained the same.

Number of Empty Houses. There are so few houses empty in either Anderson or Knox that we cannot tell just what effect the industrial development has had on the number. There was an average of only two in Knox, and that for only a very short time. In 1896 almost all of the houses were also full in the eight communities of Knox, the average number being 1.9 vacant. (Table #1 and #2)

The eight communities of Anderson also have almost all of their

of their houses full, and what few that are not full were vacant for only a short time. An average of only 1.1 were vacant. The number of empty houses in 1906 in Anderson was low, there being only an average of 1.9 per community. (Table #1 and #3)

The same situation is found in both Hawkins and Sullivan County, for both in 1914 and 1925, the number of empty houses were so few that we cannot tell any effect of industrial development on the number.

There was an average of only 1.2 for Hawkins and 1.0 for Sullivan in 1925, and these were vacant only a short while. In 1914 no houses were vacant in Hawkins and only an average of one in Sullivan. (Table #21 and #22)

Number of Acres of Alfalfa. There is not as many acres of alfalfa in either Knox or Anderson as there should be. Only an average of 2.5 acres were in Knox and only 2 in Anderson, or one-half of an acre more in the Knox communities. (Table #1)

In 1896 there was no alfalfa in the Knox section and in 1906 there was none in the Anderson section. (Table #2 and #3)

As there was no alfalfa in the least accessible communities of Knox the most accessible communities had an average of 5 acres per community. (Table #8). This shows that a community being accessible to the influence of industrial development caused the number of acres of alfalfa to increase. Table #9 shows that all the alfalfa that is grown in that section is grown in the most accessible communities.

There was no alfalfa in either Hawkins or Sullivan Counties.

Value of Land Per Acre. The development of industry has a direct and decided influence on the price of land per acre. Two reasons for the price of land going up when industrial development comes are as follows:

more people want to live in that area and they have more money with which to pay for land. The value of land per acre in the eight communities of Knox in 1926 was $61.25, while the price of land in Anderson was only $53.13 per acre. (Table #1)

The price of land per acre in the eight communities of Knox increased from $21.25 in 1896 to $61.25 in 1926, or almost tripbd during that period. Not all of this increase has been due to industrial development, but a large part of it has. (Table #2)

The price of land in Anderson increased from $21.88 in 1906 to $53.13 in 1926. This is shown in Table #3.

In 1926 the price of land per acre of the four most accessible communities of Knox was $87.50 while the price in the least accessible communities was $35.00, being more than twice as high in the most accessible communities. (Table #8)

The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of $75 per acre and the four least accessible had a value of only $31.25 per acre. The price is therefore $12.50 more than twice as much per acre in the most accessible communities. (Table #9)

Knox being a more highly developed industrial center, we find that the price of land in the four most accessible communities in 1926 was $87.50, while in the four most accessible of Anderson the price was only $75.00 per acre, or $12.50 less than in Knox.

There is a great contrast in the price of land in the four least accessible of Knox and the four least accessible of Anderson. The price was $35.00 in Knox and only $13.25 in Anderson. This is shown in Table #11.

Table #13 shows that there is a greater effect in a medium developed industrial center on the more accessible communities than there is in the larger developed in the inaccessible. That is, land is higher in price, closerin to a small industry than it is out further from a larger industry.

This is shown by land selling for $35.00 in the least accessible communities of Knox and for $75.00, or more than twice as much in the most accessible of Anderson. Taking the whole county of Knox, we found that in 1924 the average price of land was $66.10, while for the whole of Anderson it was only $23.39, or but little more than 1/3 as much in Anderson. (Table #20)

There was also a great contrast in the price of land in Hawkins and Sullivan Counties in 1925. The price was $131.25 for the eight communities of Sullivan and only $72.50 for Hawkins. Most of this difference in land value is undoubtedly due to the industrial development at Kingsport, because in 1914 the price of land was the same in both areas; that is, $36.87 in Hawkins and $36.25 in Sullivan. These figures are shown in Tables #21 and #22.

The price of land in the eight communities of Sullivan increased from $36.25 in 1914 to $131.25 in 1925, or almost four times the price in 1914. But the price of land in the eight Hawkins communities has increased from $36.87 to only $72.50, or just a few cents less than twice the price in 1914. (Table #23 and #24)

The price of land was about 1/3 higher in the most accessible communities of Hawkins in 1925 than it was in the least accessible communities. That is, $80.00 in the most accessible and only $60.90 in the least accessible. (Table #25)

In 1924 the price of land for the whole county of Sullivan was an average of $66.47 per acre, and that of Hawkins was only $44.30; or one-third more in Sullivan County. This difference was mostly due to the industrial development being in Sullivan County.

When all the counties of Tennessee are divided into three sections: (1) most manufacturing, (2) medium manufacturing, and (3) least manufacturing, the price of land in 1920 was $44.10 in the most manufacturing counties,

$39.02 in the medium, and $33.31 in the least. This shows that there is a direct relation between the amount of manufacturing, or industrial development, and the price of farm land. (Table 30)

When all the states of the Union are divided into two groups, that is, most manufacturing and least manufacturing, the price of land in 1925 was $79.01 per acre in most manufacturing counties and for the least manufacturing only $35.31, or less than 1/2 as much. (Table 31)

This indicates that not only do the most highly developed industrial communities and counties have the highest priced farm land but also the states as a whole.

Modern Machinery (Number of Binders and Tractors) There is a direct relation between the amount of improved farm machinery used and the amount of industrial development. That is, the eight communities of Knox in 1926 had 22.9 binders, while the eight communities of Anderson had only an average of 2.9 per community. (Table #1) The number of tractors in the eight Knox communities was 6.25, while Anderson had only an average of 1.38.

The number of binders for the eight communities of Knox increased from an average of 10.6 in 1896 to 22.9 in 1926, which is more than twice as many. The number of tractors increased from none in 1896 to 6.25 in 1926. These figures are shown in Table #2.

The number of binders for the eight communities of Anderson increased from 0.6 to 1.38 from 1906 to 1926. And the number of tractors increased from none to 1.38 per community. These figures are found in Table #3.

There were more binders in the four least accessible communities of Knox that there were in the four most accessible communities of Anderson in 1926. The average number was 8.3 in Knox and 2.8 in Anderson. The average number of tractors was more in the four most accessible of Anderson than in the four least accessible of Knox. The number was 1.75 in Anderson and only 1.0 for Knox. This shows that there is but little difference between the amount of improved machinery in a close in community to a midium amount of industrial development and a more removed region to a larger amount of industrial development. (Table #13)

Knox County, as a whole, had an average of $9.53 worth of improved

machinery to each acre of crop, while Anderson had only $7.03 or $2.50 per crop acre less in Knox County. (Table #20).

We have no data on the number of binders to be found in either the eight Hawkins communities or the eight Sullivan communities. The number of tractors that were in the eight communities of Hawkins was only half the number in the eight Sullivan communities, the average number being 1.13 for Hawkins and 2.25 in the eight Sullivan communities. All of the increase in amount of improved farm machinery in Sullivan over that of Hawkins was due to the development of industry, because Hawkins County is as well suited, or better, for the use of improved machinery as is Sullivan. (Table #20) Neither the Hawkins nor the Sullivan Communities had tractors in 1914.(Table #22)

The most accessible communities of Hawkins had an average of 1.4 tractors, while the least accessible communities had only an average of 0.66. This shows that there is a direct relation between the amount of machinery and the accessibility of a place. (Table #25)

Taking the whole county of Sullivan in 1925 there were 69 tractors on farms, while the whole county of Hawkins had only 50 tractors.

The value of machinery per crop acre was $7.84 in Sullivan, whereas it was only $5.60 for Hawkins. (Table 29)

When all the counties of Tennessee were divided into three groups: most manufacturing, medium manufacturing, and least manufacturing, in 1919, the value of improved farm machinery per crop acre was $7.12 for the most manufacturing group, $6.80 for the medium group, and $6.10 for the least manufacturing group. This is shown in Table #30.

In 1919 the half of the states of the Union that had the most manufacturing had $14.13 worth of improved farm machinery per crop acre while the 1/2 of the states that had the least manufacturing had only $9.67 worth of machinery per crop acre. (Table #31)

There is a direct effect on the amount of farm machinery from the amount of industrial development in not only the small communities but also in the whole state of Tennessee and in the United States as a whole. We can safely say that the greater the development of industry the more improved farm machinery is found.

Number of Purebred Livestock. The eight communities of Knox County had an average of 350.75 purebred livestock, whereas the eight communities of Anderson had but 42. When a section is highly industrialized the number of purebred livestock is much higher than if no industrial development had taken place. (Table #1)

There was a large increase in the number of purebred livestock in the eight Knox communities from 1896 to 1926. The number was 27.13 in 1896 and 350.75 in 1926. This is shown in Table #2.

The number of purebred livestock for the eight Anderson communities increased from an average of 0.38 in 1906 to 42.0 in 1926 (Table #3)

The number of purebred livestock in the four most accessible communities of Knox was 684 in 1926 and only 18 in the least accessible. As the accessibility to industry of a community increases the number of purebred livestock increases. (Table #8)

The number of purebred livestock in the most accessible communities of Anderson was 53, while the number in the least accessible was 31. Here it is shown that the number of purebred livestock increased as the communities became accessible to industrial development. (Table #9)

The number of purebred livestock is more than twice as many in the most accessible communities of Anderson as in the least accessible of Knox. The number was 18 in Knox and 53 in Anderson. (Table #13)

This shows that a community close in to a medium well developed industry has a larger number of purebred livestock than does a community further back

from a larger industrial center.

In 1925 there was an average of only three purebred livestock in each of the eight communities in Hawkins County while the eight communities of Sullivan had an average of.18, or six times as many. (Table #21)

Neither the eight communities of Hawkins nor the eight communities of Sullivan had any purebred livestock in 1914. (Table #22) All the extra amount gained in the Sullivan communities over those in Hawkins is caused by the development of industry at Kingsport, because Hawkins is equally as well suited for purebred livestock production as is Sullivan.

Number of Silos. There is a close relation between the amount of industrial development and the number of silos on farms, as will be shown in the following figures. Not only do the communities the most highly developed in industry have more silos, but the most accessible communities in each county have a much larger number than the least accessible communities.

Table #1 shows that the eight communities of Knox had an average of 13.75 silos while the eight in Anderson had only 1.25. In 1896 there were no silos in the eight Knox communities and in 1906 there were none in the eight Anderson communities. (Tables #2 and #3)

In the most accessible communities of Knox there were 27 silos in 1926, but in the least accessible communities there were only an average of 0.5 (1/2) silos per community.

As is shown in Table #9, the most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 2.5 silos, while the least accessible communities do not have any.

In Table #13 we find that the four most accessible communities of Anderson had more silos than the four least accessible communities of Knox. The number was 2.5 in Anderson and 0.5 in Knox. In 1925 there were only 7 silos in the whole county of Anderson, while there were 163 in Knox County.

In 1925 there were but few silos in either the eight Hawkins or the eight Sullivan communities. The average number was 0.5 in Hawkins and 0.75 in Sullivan. (Table #21) In 1914 there were no silos in either the eight communities of Hawkins or the eight communities of Sullivan.

In the five most accessible communities of Hawkins there were an average of 0.8 silos per community, but in the three least accessible communities there were no silos. In 1925 the whole county of Sullivan had 47 silos on farms and Hawkins County had only 8.

Table #30 shows that the number of acres of silage crops was 543 in 1920 for the 1/3 most manufacturing counties of Tennessee. It shows 339 acres for the medium 1/3 manufacturing counties, and 105 acres for the least 1/3 manufacturing counties. This shows that as the amount of manufacturing increases the number of acres of silage crop increases also. The number of silos is not given. Table #31 shows that the 1/2 of the states that have the most manufacturing had 137,778 acres of silage crops in 1919, while the 1/2 with the least manufacturing had only 27,864, or less than 1/4 as much in the 1/2 with least manufacturing.

Number of Acres Land that has been Limed. The amount of lime used is generally very much less than it should be. There is not enough farmers in any one community that know the value of lime to cause any one to keep lime stone to sell at all times. One or two men can hardly afford to use a whole car load shipment at one time because of so much hauling coming at once. Therefore those who want lime at some time in the year, if they cannot get it at that time will probably fail to use it.

There is a close connection between the amount of industrial development and the amount of lime used. That is, the counties and communities having the most manufacturing use the most limestone. The most accessible communities

use more lime than the less accessible communities.

Table #1 shows that the eight communities of Knox limed an average of 7.12 acres, while the eight in Anderson limed only an average of 4.13. The most accessible communities of Knox limed an average of 13.25 acres per community and the least accessible limed only an average of one acre. (Table #8) The four most accessible communities of Anderson limed 5.25 acres per community, while the least accessible limed only 3 acres, as shown in Table #9. Table #21 shows that the eight communities of Hawkins County used more lime than did Sullivan, which is an exception and not the rule. The eight communities of Hawkins limed an average of 2.6 acres and Sullivan limed an average of only 0.25 acres.

The five most accessible communities of Hawkins limed an average of 4.2 acres of lime per community and the three least accessible communities did not lime any.

Number of Markets Available. As shown in Table #1, the eight communities of Knox had only an average of one market, but since it was a large market, that was all they needed. The eight communities of Anderson County had an average of 1.38 markets. That is, some communities had two or more markets. Even those having two or more markets were not as well off as those of Knox County with the one larger market.

The eight communities of Knox had but one market in 1896 and had the same in 1926, but it was a much larger market in 1926. In 1906 the eight communities of Anderson had an average of 1.13 markets per community and in 1926 they had 1.38. The size of these markets improved slightly but not nearly as much as did the Knoxville market.

The eight communities of Hawkins had an average of 1.88 markets and the eight communities of Sullivan had an average of 1.25 markets. But the market at Kingsport in Sullivan is a much better one than any or all of the markets

in Hawkins County.

We have no data on the number of markets in the three divisions of the counties of Tennessee based on manufacturing, but after all, it is not the number, but the size of the market that is most important. The people in Sullivan have a much more satisfactory market than do the people in Hawkins, though the number is smaller; and the same is true of Knox and Anderson Counties.

Number of Cooperative Organizations. The cooperative organizations had not developed very much and not as they should develop, in either Knox or Anderson Counties. There were no cooperative organizations in the eight communities of Knox, and only an average of 0.75 organizations per community in Anderson. (Table #1) The few organizations in Anderson County were small and functioned for only a small part of the year. That is, they were to handle the peach crop or some other crop.

In 1896 there were no cooperative organizations in Knox and in 1906 there were none in Anderson. (Table #2 and #3) The most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 1.0 cooperative organizations, while the least accessible communities had but 0.5. This is shown in Table #9.

There is no difference in the number of cooperative organizations in Hawkins and in Sullivan Counties, as each had an average of 0.25 per community. (Table #2)

In 1914 there were no cooperative organizations in the eight communities of Hawkins and only an average of 0.13 per community in Sullivan. This is shown in Table #22.

Cooperative Buying (Number Products); Cooperative Selling (Number Products).

In 1926, as shown in Table #1, there were no products bought cooperatively in either the eight communities of Anderson or the eight communities of Knox.

There were no products sold cooperatively in Knox and only an average of 0.75 per community in Anderson. In 1896 there were no products either bought or sold cooperatively in the eight communities of Knox. Still in 1926 no products were bought or sold cooperatively in Knox. (This is in Table #2)

Table #3 shows that the eight communities of Anderson did not buy or sell any products cooperatively in 1906 and did not buy any in 1926 and sold only an average of 3/4 or 0.75 products per community.

There were the same number of products bought and sold in the most accessible communities of Anderson as there were in the least accessible communities, there being no buying in either case, and only an average of 0.75 products sold. (Table #9)

The number of products bought cooperatively were the same for both Hawkins and Sullivan Counties, being an average of 0.25 in each community. The number of products sold cooperatively was 0.13 in Hawkins and an average of 1.0 in the eight Sullivan communities.

In this study and others made within this state there is no relation found to exist between the amount of cooperative buying and selling and the industrial development. The main cooperative sellings in this state have been of certain crops, such as cotton, tobacco, and a few truck and crops. Most of the cooperative buying has been by these selling organizations, purchasing the supplies such as seed, feed, and fertilizer for their members.

The above special crops may or may not chance to be in a county where industry has developed, therefore there is no relation between manufacturing and cooperative selling or buying.

Home Supplies (Garden, Milk, Fruit, Meat, Butter, Eggs, etc.) The amount of home supplies which was bought in the eight Knox communities was

was 1.75 per community and only an average of 0.88 products per community in Anderson. In the Knox section the production of wheat has been almost discontinued and several communities have had to buy meat. Knox County had a greater supply of fruit and vegetables but since Anderson did not buy to make up their shortage, it did not show up against them. The same thing is apparently happening in Anderson that has happened many other places; namely, if the people do not grow their fruit and vegetables they simply use a fewer number.

In 1896 the people of Knox did not buy enough of any one product to consider that they had it to buy. Most of the things that one farmer needed could be bought from a farmer in the neighborhood. This causes the figures in Table #2 to show 0 in 1896 and 1.75 in 1926.

As shown in Table #3, the eight communities of Anderson bought more home supplies in 1926 (0.88) than they did in 1906 (0.5) but they had a much better supply in 1926. Such things as winter vegetables and fruits were scarce in 1906 but they failed to use them instead of buying them.

The home supplies for Hawkins and Sullivan Counties could not be tabulated numerically (Table #21) but is written up, just following Tables #21 and #28.

Type of Farming Now; Formerly; Cause of Change. As the development of industry increases a good local market is created for such things as fruits, vegetables, dairy products, and poultry. This causes a more intensive method of farming to be followed. That is, one man will not plant so many acres but will put more work on each acre. In 1926 we found that the eight communities of Knox still had mostly general farming but were more closely approaching specialized farming than was the Anderson sections.

In 1896 the Knox section had general farming with wheat and beef cattle as the larger sources of their income.

The eight communities in Anderson in 1926 had general farming with some fruit, vegetables, and dairy products as some of their income.

The type of farming changed in both Anderson and Knox because it was found that fruit, vegetables, tobacco, and dairying were more profitable than wheat and beef cattle. This is discussed further just following Tables #1 to #19.

The material on type of farming now, formerly, and why changed could not be tabulated numerically but is discussed immediately after Tables #21 to #28.

The type of farming in both Hawkins and Sullivan Counties in 1914 was general extensive farming with a large amount of wheat and beef cattle as sources of income. In 1926 the farming was still general but more intensive. The farming in Sullivan was much more specialized than it was in Hawkins. Fruit, vegetables, tobacco, and dairying are some of the new sources of income in Sullivan. The system changed in Sullivan because the intensive crops were more profitable; and they were made more profitable because of industrial development which has produced a good market.

Organized Movements to Improve Farming. The movements to improve farming are almost lacking in both the eight Knox and the eight Anderson communities. The Knox section had only an average of 0.13 and Anderson had an average of 0.88 per community. (Table #1) The eight communities of Knox had no movements to improve farming in 1896. This is shown in Table #2. In 1906 the eight communities of Anderson had an average of 0.15 movements to improve farming and in 1926 an average of 0.88. This is shown in Table #3.

The movements to improve farming are not very numerous in Hawkins and Sullivan Counties either. The Hawkins section had no movements and the Sullivan area had an average of 0.63 per community. The data secured in the community surveys are not adequate to show whether or not there is any relation

between manufacturing development and organized movements for the improvement of agriculture in the community.

Number of Farmers' Needs. When we tried to find the greatest needs of farmers we found a great diversity of opinion. One person gave one need as greatest while another would give another need as most urgent. In some communities some of the people asked about this would say that there were no real urgent needs, while other men in the same section would name several needs.

In Anderson and Knox and also in Hawkins and Sullivan the needs most frequently mentioned were: cooperative marketing, better markets, more machinery, better care of machinery, rotation of crops, and the production of legumes. This is discussed further just following each table from #1 to #28.

CHAPTER II.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Total Mileage of Highways. As the amount of industrial development increases the number of miles of improved roads increases. The most manufacturing counties had the larger number of improved roads and the most accessible communities of each county had a larger mileage than the least accessible communities. The eight communities of Knox had an average of 31.9 miles of improved roads and the eight communities of Anderson had only 18.9 miles per community. (Table #32) The eight communities of Knox in 1896 had an average of 26.5 miles of roads and in 1926 they had an average of 31.9. The roads were in much better condition in 1926 than they were in 1896. (Table #33)

The eight communities of Anderson had an average of 15.1 miles of roads in 1906 and 18.9 miles in 1926. (Table #34) The roads were much better improved in 1926 than they were in 1906. In 1926 the most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 50 miles of roads and the least accessible communities had only 13.8 miles, or more than three times as much road mileage in the most accessible communities. This is shown in Table #39.

As is shown in Table #40, the four most accessible communities of Anderson had 22 miles of road and the least accessible communities had only 15.8 miles per community.

Table #44 shows that the least accessible communities of Knox County had only 13.8 miles of road and the four most accessible of Anderson had 22 miles per community. This shows that the more accessible communities in

a medium well developed industry area had more roads than the less accessible communities of a larger industrial center.

Table #45 shows that the most accessible communities of Knox are increasing their number of miles of roads faster (25%) than are the least accessible communities (5.7%). This was between 1896 and 1926. The four most accessible communities of Anderson, as shown in Table #46, increased 23.9% in number of miles of roads and the four least accessible communities increased but 16.7%. This is 7.2% greater increase in the most accessible communities. (Table #46)

The number of miles of roads increased 23.9% in the most accessible communities of Anderson and only 5.7% in the four least accessible communities, or more than four times as large an increase in the four most accessible communities of Anderson as there was in the four least accessible communities of Knox. (Table #50). In 1922 the whole county of Knox had 937 miles of public roads and the whole county of Anderson had only 588 miles or 349 miles more than Anderson. The number of miles of Federal and State aid roads per 100 square miles was almost twice as much in Knox County as it was in Anderson. This was 9.7 miles in Anderson and 18.9 miles in Knox. The whole county of Knox in 1924 had 95.1 miles of Federal and State Aid highways and Anderson had about 1/3 as much - 33.3 miles. All this is shown in Table #51.

As shown in Table #52, the average total mileage of highways per community was 13 for eight communities of Hawkins and 12 for the eight communities of Sullivan..This shows an average of 1 mile in favor of the least manufacturing county, but when we look at Table #53 and find that in 1914 Hawkins had 13.5 miles and Sullivan only 10.0, it shows that Sullivan increased two miles and Hawkins decreased an average of 0.5.

The five most accessible communities of Hawkins had in 1925 an average of 16.4 miles of highways and the three least accessible communities had

only an average of 7.33 miles. This is shown in Table #56.

In 1922 the whole county of Hawkins had 849 miles of highway and the whole county of Sullivan had 850 miles, or one mile more in Sullivan. In 1924 the miles of Federal and State Aid highways per 100 square miles was practically the same in the two counties, being 18.3 in Sullivan and 18.6 in Hawkins. This industrial development had just begun to show its effect on improved roads in 1924. By 1925 the increase in improved roads was much greater in Sullivan than it was in Hawkins. This is shown in Table #60.

When all the counties of the whole state of Tennessee are divided into three groups: most, medium, and least manufacturing the total mileage of Federal and State Aid highways for the most manufacturing group was 60.3, for the medium manufacturing 51.3 miles, and the least manufacturing had only 35.7. Although the 1/3 with most manufacturing had the largest number of miles of Federal and State Aid highways, they have fewer miles per 1000 population (the most manufacturing group, 2.10 miles; medium manufacturing group, 2.98; and least manufacturing group, 2.95) showing that the most manufacturing group is furnished with better roads per 100 square miles but at the same time at a less expense per person. This is shown in Table #61.

In the 1/2 most manufacturing states there is twice as much Federal and State Aid highway mileage per 100 square miles (17.3 miles for the most and 8.7 miles for the least), whereas they have but 1/4 as many miles per 1000 population. In other words, if the Federal and State government should spend as much per person in the most manufacturing states as they spend in the least manufacturing they would have eight times as much road mileage as the least manufacturing have.

Total Miles of Hard Surface Highways. In 1926 eight communities of Knox County had an average of 15.56 miles of hard surface road per community

and the eight communities of Anderson had only 4.25 miles, or less than 1/3 as many miles. (Table #32)

In 1896 the eight communities of Knox had only 2.38 miles of hard surface roads per community and in 1926 they had an average of 15.56.

The eight communities of Anderson in 1906 had only 0.25 miles of hard surface roads per community and in 1926 they had an average of 4.25 miles per community. This is shown in Table #34.

In 1926 the four most accessible communities of Knox, as shown in Table #39, had an average of 34.75 miles of hard surface road and the least accessible communities had 6.38 miles.

As is shown in Table #40, the four most accessible communities of Anderson had 7 miles per community and the least accessible communities had an average of only 1.5 miles.

Table #44 shows that the four most accessible communities of Anderson had more miles of hard surfaced road (7.0) than did the four least accessible of Knox (6.38 miles). This indicates that there is a greater effect on the accessible communities to a medium well developed industrial center than there is on a less accessible community near a larger manufacturing center. As has been mentioned before the number of miles of Federal and State Aid highways was twice as many in the whole of Knox County as in Anderson County. Anderson had 9.7 and Knox 18.9 miles per 100 square miles. This is shown in Table #51.

The eight communities of Hawkins had an average of 2.63 miles of hard surface per community while the eight communities in Sullivan had 4.5 or almost twice as much. (Table #52) In 1914 there was but little hard surface roads in either Hawkins or Sullivan Counties, being none in Hawkins and only 0.37 miles per community in Sullivan. (Table #53)

In 1924 the whole county of Hawkins had 18.6 miles of Federal and State Aid highways per 100 square miles and Sullivan had only 18.3 miles. (Table #60)

Sullivan has had a much more rapid development of roads since 1924 than

than has Hawkins.

As was mentioned under total miles of roads, the 1/3 most manufacturing counties had 12.8 miles of Federal and State Aid highways, the 1/3 medium had 10.7, and the 1/3 least manufacturing had 10.7 miles. The above shows that the 1/3 most manufacturing counties had the largest number of miles of highways per 100 miles but had fewer miles per 1000 population. This is shown in Table #61.

Table #62 shows that the 1/2 most manufacturing states had 17.3 miles of Federal and State Aid highways per 100 square miles and the 1/2 least manufacturing states had only 8.7 miles. In the same table we find that the 1/2 most manufacturing states had much fewer miles per 1000 population. That is, the most manufacturigg states had 1.9 miles and the least manufacturing had 7.9 miles.

Miles of Asphalt, Macadam, Graveled, Graded, and Ungraded Roads. The number of miles of asphalt roads was very few in 1926 in both Knox and Anderson. There was but an average of 0.57 miles per community in Knox County and none in Anderson. In the eight communities of Knox there was an average of 13.3 miles of macadam roads, and only 3.4 miles in Anderson. There was 1.13 miles of gravel road in the Knox section and only 0.38 in the Anderson. No data were available on graded and ungraded dirt roads for either Anderson or Knox. All the above is found in Table #32.

Table #39 shows that the most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 1.13 miles of asphalt highways and the least accessible communities had none.

The most accessible communities of Knox County had 20.8 miles of macadam road and the least accessible only 5.9 miles. The most accessible communities had 1.8 miles of gravel and the least accessible only 0.5 miles. No data were available on graded and ungraded dirt roads.

Table #40 shows that there were no asphalt roads in either the most or least accessible communities of Anderson County in 1926. The most accessible communities of Anderson had 6.3 miles of macadam road while there was only 0.5 miles in the least accessible communities. The most accessible had only 0.75 miles of gravel roads and the least accessible had none. No data were available on graded and ungraded dirt roads.

As is seen in Table #44 there was no asphalt in the four least accessible communities of Knox and none in the four most accessible of Anderson in 1926. There were 6.3 miles of macadam roads in the four most accessible communities of Anderson and only 5.9 miles in the four least accessible of Knox. The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 0.75 miles of gravel roads ad the least accessible communities of Knox had only 0.5 miles. We have no data on the amount of graded and ungraded dirt roads.

This shows that there was a greater effect on roads from industrial development in the more accessible communities near a medium developed industrial center than there was in the less accessible communities of a larger industrial development.

As is shown in Table #51, there were 18.9 miles of Federal and State Aid highways in Knox County per 100 square miles in 1924 but only 9.7 miles per 100 square miles in the whole county of Anderson. Anderson County has only about 1/2 as many miles of road per square mile, yet it had 1.8 miles of road per 1000 population, while Knox County had only 0.8 miles. This shows that Knox had more roads per 100 square miles but had it at a much less cost per person.

In 1925 there was no asphalt roads in either the eight communities of Hawkins or the eight communities of Sullivan. There was 3.3 miles of macadam road in Hawkins and 3.7 miles in Sullivan. No gravel roads in Hawkins and none in Sullivan. There was an average of 4.75 miles of graded dirt

roads in Hawkins and 5.1 miles in Sullivan. Still there was an average of 5.63 miles of ungraded roads in Hawkins and only 2 miles of ungraded roads in Sullivan. This is shown in Table #52.

The above shows only a slight advantage in favor of Sullivan County but the manufacturing had just begun to show its effect on improved roads in 1925.

In 1914 there was very little improved roads in either Hawkins or Sullivan Counties. No asphalt was found in either county. There was an average of 0.4 miles of macadam road in each of the communities. Neither county had gravel roads. Hawkins had no graded dirt road and Sullivan had 4.75 miles. Hawkins had 12.5 miles of ungraded dirt and Sullivan had 6.13 miles. This is shown in Table #53.

In Sullivan between 1914 and 1925 the amount of macadam roads increased from 0.4 to 3.3 miles. The graded dirt road increased from 0 to 4.75. The ungraded roads decreased from 12.5 to 5.63 miles. This is shown in Table #55.

In 1922 the whole county of Sullivan had 1.95 miles of public roads per square mile compared with 1.76 miles per square mile for the whole of Hawkins County. The number of farms on concrete or brick roads (1925) was 129 for Sullivan and 0 for Hawkins. The number of farms on macadam roads for Sullivan was 467 and only 298 in Hawkins. The number of farms on gravel roads was 310 for Sullivan and only 42 for the whole county of Hawkins. This is shown in Table #60.

Number of Bridges and Ferries. The eight communities of Knox had an average of 5.4 bridges per community, while the eight communities of Anderson had only an average of 2.3 bridges per community. (Table #32) The eight communities of Knox increased their number of bridges from 2.1 in 1896 to 5.4 in 1926. (Table #33) The number of bridges per community increased

from 1.8 in 1906 to 2.3 in 1926 in the eight communities of Anderson County.

The four most accessible communities of Knox had 6.5 bridges per community in 1926 and the four least accessible communities had only an average of four. This is shown in Table #39. In 1926 the four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 2.3 bridges per community and the least accessible communities had only an average of one bridge per community. (Table #40) Table #41 shows that the least accessible communities of Knox had four bridges per community and the most accessible of Anderson only 2.3 bridges.

In 1925 the eight communities of Hawkins had an average of only 5.62 bridges per community while the eight communities of Sullivan had 11.75. (Table #52) The eight communities of Hawkins in 1914 had 3.5 bridges and the eight communities of Sullivan had an average of 7 bridges per community. Between 1914 and 1925 the number of bridges increased from 7 per community to 11.75 per community in Sullivan. The number of bridges in Hawkins increased from 3.5 to only 5.62. This is shown in Tables #54 and #55.

The five most accessible communities of Hawkins, as shown in Table #56, had 6.6 bridges per community, and the least accessible communities had an average of only four bridges.

Percentage of People Served by Rural Mail Carriers. The development of industry affects the mail service indirectly in two ways: it causes the roads to be improved so the carriers can get around; and the density and number of rural population to increase so that the need for mail service is increased.

Table #32 shows that the eight communities of Knox had in 1926 a smaller percentage of their people reached by mail service than do the eight communities of Anderson. This is very different from the facts of the two counties

as a whole. This was caused by Heiskell, one of the least accessible communities of Knox, being located in a place where only 50% of the people are reached with rural mail service. This table shows that the eight communities of Anderson had 95.5% of the people served by rural mail carriers while 92.3% of the eight Knox County communities were reached.

The most accessible communities of Knox, as is shown in Table #39, had 97% of their people served by rural carriers and only 87.5% of the people of the least accessible communities were so reached.

Table #44 shows that the four most accessible communities of Anderson had 93.8% of the people served with rural mail carriers and the four least accessible communities of Knox had only 87.5% of their people served by rural mail carriers.

The whole county of Anderson in 1924 had but 11 rural routes, and the whole county of Knox had 41 rural routes, or nearly 4 times as many rural routes. This gives a good example of how an industrial county will increase its rural mail routes over that of a less industrialized county.

The eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 had 95% of their people served by rural delivery routes while the eight communities of Sullivan had 97.5% of their people served.

In 1914 the eight communities of Hawkins had 82.5% of their people served by rural carriers while at that time the eight of Sullivan had only 53.8% of their people served. (Table#53). The county of Sullivan in 1914 had but 22 rural mail routes and Hawkins County had 29 rural routes. (Table #60)

Table #61 shows that the 1/3 most manufacturing counties of Tennessee had an average of 19.7 rural mail delivery routes per county, the 1/3 madium manufacturing had 18.1 mail routes, and the 1/3 least manufacturing had only 12.4 mail routes.

The 1/2 most manufacturing states had 1,273 rural mail routes per state, while the 1/2 least manufacturing states had only 579 rural mail routes. (Table #62)

Number of Automobiles. There is a very close relationship between the amount of industrial development and the number of automobiles. This is true in the sections of counties, in the whole counties, in the whole state of Tennessee, and also in the whole United States.

In 1926 the eight communities of Knox had an average of 89.75 automobiles per community and Anderson had only 20.4. The Knox communities averaged 22.5 cars other than Fords and the Anderson communities only 3.88. The Knox communities averaged 67.25 Fords and the Anderson communities only 16.71 Fords. These data are shown in Table #32.

In 1896, as is shown in Table #33, there were no automobiles in any of the eight Knox sections. (In fact, this was the year that the automobile was first invented) In 1906 there were no cars in the eight communities of Anderson. (Table #34)

There is a very close relation between the accessibility of a community and the number of automobiles found in it. Table #39 shows that the most accessible communities of Knox averaged 168.75 automobiles in 1926, and the least accessible communities averaged only 10.75 automobiles. The most accessible communities averaged 43.75 cars other than Fords and the least accessible communities had an average of only 1.25 cars other than Fords per community. The most accessible communities averaged 125 Fords and the least accessible had only 9.5 Fords per community.

The most accessible communities of Anderson County had in 1926 an average of 31.5 automobiles per community and the least accessible communities only an average of 9.25. The most accessible of Anderson had an average of 7 cars

other than Fords and the least accessible had only an average of 0.75. The most accessible communities had 28 Fords and the least accessible had only 8.25 Fords per community. (Table #40)

As is seen in Table #44, the least accessible communities of Knox averaged 10.75 automobiles and the four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 31.5 automobiles per community. The least accessible of Knox averaged 1.25 cars other than Fords and the most accessible of Anderson averaged 7 per community. The least accessible of Knox had 9.5 Fords and the most accessible of Anderson had 28 Fords per community.

In 1924 Table #51 shows that there were 13,242 passenger automobiles (including Fords) in the whole county of Knox and only 742 passenger cars in the whole county of Anderson.

There was one car (1923) for every 10.6 persons in Knox County, and one for every 22.2 persons in Anderson. In 1922 there were 45.5 cars per 100 families for Knox County and 21.5 per 100 families in Anderson County. 52.7% of the cars in Knox County were not Fords, and 29.8% in Anderson were not Fords.

Table #52 shows that in 1925 there were an average of 23.0 automobiles in the eight communities of Hawkins County. There were an average of 29.4 automobiles in the eight communities of Sullivan. The eight communities of Hawkins had an average of 1.87 cars other than Fords, and the eight communities of Sullivan had 3.75 per community. The eight communities of Hawkins averaged 21.0 Fords and Sullivan averaged 25.6 Fords.

In 1914 there were no automobiles in Hawkins and an average of only 0.87 per community in Sullivan. There were no cars other than Fords in either Hawkins or Sullivan Counties. In other words, there were no Fords in Hawkins and only an average of 0.87 Fords per community in Sullivan.

The 5 most accessible communities of Hawkins in 1925 had 31.8 automobiles, 28.8 of which were Fords and 3 other than Fords; and the three least

accessible had only 8.3 automobiles per community, all of which were Fords. (Table #56)

Table #60 shows the whole county of Sullivan compared with the whole county of Hawkins. This shows 2,880 passenger automobiles (Fords included) in Sullivan and only 1,131 in Hawkins. The number of persons per passenger automobiles were 13.7 in Sullivan and 20.2 in Hawkins. 29.4% of the cars in Sullivan were not Fords, while only 20.4% were not Fords in Hawkins. Sullivan County had 37 cars per 100 families, while Hawkins had only 23.8.

The 1/3 most manufacturing counties of Tennessee had an average of 4,064 paswenger automobiles per county. The 1/3 medium had 1,136 cars, and the 1/3 least manufacturing had 565 cars per county.

The number of people per passenger car was 20.9 in the 1/3 most manufacturing, 24.0 in the medium manufacturing, and 42.7 in the least manufacturing. The 1/3 most manufacturing section had 27.7 cars per 100 families, the 1/3 medium had 22.2, and the 1/3 least manufacturing had 16.1 cars per 100 families.

The average number of passenger cars (including Fords) per state in the 1/2 most mamufacturing states was 426,304 in 1923 and only 113,231 for the 1/2 least manufacturing states. The number of people per passenger automobile in 1921 was 11.2 for the 1/2 most manufacturing and 12.3 for the least manufacturing. The number of passenger cars per 100 families was 55 in the 1/2 most manufacturing states and 53 in the 1/2 least manufacturing states. These data are shown in Table #62.

The above figures show that as the amount of manufacturing increased the number of passenger cars increased; and also as a community becomes more accessible to the influence of manufacturing the number of cars increase.

Number of Farm Trucks. The average number of farm trucks was 12.88 per community in 1926 for the eight communities of Knox County and only 1.88 for the eight communities of Anderson County. In 1896 there were no farm trucks

in the Knox section and in 1906 there were no trucks in the Anderson section.

In the four most accessible communities of Knox in 1926 there were an average of 24.25 farm trucks per community, and only 1.5 farm trucks in the four least accessible communities of Knox. (Table #39) The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 3 farm trucks per community, and the four least accessible communities had only an average of 0.75 farm trucks per community. (Table #40)

The four most accessible communities of Anderson, as is shown in Table #44, had an average of 3 farm trucks, and the four least accessible communities of Knox had only 1.5 farm trucks per community. This is shown in Table #44.

As is shown in Table #52, the eight communities of Hawkins had only an average of 1.1 farm trucks per community (1925) and the eight communities of Sullivan had 3.1 farm trucks, or about three times as many in Sullivan County. In 1914 there were no farm trucks in either Hawkins or Sullivan Counties, as is shown in Table#53.

The five most accessible communities of Hawkins in 1925 had an average of 1.6 farm trucks to each community, and the three least accessible communities of Hawkins had only an average of 0.33 farm trucks. (Table #56)

A farm truck is a dual purpose car. That is, it can be used to market farm products and bring back supplies, and it can be used for pleasure trips. If only the latter were wanted a passenger car would be used instead of the truck. We find a close connection between the amount of manufacturing and the number of farm trucks. There are three reasons for this: (1) there is a greater demand for farm products such as fruit and vegetables, and the truck is needed more for hauling, (2) more money can be had with which to buy this truck after it is needed, (3) highways are better near industrial developments.

Railroads: Distance to; Condition of Roads to; Efficiency of Service.

Perhaps the railroads have had more influence in causing the industries to

develop where they have instead of the industrial development causing the railroad. In some cases where the demand is great enough, a railroad will be built. The amount of industrial development will cause the highways to the railroad to improve. The farmers, as well as the manufacturers, must get to and from the railroad, and for that reason they will see to it that the road is kept in good condition.

The eight communities of Knox in 1926 had an average distance of 3.4 miles to the railroad, and the eight communities of Anderson had a distance of five miles. The roads in the Knox section were 77.5% good condition, and the roads in Anderson only 68.75%. The railroad service was said to be only 76.25% efficient, and it was reported to be 78.8% efficient in Anderson. This is shown in Table #32.

Between 1906 and 1926 the average distance to railroad increased from 4.3 miles to 5 miles in the eight communities of Anderson. The condition of roads to railroad improved from 52.5% to 68.75%. The efficienty of railroad service increased from 75% to 78.8%. (Table #34) The condition of roads is the only thing that the development of industry will in many cases affect very much. A large volume of business might cause the railroad service to improve slightly. The development of industry will increase the volume of business.

The four most accessible communities of Knox County had an average distance of 2.5 miles to a railroad, and the least accessible had a distance of 4.3 miles. The condition of roads to railroads in the most accessible communities was 80% and the condition of roads was only 75% for the least accessible communities. The efficiency of railroad service was 80% for the most accessible communities and only 71.7% for the least accessible. (Table #39) The distance to railroad is shown to have been almost twice as great for the least accessible as it was for the most accessible. It was not because of the inaccessibility of these that increased the distance, but the greater distance to rail-

road was used to help determine whether a community was accessible or not.

Table #40 shows that the four most accessible communities of Anderson were 4.1 miles from railroad and the four least accessible were 2.8 miles. The condition of highways to railroad was 77.7% good for the most accessible communities and only 60% for the least accessible. The efficiency of railroad service is 80% in the most accessible communities and only 77.7% in the least accessible communities of Anderson. It happens that the railroad comes through several of the least accessible communities. This helps to make them more accessible but the distance to town, kinds of road, and other things make them inaccessible.

Knox County, as a whole, not only had more total miles of railroad than Anderson County but had more per 100 square miles. Knox had 121 miles and Anderson only 78. Knox had 23.8 miles of railroad per 100 square miles, and Anderson had 22.8 miles. (Table #51) The fact that Knoxville had developed so large an industrial center has caused more railroads to be built into the city and in the county. The fact that Knoxville is located where it is has caused it to grow as it has.

In 1925 the distance to the railroad was just the same for the eight communities of Hawkins as it was for the eight communities of Sullivan, being 4.8 in each case. The condition of the highway to the railroad was 70% in Hawkins and 72.5 in Sullivan. The efficiency of railroad service was 70% in Hawkins and 80% in Sullivan. (Table #52) In 1914 the distance to railroad was 4.8 miles in Hawkins and 9.2 miles in Sullivan. The condition of road was 54% good in Hawkins and 55% in Sullivan. The efficiency of railroad service was 67.5% in Hawkins and 76.25% in Sullivan. (Table #53) This shows that the distance has been reduced very much in Sullivan but remains the same in Hawkins.

Table #60 shows that the whole county of Hawkins had the same number of miles of railroad as had the whole county of Sullivan (51) But the miles

per 100 square miles is 11.7 for Sullivan and only 10.5 for Hawkins (1924). The value of railroads in 1922 was about twice as much in Sullivan as it was in Hawkins. Sullivan had $3,205,000 value and Hawkins only $1,955,000 value.

The industrial development in Sullivan County had some effect on the new railroad being run through the county. This larger value of railroads in Sullivan caused a great reduction in the amount of tax the farmers had to pay, because the railroads pay a large amount of the county's tax.

As is shown in Table #61, the 1/3 most manufacturing counties of Tennessee had 78 milesof rialroad per county, the 1/3 medium manufacturing counties had 39, and the 1/3 least had only 21.

The 1/3 most manufacturing had 15.4 miles of railroad per 100 square miles, the 1/3 medium manufacturing counties had 8.8 miles per 100 square miles, and the 1/3 least manufacturing counties had 5.5 miles. In this is both cause and effect. That is, the presence of the railroad has caused the counties to develop many of their industries, and the fact that industry developed caused some more railroads to be built.

In the 1/2 most manufacturing states, as is shown in Table 62, there were 6,380.61 miles of railroad per state, and only 3,892.57 per state in the 1/2 least manufacturing states. The 1/2 most manufacturing states had 15.6 miles of railroad per 100 square mile and the 1/2 least manufacturing had only 9.8 miles of railroad per 100 square miles.

We often find good railroads in a section but no industry. However, we never see a large amount of industrial development without a railroad. The railroad causes industry to develop. After industry has developed a new railroad may come to the town because of the amount of business that they will receive from the town. The L. and N. Railroad, coming to Knoxville, is an example of a new railroad coming to a town because of the industrial development. The Southern Railroad was in Knoxville from a very early date

and as the L. and N. was extending from Cincinnati to Atlanta, it came through Knoxville because of the industrial development.

Telephones: Number, Extent Available, Percentage Efficiency. In 1926 the eight communities of Knox County had an average of 38.13 telephones per community, while the eight communities of Anderson had only an average of 31.0. 3.86% of the people of the eight Knox communities had telephones, and 4.67% of the people in the eight Anderson communities had telephones. The telephone service was 71.3% efficient in Knox section and only 66.3% efficient in the Anderson section. (Table #32)

There were no telephones in the eight communities of Knox County in 1896 and but an average of 1.91 telephones per community in 1906 for the eight Anderson communities. (Tables #33 and #34) The percentage of people in Anderson having telephones increased from 1.71% in 1906 to 4.67% in 1926. The efficiency of service in the Anderson section improved from 10% in 1906 to 66.3% in 1926.

The most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 60 telephones per community while the least accessible had 16.25 telephones or more than three times as many telephones in the most accessible communities.

The most accessible communities of Knox had 3.66% of their people supplied with telephones and the least accessible communities supplied 4.81% of their people with phones. Telephone service is 70% efficient in the four most accessible communities of Knox and 72.5% efficient in the four least accessible communities of Knox. (Table #39) To find a larger percentage of people with telephones in the least accessible communities is very different to what one might expect to find. The reason for this is: it is very expensive to have a line run out from Knoxville and most of the more accessible communities are not close enough to a county exchange to be connected with it. Riverdale, in one of the least accessible communities, has a well de-

veloped county exchange, and 12% of the people in that community have telephones.

In fact, all the least accessible communities have access to county exchanges while only two of the most accessible communities have close access to county exchanges. These are Corryton and Hall's Cross Roads.

The most accessible communities of Anderson County, as is shown in Table #40, had 51.25 telephones per community in 1926 and the four least accessible communities had an average of only 10.75 phones. The most accessible communities had 4.9% of their people supplied with telephones and the four least accessible had only 4.15% of their people supplied with telephones. The telephone service was 67.5% efficient in the four most accessible communities of Anderson and only 65% efficient in the four least accessible communities.

There were an average of 51.25 telephones per community in 1926 for the four most accessible communities of Anderson and only 16.25 telephones for the four least accessible of Knox.

An average of 4.9% of the people in the four most accessible communities of Anderson had telephones and 4.81% of the people in the four least accessible communities of Knox had telephones. The service in the four most accessible communities of Anderson was 67.5% efficient, and the service for the four least accessible communities of Knox was only 72.5% efficient. (Table #44)

When we notice Table #51, where the whole county of Anderson is compared with the whole county of Knox, we see that in 1920 only 21.1% of the people of Anderson County had phones, while tha percentage of people in Knox County who had phones was 31.1%.

The reason for the figures of 1925 being lower than those of 1920 is that the communities we studied did not contain any towns, and the people in towns have a larger percentage of phones than do the country people.

We do not have data as to the number of telephones in the communities of either Hawkins or Sullivan Counties. The availability of telephones is written up just following Table #52. The service was 66% efficient in Hawkins and 73.7% efficient in Sullivan County.

When we compare the whole county of Sullivan with the whole county of Hawkins as does Table #60 we find that in 1920 Sullivan furnished 26.5% of its people with telephones, while Hawkins furnished only 10.1% of its people with telephones. In this we found that the county having the most manufacturing had the largest number of telephones. A telephone is a very profitable home conveniency. That is, it often saves much time for its owner in being able to call a party, or to order some article that is needed at once. As industry develops, there is more money in a community with which to obtain such conveniences as telephones, radios, etc. and also as industry develops a greater need is seen for a telephone.

CHAPTER III.

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Farm Bureaus and Farmers' Unions. As is shown in Table #63, the eight communities of Knox and the eight communities of Anderson had no Farm Bureau and no Farmers' Unions in 1926. The eight communities of Knox had no Farm Bureaus in 1896, as it was not organized anywhere then, nor did they in 1926. In 1896 the eight communities of Knox averages 0.5 Farmers' Unions but in 1926 they had none. (Table #64)

As is shown in Table #83, neither the eight communities of Hawkins nor the eight communities of Sullivan had a Farm Bureau, and they did not have a Farmers' Union in 1926. In 1914 neither the Hawkins nor the Sullivan communities could have had a Farm Bureau since it was not then in existence. The eight communities of Hawkins had no Farmers' Union but the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 0.5 Farmers' Unions. This is shown in Table #84.

From the above we see that industrial development has not had much effect on Farmers' Unions and Farm Bureaus. There are few in either set of communities.

Community Clubs and Community Fairs. The eight communities of Knox and the eight communities of Anderson had in 1926 the same number of community clubs. Each county averaged 0.5 community clubs per community. The eight communities of Knox averaged 0.5 community fairs and the eight communities of Anderson averaged only 0.25 community fairs.

The eight communities of Knox had an average of 0.5 community clubs in 1896 and still the same number (0.5) in 1926. They had an average of 0.13 community fairs in 1896 and an average of 0.5 community fairs in 1926. (Table #64) The eight communities of Anderson had an average of 0.5 community clubs in 1906 and the same number in 1926. No change has taken place. In 1906 the eight communities of Anderson had no community fairs and in 1926 they had an average of only 0.25 community fairs. (Table #65)

The eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 had no community clubs. The eight communities of Sullivan averaged 0.13 community clubs. The Hawkins communities averaged 0.4 community fairs, and the Sullivan communities averaged 0.3 community fairs. (Table #83). In 1914 neither the Hawkins nor the Sullivan communities had community clubs, nor did they have any community fairs.

There is as yet but little relationship between the amount of industrial development and the number of community clubs and fairs in these four counties. However, such clubs and fairs are generally organized, when they exist, by County Agents. Hence, taken as a whole it appears that industrial development stimulates such organizations by assisting in keeping County Agents in the counties.

Local Farmers' Institutes. The eight communities of Knox in 1926 had no local farmers' institutes, but they could come to the one held at the University of Tennessee. The eight communities of Anderson had no farmers' institutes, and there were none closer to them than Knoxville, (Table #63)

The eight communities of Knox in 1896 had an average of 0.13 farmers' institutes, but in 1926 they had none. (Table #64) Since the East Tennessee Farmers' Convention is held in Knox County, these communities can come to that institute quite easily.

Table #83 shows that the eight communities of Hawkind, in 1925, had

no farmers' institutes while the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 0.38 farmers institutes per community.

In 1914 neither the Hawkins nor the Sullivan communities had farmers' institutes.

Several years ago it was the practice of the College of Agriculture to hold local Farmers' Institutes at various points over the state. This practice has now to a large extent been abandoned and other forms of extension work substituted for it, the institute work being largely concentrated into three large annual regional conventions. Were local institutes still being held as formerly the industrial areas would undoubtedly have more than the inaccessible areas for they are much better supplied with County Agents who would promote them.

Number of Livestock Associations. There were no livestock associations in either the Knox or Anderson communities in 1926, as shown in Table #63.

The eight communities of Knox in 1896 had an average of 0.3 livestock associations but had none in 1926. (Table #64) The eight communities of Anderson did not have a livestock association in 1906 and did not have any in 1926. Increasing the amount of industrial ddvelopment does not necessarily increase the number of livestock associations. (Table #65)

The eight communities of Hawkins, in 1925, had no livestock associations and the eight communities of Sullivan had none. This is shown in Table #83. As is shown in Table #84, in 1914 there were no livestock associations in either the Hawkins or the Sullivan sections.

This shows that industrial development had not as yet affected the number of livestock associations to any great extent in these counties.

Boys' and Girls' Clubs. The eight communities of Knox in 1926 had

an average of 1.5 boys' and girls' clubs and the eight communities of Anderson averaged the same. This is shown in Table #63.

The eight communities of Knox had no boys' and girls' clubs in 1896 but the eight communities of Anderson in 1906 had an average of 0.13 clubs. (Table #64).

We found the number of clubs but do not have data showing the number of boys and girls in each club. Hence we do not know which of the above had the largest number of club members.

As is shown in Table #70, the four most accessible communities of Knox had an average of two boys' and girls' clubs, and the four least accessible communities had only an average of one club. There is no difference in the number of boys'and girls'clubs in the four most and the four least accessible communities of Anderson, an average of 1.5 clubs in each section.

The eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 had an average of 0.5 boys' and girls' clubs and the eight communities of Sullivan had an average of 2 clubs per community. This is shown in Table #83. In 1914 there were no boys' and girls' clubs in either Hawkins or Sullivan communities. (Table #84)

If we had the number of club members in Hawkins and Sullivan communities it would mean more than the number of clubs. There may be several members in one club or there may be a club with only a few members in it.

The reason there are more boys and girls' clubs in the more accessible counties and areas is that the counties with manufacturing are more likely to have a county agent; and this agent does more work in the more accessible and more progressive communities.

Number of Social Clubs; Fraternal Orders. The eight communities of Knox had an average of 0.38 social clubs in 1926 and the eight communities of Anderson averaged 0.3. In 1896 the eight communities of Knox had an average

of 2.25 fraternal orders, and in 1906 the eight communities of Anderson averaged only 0.25 fraternal orders per community. This is shown in Table #63.

In 1896 the eight communities of Knox had no social clubs and in 1926 they averaged only 0.38 social clubs per community. In 1896 the Knox communities averaged 0.63 fraternal orders and in 1926 had increased until they averaged 2.25 fraternal orders per community. This is shown in Table #64.

In 1906 the eight communities of Anderson had no social clubs. In 1926 they averaged only 0.3 social clubs per community. In 1906 the eight communities of Anderson averaged 0.25 fraternal orders, and they averaged the same number in 1926 (0.25)

In 1926 the four most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 0.75 social clubs and the four least accessible communities had no social clubs. The four most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 3 fraternal orders and the four least accessible communities averaged only 1.5 fraternal orders per community. (Table #70)

As the amount of manufacturing increases the number of fraternal orders increased for two reasons: (1) there are more people to belong to the order; and (2) they can make a living for the family easier after the manufacturing has developed and therefore the people would have more time to mix with each other at a social or fraternal order, as well as having more money with which to pay dues.

The eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 had no social clubs nor did the Sullivan communities. The Hawkins communities averaged 1 fraternal order and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged only 0.6 fraternal orders. (Table #83)

In 1914 there were no social clubs in either the Hawkins or the Sullivan communities.

The eight communities of Hawkins had an average of 0.5 fraternal orders

and the eight Sullivan communities had an average of 0.14 fraternal orders. (Table #84)

The eight Hawkins communities had a larger number of fraternal orders than the eight Sullivan communities. This was true to a larger extent in 1914 than it was in 1925. Industry had been developed such a short while in Sullivan that it had not as yet had much effect on number of fraternal orders.

Number of Volumes in Community Library. Community libraries are not well developed in either of the four counties studied; that is, Knox, Anderson, Hawkins and Sullivan. The eight communities of Knox had no volumes in community libraries in 1896 and they still had none in 1926. The eight communities of Anderson had no volumes in community library in 1926, but in 1906 they averaged 0.13 volumes per community. Tables #63, #64, #65.

In 1925 there were no volumes in community libraries in the eight communities of Hawkins but there were an average of 12.5 volumes in the eight communities of Sullivan. In 1914 there were no volumes in community libraries at all, in either group of communities. This is shown in Tables #83 and #84.

As manufacturing developed in Sullivan there was a rapid increase in number of books in community libraries. Perhaps the reason this rural community development did not come in Knox communities was that they were closer enough to Knoxville to use the city library.

Consolidated Schools. The real change in the number of schools due to consolidation was shown in the chapter on schools. The eight communities of Knox in 1926 averaged 0.75 consolidated schools per community and the eight communities of Anderson averaged 0.63. (Table #63).

The eight communities of Knox in 1896 had no consolidated schools and the eight communities of Anderson in 1906 had an average of 0.13 consolidated

schools. (Table #64 and #65)

The four most accessible communities of Knox in 1926 averaged one consolidated school per community (that is, an average of two schools had been put together to form one) and the four least accessible communities averaged only 0.5 consolidated schools, or just one-half as many as had the most accessible communities. The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 0.75 consolidated schools and the four least accessible communities had an average of only 0.25 consolidated schools, or just 1/3 as many as had the four most accessible.

The eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 had an average of only 0.13 consolidated schools and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 0.4 consolidated schools. In 1914 there were no consolidated schools in either Hawkins or Sullivan Counties. These data are shown in Tables #83 and #84.

There is a very close relationship between the amount of manufacturing and the number of consolidated schools. As the industry develops, the number of one-room schools drop off, due to two or more consolidating to form one larger school. This consolidation is a result of several other things; when a community has manufacturing the people are more prosperous. When a people become prosperous they want better schools; they find that they must consolidate in order to have the best of schools; and already the roads have been made better, due to manufacturing. So this makes the school consolidation possible.

Recreational Clubs. One of the greatest needs in our rural communities of Tennessee and other states as well is good wholesome recreation. This can best be had through rural recreational clubs. There are too few recreational clubs in all our communities. The eight communities of Knox in 1926 averaged 0.38 recreational clubs, and the eight communities of

Anderson averaged only 0.13 clubs per community.

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 0.75 recreational clubs and the four least accessible communities had none. The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 0.25 recreational clubs and the four least accessible communities had none. This is shown in Tables #70 and #71.

The eight communities of Hawkins and the eight communities of Sullivan had no recreational clubs in 1914 and they still had none in 1925. (Tables #83 and #84)

In Knox and Anderson County, there is a relationship between recreational clubs and amount of manufacturing. That is, Knox had much more manufacturing than Anderson and Knox had three times as many recreational clubs. Also in the most accessible communities of both Knox and Anderson were found all the recreational clubs. That is, the least accessible communities of these two counties had no recreational clubs.

CHAPTER IV.

FINANCIAL OPPORTUNITIES.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Credit Facilities Available. The average distance to a bank for the eight communities of Knox in 1926 was 7.7 miles while the distance to bank averaged only 6.5 miles for the Anderson communities. Since the day of the automobile distance is no longer a problem because a man can go much farther than either of these distances and back in one-half day. In both Knox and Anderson Counties every community had plenty of credit.

Although the communities of Anderson had plenty of credit the interest rate was higher than in Knox. The Knox communities had an average interest rate of 7.63% and the Anderson communities had a rate of 8.25%. Men needing a small amount of money usually must borrow it from a local man and pay a higher interest, as he often does not have credit at the bank. In both the Knox and Anderson communities there was an average of one farm loan association. These data are shown in Table #94.

The average distance to a bank for the eight communities of Knox in 1896 was 10.7 miles and for the eight communities of Anderson in 1906 6.5 miles. In 1896 in the Knox section only an average of 0.125 communities had plenty of farm credit. In 1906 none of the eight Anderson communities had plenty of credit, this being a year when there was a general money panic. For the eight communities of Knox there were no data for 1896 and there were no data in 1906 for the Anderson communities. This is shown in Tables #95 and #96.

The four most accessible communities of Knox had an average distance of 7.5 miles to a bank and the four least accessible communities had an average of 7.8 miles. In both the most and the least accessible communities there were plenty of credit available. The interest rate was slightly higher in the least accessible communities, this being 7.5% for the most and 7.8% for the least accessible communities.

Every community in each county had one farm loan association. That made an average of one for the most accessible communities and one for the least accessible communities. This is shown in Table #101. There was no relation between industrial development and the distance to banks. This is a very small matter, however. But when we notice the interest rate we find that the Knox communities had a lower interest rate than Anderson. In both counties the interest rate was higher in the four least accessible communities than it was in the four most accessible communities. Where the rate of interest is lower it is evident that there is more money available.

For the eight communities of Hawkins County the average distance to a bank in 1925 was 6.8 miles and only an average of 5.9 miles for the eight Sullivan communities. Both Hawkins and Sullivan communities had a fair amount of credit available. The interest rate for the Hawkins communities was 7.0% and for the Sullivan communities an average of only 6.5%. Both counties had an average of one farm loan association.per community. These data are shown in Table #114.

In 1914 the average distance to a bank for the eight communities of Hawkins was only 6.8 and for the eight in Sullivan an average of 14.1 miles. More than twice as much credit was available in Hawkins, there being an average of 0.8 communities having plenty of credit in Hawkins and only an average of 0.3 in Sullivan. The interest rate was the same for both Hawkins and Sullivan communities, being 7.0% in both at that time.

There were no data in either the Hawkins or the Sullivan communities in regard to farm loan associations. These data are shown in Table #115.

The development of industry in Sullivan County has changed the distance to a bank from 14.1 in 1914 to only 5.9 in 1925, whereas the distance to a bank in Hawkins was still the same in 1925 as it was in 1914. The amount of credit seemed to be in favor of the Hawkins communities in 1914 but in 1925 there was more credit available in Sullivan, shown by a lower rate of interest. We cannot tell which county has the best service from farm loan associations, as both had an average of one association per community.

It appears that industrial development has a decided effect in reducing interest rates. This is further borne out when we note that the interest rate on farm loans is very much lower in the industrial area of New England than it is in the strictly agricultural areas of the West and South.

Even Distribution of Wealth. Number Rich People; Number Poor People. This is a rather hard point to get correct data on. It is hard to know how much or how little a man is worth. That is, one man may make a larger showing with $5,000 than some other man would with $10,000, or one man might give up when he yet had property and call for help, while the other man may hold out a long time after all of his money is gone.

In 1926 the eight communities of Knox were said to have an average of 2.5 rich people, while the eight Anderson communities had none. The Knox communities had an average of 3.13 real poor people while the Anderson communities averaged 7.13, or more than twice as many. (Table #94)

A rich person is no drawback to a community. In fact, if he is the right kind of man he is worth a great deal to the community. A real poor

man, no matter how good he is, is not usually an asset in a community, because the community is likely to have to support him.

In Table #101 we find there are an average of 5.0 real poor people for the four most accessible communities of Knox and only 1.25 for the least accessible. The number of rich people is larger in the four most accessible communities. That is, the most accessible communities averaged 0.5 and the least accessible communities had none.

For the four most accessible communities of Anderson there was an average of 4.25 real poor people and an average of 10.0 for the four least accessible communities. (Table #102)

The eight communities of Hawkins had no rich people in 1925, while the eight Sullivan communities averaged 0.25 rich people per community. There was one real poor person in the eight communities of Hawkins and no poor people in the eight communities of Sullivan. (Table #114)

In 1914 there were no rich people in the eight Hawkins communities and only an average of 0.13 rich people for the eight communities of Sullivan. (Table #115)

This indicates that the counties with the least manufacturing had the largest number of real poor people. That is, as industry develops the number of real poor people diminishes. This is because many people who would probably always be poor if they depended on farming can work at an industry and some enough to get out of the "real poor" class.

Market for Bulky Products: Extent Available, Extent Used. Such things as ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc. could not of course be made more abundant because of industrial development. That is, if these things are not already present in an area they will bet be present after the industry develops.

But there is a larger amount of some of these products used or sold after industrial development takes place. A man in a strictly agricultural area may be forced to sell timber that would bring him more in a few years, if he has to have the money, but if he lives in an industrial area he can work at town and earn this money and thus let his timber stand. This might also be true with ore. If there is but a small profit on selling ore at present, it may be wise to leave the ore and work at the industrial plant to earn the much needed money for the time being.

The eight communities of Knox had an average of 1.6 products available, and the eight communities of Anderson averaged only one product. The eight Knox communities used or sold an average of 0.57 products, and the eight Anderson communities used or sold an average of 0.86 products. (Table #94)

The eight Knox communities in 1896 averaged 1.5 products available and the Anderson communities in 1906 averaged one product. The Knox communities used or sold an average of 0.5 products in 1896 and the eight communities of Anderson used or sold an average of 0.75 products in 1906.

The four most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 1.5 products available and the least accessible had an average of 1.7 products. The most accessible used or sold 0.66 products and the least accessible only 0.5 products. (Table #101).

The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged one product available and the four least accessible averaged the same. The four most accessible of Anderson used or sold an average of one product and the least accessible only 0.66 products. (Table #102)

The eight communities of Hawkins averaged 2.5 products available and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 3.0 products available. The Hawkins communities used or sold an average of 1.33 products and the eight communities of Sullivan used or sold an average of 1.5 products. If we knew

just what kind of products are found in each area it would give additional light on the subject.

Extent Local Industries Was Developed.

a. Number of employees at local industry. The eight communities of Knox County had an average of 10.28 employees at local industry in 1926 and the eight Anderson communities averaged only 7.84 employees (Table #94) In 1896 the eight communities of Knox averaged 18.55 employees at local industries and the eight Anderson communities of Anderson averaged only 3.43 employees at local industry in 1906.

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged about the same number of employees as did the four least accessible communities. The average for the most accessible was 10.4 and the average for the least accsssible communities was 10.17 employees. This is shown in Table #101.

The eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 averaged 10.63 employees at local industry, while the eight communities of Sullivan averaged only 2.25 employees. No data for 1914.(Tables #114 and #115) In a general statement, we cannot say that there is any relation between industrial development and number of employees at local industries out a few miles from the industrial center.

In some cases the number of employees would increase, due to development of local industries, and in other cases it would decrease. That is, if the central industry needed some bulky product back in the community it would cause a larger number of employees. but on the other hand, if this local industry were not producing anything that the larger industry needed, then the wage paid at larger industry is apt to be higher, causing many to leave the local industry. Too, there would be less need for such a thing as a saw mill, because the farmer does not have to sell his timber to pay tax, or buy food, because he can work at the larger industry and raise the money

in that way.

a. Condition of work at local industries. The percentage condition of the working was just the same for the eight communities of Knox as it was for the eight communities of Anderson, being 60% in both counties. In 1896 the percentage condition of work for the Knox communities was the same as it was in 1926, that is, 60%. In 1906 the condition of work for the eight Anderson communities was 60%, just the same as in 1926. This is shown in Tables #94, #95, and #96.

There was no difference in condition of work for the most and least accessible communities of either Knox or Anderson Counties.

The condition of work of local industries was just the same for the Hawkins communities as it was for the Sullivan communities in 1925. That is, it was 80% in both sets of communities. In 1914 there were no data for Hawkins, but the condition in Sullivan was 80%, just the same as 1925 (Tables #114 and #115)

In both groups of counties this shows that there was no relation between the amount of industrial development and the condition of work.

It was rather hard to get at the real condition of work in the various sections, especially as the same set of men had not worked at all of them. That is, one group of men might think their working conditions were good, because they were so much better than they had been used to, and another group might think conditions were poor because they did not want to work.

c. Daily wages paid at local industries. The average daily wage paid by local industries for the eight communities of Knox in 1926 was $2.13. The average wage paid for the eight communities of Anderson was only $1.88, a difference of 25¢ per day. The average daily wage for the Knox section in 1896 was $0.84, while the average wage for the Anderson communities in 1906 was $0.96. This is shown in Tables #94 and #95.

The eight communities of Hawkins averaged $2.42 as a daily wage at

local industry in 1925 and the Sullivan communities averaged $2.56 or 14¢ more than the Hawkins communities. In 1924 there were no industrial employees in the Hawkins communities. Therefore they had no daily wage. For the Sullivan communities a wage of $1.00 per day was paid.(Tables #114 and #115) This shows a direct relation between the amount of industrial development and the rate of wage at local industries. That is, the counties having the largest amount of industrial development had the highest daily wage at local industry.

d. Amount of capital invested and weekly payroll at local industry. The eight communities of Knox in 1926 had an average capital of $6,713 in local industries and the eight communities of Anderson averaged only $1,363 or just a little more than 1/5 as much. The average weekly payroll of the Knox communities was $131.30 and only $93.50 for the Anderson community. This is shown in Table #94.

In 1896 the Knox communities had only an average of $800 capital for local industries and the Anderson communities in 1906 averaged $1,250 capital for local industry. That showed that Anderson communities increased only $113 in capital for local industries from 1906 to 1926. These data are shown in Tables #95 and #96.

Table #101 shows the four most accessible communities to have only an average of $550 capital for local industry and the least accessible communities to average $12,875, or more than twenty times as much. The most accessible communities had only 1/20 as much capital, but the weekly payroll is about the same, being $125 for the most accessible communities and $137 for the least accessible communities.

Table #114 shows that the Hawkins communities averaged $312,687 capital for local industry and the Sullivan communities averaged only $687.50 in 1925. The average weekly payroll was $153.75 for Hawkins and only $34.50 for Sullivan.

As is shown in Table #115, there was no local industry in the Hawkins section in 1914. There was an average capital of $571.00 for local industry in the Sullivan communities in 1914. No data was available as to weekly payroll in those counties in 1914.

This shows no relation between industrial development and the amount of capital for local industry several miles away. Also no relation between the local weekly payroll and nearness to a central industry.

Outside Work. Extent available, people so working, length of time each works. The eight communities of Knox in 1926, as is shown in Table #94, had 82.5% sufficient outside work available and the eight Anderson communities had only 76.25% available. That is, if every person in the whole community who wanted outside work had been able to find it, then it would be 100% available. The eight Knox communities averaged 39.2 people working at outside work, and the eight Anderson communities averaged only 14.9 persons; that is, more than twice as many working in the Knox communities as were in the Anderson communities. Each person working in Knox averaged 10.5 months, while in Anderson they averaged 12.0 months. That is, in Anderson all the labor was regular, while in Knox many farmers would make a crop and then work the rest of the year in town.

In 1896 work was only 50% available in the Knox communities and only 45% in 1906 for the eight communities of Anderson. In 1896 there were only an average of 3.2 people working at outside work for the Knox section and an average of 4.9 persons in Anderson in 1906.

Each person working in the Knox section averaged 6 months and the average in Anderson was 7.2 months. (Tables #95 and #96)

In 1926 work was 87.5% available for the four most accessible communities of Knox and only 77.5% available in the four least accessible communities of Knox. There were an average of 48.8 persons working at outside work for the

four most accessible communities and only 29.5 persons working for the four least accessible communities. The length of time that each person worked was the same for both sections, that is, 10.5 months in each.

The amount of work available for the eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 was 67% and the amount of work available for the Sullivan communities was 100%. In other words, every person really wanting work found it.

There were an average of 41 people working at outside work for the Hawkins communities and an average of 36.4 for the Sullivan communities. The people of Hawkins averaged working 12 months and those of Sullivan averaged 10.5. This is shown in Table #114.

In 1914 work was 40% available, in Hawkins, and 49% available in Sullivan.

There is a very close relation between industrial development and the amount of work that is available. This was shown by Knox having a much larger percentage of outside work available than did Anderson and also Sullivan a much larger percentage than Hawkins. Sullivan showed to have more work available than did Knox. This was because Sullivan's development had taken place so recently that such large numbers of people had not moved in as yet.

In general, as industry develops, the number of people working at outside work increases.

The average length of time for each worker to work at outside work is less than 12 months in the industrial communities. That is, a large number of farmers make crops and work at industrial plants the remainder of the year.

PART II.

SOCIOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

CHAPTER V.

POPULATION

*****

CHAPTER VI.

EDUCATION.

****

CHAPTER VII.

RURAL HEALTH

****

CHAPTER VIII.

CHURCHES.

****

CHAPTER IX.

RURAL RECREATION.

****

CHAPTER X.

MISCELLANEOUS.

CHAPTER V.

POPULATION

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Number and Increase in Population. The eight communities of Knox county in 1926 had an average population of 987.5 per community, and the eight communities of Anderson averaged 445 people per community. This is more than twice as many for the Knox section. This is shown in Table #125.

In 1896 the Knox communities averaged 887.5 people per community, or 100 less than in 1926, while the eight communities of Anderson in 1906 averaged 426.8 people per community, or an average of 18.2 people per community less than in 1926. This is shown in Tables #126 and #127. The four most accessible communities of Knox in 1926 averaged 1,637 people per community and the four least accessible communities averaged only 337.5 people per community. Table #132.

The four least accessible communities of Knox averaged 337.5 people per community and the four most accessible of Anderson averaged 258.75. That is, there was an average of 78.75 more in the four least of Knox than in the four most accessible of Anderson. (Table #135)

The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 631.25 people per community and the four least accessible of Anderson averaged 258.75 people per community. This is shown in Table #133.

When the whole county of Anderson is compared with the whole community of Knox we find that Anderson in 1920 had 53.5 people per square mile while Knox had 224.1 people per square mile, or more than four times as many. When rural epople are considered we find that Anderson had 53.5 rural people per

square mile and Knox had 69.7, or 16.2 more rural people per square mile in the county of Knox than there was in the county of Anderson. Table #144 shows that the rural population of Knox decreased 17,607 and that the total population increased 18,739 from 1910 to 1920. This means that the urban population increased 36,346. The reason for the spread between urban and rural population was largely due to the Knoxville City limits being extended to take in more people. This increased the number in Knoxville several thousand and decreased the rural population the same number. Between 1910 and 1920 while Knox County increased in population 18,739, Anderson County increased only 581. Anderson had no urban population. This also is shown in Table #144.

The eight communities of Hawkins averaged only 270 people per community, while the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 403 people per community. This is an average of 133 more per community in Sullivan communities. This is shown in Table #145. In 1914 the eight communities of Hawkins averaged 267 people and the Sullivan communities averaged 354, or 87 more people for Sullivan then. (Table #146)

When the whole county of Hawkins is compared with the whole county of Sullivan we find 83.2 people per square mile in Sullivan and only 47.5 people per square mile in Hawkins. When rural population alone is considered we find that Sullivan has 51.7 rural people per suqare mile and Hawkins has only 47.5 people. Between 1910 and 1920 the population of Sullivan increased 8,139 and the population of Hawkins decreased 669. The rural population of Sullivan increased 1,548. This is found in Table #153.

The development of industry in Sullivan has caused a greater prosperity. Most all of its population has remained and several others have moved in. For several miles from Kingsport many people live on small farms, owning a cow, chickens, etc., and perhaps their families cultivate small crops, while

some members of the families work in town most of the time. That is, some members of the families may work in town and the others work on the farms. This has caused an actual increase of rural people.

Table #153 shows not only the number of population that increased or decreased, but it shows that the population of Sullivan increased 28.9%, or more than 1/4 of its population, while the population of Hawkins decreased 2.8%. This was between 1910 and 1920.

The 1/3 most manufacturing counties of Tennessee had an average population of 41,715 per county; the 1/3 medium manufacturing averaged 19,396; and the 1/3 least manufacturing averaged 13,437. The population of the 1/3 most manufacturing counties increased 4,655 between 1910 and 1920; the 1/3 medium manufacturing increased 338; and the 1/3 least manufacturing increased only 31. This is shown in Table #154.

Table #155 shows the United States divided into 1/2 most manufacturing states and 1/2 least manufacturing. This shows that the 1/2 most manufacturing states had an average population of 3,587,350 per state and the 1/2 least manufacturing averaged only 1,032,342 per state, or less than 1/3 as many as the 1/2 most manufacturing states. The population of the 1/2 most manufacturing increased 455,582, while the 1/2 least manufacturing states increased but 112,176.

In this we find a direct relation between amount of industrial development and total population. This holds true for the special communities, for the whole county, for the group of counties, and for the whole United States.

Whence Came Incomers; Why Came Incomers; and Character and Sex of Incomers. The data for Anderson and Knox communities, as to whence came incomers, why they came, and character and sex of incomers, could not be tabulated but it is presented verbally just after Tables #125 to #143.

Also, as is shown in Tables #145 to #152, the data on whence came in-

comers, why they came, and the character and sex of incomers in Hawkins and Sullivan Counties could not be tabulated, but is presented verbally just following the tables above mentioned.

Number of Foreigners. The eight communities of Knox had an average of only 0.75 foreigners in 1926, while the eight communities of Anderson had an average of 1.0 foreigner per community. (Table #125) Between 1896 and 1926 the number of foreigners decreased in Knox communities from 7.25 to 0.75, and the number of foreigners for Anderson communities decreased from 2.5 to 1.0 between 1906 and 1926. This is shown in Tables #126 and #127. The four most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 1.3 foreigners in 1926 and the four least accessible communities averaged only 0.25 foreigners. The four most accessible communities of Anderson had no foreigners, and the four least accessible communities averaged 2.0 foreigners per community. This is shown in Tables #132 and #133.

The least accessible communities of Knox averaged 0.25 foreigners and the four most accessible communities of Anderson had no foreigners. (Table #135)

When we compare the whole county of Knox with the whole county of Anderson, the number of foreign-born is much greater in Knox. This is because it takes in the city of Knoxville. Knox had 950 foreign-born and Anderson had only 47. This is not so bad when we consider that Anderson had only 1/6 as many people as Knox.

In 1925 there were no foreigners in either the eight Hawkins or the eight Sullivan communities and the same was true in 1914. This is shown in Table #145 and #146.

The whole county of Sullivan had more foreign-born population than the county of Hawkins. This is because we take in the cities of Sullivan, and there are no cities in Hawkins. Sullivan had 128 foreign-born whites and

Hawkins only 10. (Table #153)

The 1/3 counties of Tennessee having most manufacturing had an average of 453 foreign-born whites in 1920; the 1/3 medium manufacturing averaged 35 foreign-born whites; and the 1/3 least mamufacturing averages only 10 foreign-born whites. (Table #154)

The 1/2 most manufacturing states of the United States averaged 513,464 foreign-born whites per state in 1920 and the 1/2 least manufacturing states averaged only 55,585 foreign-born whites. This shows up very poorly for the 1/2 most manufacturing states until we consider the percentage. Then it looks different. The 1/2 most manufacturing states had 13.0% of population foreign-born and the 1/2 least manufacturing states averaged 9%, or only 4% more in the most manufacturing states.

While studying the rural communities there was no relationship found between the amount of industrial development and number of foreign-born, but when we compare whole counties, groups of counties, and groups of states, we find a relation there. That is, the more mamufacturing the larger the number of foreign-born in the cities of the area. This is because the foreign-born locate in the cities, and the states with the most manufacturing have the largest number of city population. A very large percentage of the foreigners remain in the city. The foreigner cannot fit into the rural life because work on American farms takes years of training before the worker becomes efficient.

Number of Negroes. The eight communities of Knox in 1923 had an average of 10.9 negroes per community while the eight communities of Anderson had an average of 5.9 negroes per community. When we consider that the eight communities of Knox had more than twice as many people, we see that the percentage of population that was negro was higher in the Anderson section than it was in the Knox section. This is shown in Table #125.

The average number of negroes decreased from 28.5 in 1896 to 10.9 in 1926 for the eight communities of Knox. The total population increased nearly 3% and the negroes decreased about 65%. (Table #126) The average number of negroes decreased from 9 in 1906 to 5.9 in 1926 in Anderson. This is a decrease of about 33%. In 1920 the whole county of Knox had 11.8% of its population negroes while the whole county of Anderson had 4.7% of its population negroes. (Table #144)

The percentage of population that was negro was less in the eight Knox communities than it was in the eight Anderson communities, but much higher in the whole county of Knox because Knoxville is included in it, and there is always large numbers of negroes in cities because city work suits their disposition and talents better than country work.

The eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 averaged 5.85 negroes per community and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged only 1.88 negroes per community. This is shown in Table #145. There was the same average number of negroes per community in Hawkins in 1925 as there was in 1914, but the number of negroes for the Sullivan communities decreased from an average of 3.75 in 1914 to 1.88 in 1925. (Tables #147 and #148) This shows that in a section of no manufacturing the negroes remained the same, while in the other section where industry had developed the number of negroes decreased, while at the same time the number of whites greatly increased.

The total number of negroes was gre ter for Sullivan County than it was for Hawkins, being 1,691 for Sullivan and 1,201 for Hawkins. However the percentage of population that was negro was larger for Hawkins. This is 4.7% for Sullivan and 5.2% for Hawkins. (Table #153)

The 1/3 most manufacturing counties of Tennessee had, in 1920, 13.8% of the population negro. The 1/3 medium manufacturing counties had 13% negro, and the 1/3 least manufacturing had 12.7% negro. This shows only 1.1% more negroes for the 1/3 most manufacturing counties than was found

for the 1/3 least. (Table #154) Table #155 shows that the 1/2 most manufacturing states of the United States had only 7.9% of population negroes, while the 1/2 least manufacturing states had 12.5%.

This shows that in Tennessee the development of industry in an area does not increase the percentage of rural population that is negro, but on the other hand decreases it.

Percentage Increase in Population. The eight communities of Knox, between 1896 and 1926, increased 2.9% in population and the eight communities of Anderson between 1906 and 1926 increased 4.6%. The population of the four most accessible communities of Knox increased 14.4, while the population of the four least accessible communities decreased 8.6%. The population of the four most accessible communities of Anderson increased 8.8% and the population of the four least accessible communities increased only 0.4%. These data are shown in Tables #132 and #133. Table #144 shows that Anderson County as a whole, between 1910 and 1920, increased her population 3.3% and the population of the whole county of Knox increased 19.9%.

Table #145 shows that the population for the eight communities of Hawkins increased but 1.2% between 1914 and 1925, while the population of the eight communities of Sullivan increased 14%.

The population for the whole county of Sullivan increased 28.9% and the population of the whole county of Hawkins decreased 2.8%. This is shown in Table #153.

The population for the 1/3 most manufacturing counties, as is shown in Table #154, increased 11.06% between 1910 and 1920. The population of the 1/3 medium manufacturing counties increased 3.14% and the population of the 1/3 least manufacturing increased only 0.29%.

The amount of increase in population between 1910 and 1920 for the

1/2 most manufacturing, and the 1/2 least manufacturing states of the United States is very near the same. It was 16.2% for the 1/2 most and 16.5% for the 1/2 least.

Although there were two exceptions to the statement that there was a close relation between the amount of industrial development, and percentage of increase in population in general it is true. These exceptions were but slight, one of them being the eight Knox communities increased less than the eight Anderson communities, and the 1/2 most manufacturing states lacked 0.3% increasing as much as the 1/2 least manufacturing.

Cause of Increase or Decrease in Population and Where Removals Have Gone. A discussion of the cause of increase or decrease in population and where removals have gone will be found just following Tables #125 to #152.

Percentage of Removals Who Left the County. As to the percentage of removals who left the county there were no data for either the eight communities of Anderson or the eight communities of Knox. This was true for Knox for both 1896 and 1926, and also true of Anderson for both 1906 and 1926. This is shown in Tables #125, #126 and #127.

Table #145 shows that in 1925 6.2% of removals had left the county, from the eight communities of Hawkins, and only 1.8% had left the county from the eight Sullivan communities. Table #146 shows that there were no data for Hawkins and Sullivan communities in 1914.

The reason that such a large percentage of removals of Hawkins left the county was that there was no manufacturing plants in the county for them to go to, and they went to other counties to get work. Very few people left Sullivan County because they could find all the work they wanted within the county.

Character and Sex of Removals. As is shown in Tables #125 to #143, the data on character and sex of removals for Knox and Anderson communities could not be tabulated, but it is presented verbally just following each of the above mentioned tables. It is not easy to get the exact data as to character, because people hesitate to give such information to strangers. A large percentage of those leaving Anderson were young men and unmarried girls. They could not have the things at home that they desired, and could not find work to do near enough home to return home at night, so they went to industrial centers.

Of the very few who left the Knox section, a much smaller percentage of them were single men and girls than was the case in Anderson. This is because the young folks of the Knox communities saw a better opportunity for themselves in their home county than did those of Anderson County. A very much larger percentage of those leaving Hawkins County were single men and girls than was true of Sullivan communities. This is written up just following Tables #145 to #152.

There was such a small opportunity for a young person to earn money in the Hawkins communities that those who were not content to do without lots of the conveniences of modern life went to industrial centers to work. Young folks in the Sullivan communities could go to Kingsport and work and return to their homes at night. They could have money to buy those things which seems that present day young folks must have if they are to feel that home is worth while.

Number of People Moving into Community from Outside the County. The data on this point for Knox and Anderson communities could not be tabulated, at the time the table was made, but it is presented verbally just after Tables #125 to #143.

Table #145 shows that the average number moving into Hawkins communi-

ties from outside the county was 1.13 per community, while the average number moving into Sullivan communities was 20.5 per community.

Table #146 shows that we have no data for 1914 as to the number of people moving into either the Hawkins or the Sullivan communities from outside the county.

Number Moving into Community. The data on the number of people moving into the communities is presented verbally just after Tables #125 to #143.

The eight communities of Hawkins had several people moving out, and also an average of 4.5 people per community moving in. During the same period of time there were an average of 20.7 people per community moving into the Sullivan communities. This is shown in Table #145.

There were no data for either Hawkins or Sullivan communities in 1914. (Table #146)

CHAPTER VI.

EDUCATION.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Kind of School House. The condition in Anderson and Knox was an exception to the usual rule. That is, there has been a lot more building of school houses in Anderson than was needed, and more than their financial condition warranted. Though Knox was much more able to build large school buildings than was Anderson, yet Anderson has about as many expensive buildings as has Knox. These data are presented verbally must following Tables #156 to #174.

Neither Hawkins nor Sullivan have built expensive school buildings; but Sullivan is some in advance of Hawkins in this respect. These data are presented verbally just following Tables #176 to #183.

Number of Rooms in Schools. Table #156 shows that the eight communities of Knox averaged 5 rooms per school in 1926 and that the eight communities of Anderson averaged 4.4 rooms. This is only a difference of 0.6 rooms in favor of Knox communities, but some of the Anderson communities had many more rooms than they needed.

The average number of rooms per school increased from 2.3 in 1896 to 50 in 1926 for the eight communities of Knox. (Table #137) The average number of rooms per school for the Anderson section increased from 1.3 in 1906 to 4.4 in 1926. If the Anderson community people had not built more rooms than they needed they would not have more than an average of 3 rooms. (Table #158)

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 7.5 rooms per school and the four least accessible averaged only 2.5 rooms. (Table #163) The average number of rooms for the four most accessible communities of Anderson was only 4.3 and the average number for the four least accessible was 4.5 rooms per school.

Here is shown very clearly the mistake of the building committee. In 1906 the buildings were of 2 to 4 rooms with only 1 teacher. This shows that the buildings were put up with but little thought as to how many students would go there.

We have no data showing the number of rooms per school for the whole county of Knox and of Anderson, but we do find in Table #175 that the average value per elementary school building and heating plant is $3,709 for Anderson County and $7,936 for Knox County. This is less than 1/2 as much for Anderson as for Knox.

The average number of rooms per school for the eight communities of Hawkins was 2.0 and the average number of rooms per school for Sullivan was 2.75.

In 1914 the average number of rooms per school for the Hawkins communities was 1.4 and the average number for Sullivan was 1.82 rooms. We have no data on the number of rooms per school for the whole counties of Hawkins and Sullivan but the percentage of schools that were one-room was 54.2% for Sullivan and 66.0 for Hawkins. Hawkins County had 63 one-room buildings and the Sullivan had only 45. This is shown in Table #184.

Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment. The eight communities of Knox had an average investment in elementary buildings and equipment in 1926 of $10,687.50 and the eight communities of Anderson averaged $9,093.75 per school. This is shown in Table #156. The average investment

for the Knox communities increased from $2,187.80 in 1896 to $10,687.50 in 1926, while the eight Anderson communities increased from $1,826 in 1906 to $9,093.75 in 1926. This is shown in Tables #157 and #158.

The average investment in elementary building and equipment for the four most accessible communities of Knox was $19,750.00 in 1926 and for the four least accessible communities of Knox only $1,625. This is shown in Table #168.

The average investment in elementary buildings and equipment for the four most accessible communities of Anderson was $11,563 and for the four least Accessible of Anderson an average of $6,625 per school. (Table #164)

Table #163 shows that the four least accessible communities of Knox had an average investment in elementary buildings and equipment of $1,625 and the average of the four most accessible of Anderson was $11,563. (Here the $11,563 would not have been more than $8,500 had the building committee built in the bounds of their needs.)

This shows that being close to a medium size manufacturing center had a much greater affect on school investment than being further away from a large industrial center.

Table #175 shows that the average investment in buildings and equipment per school for the whole county of Anderson was $3,709 and for Knox County an average of $7,936 in 1923.

We have no data on the amount of investment in elementary building and equipment for either the eight Hawkins or Sullivan communities in 1925. Also no data for 1914. Tables #176 and #177.

Table #184 shows that Sullivan County as a whole has an average of $2,094 per school invested in building and heating plant, while Hawkins County as a whole averaged only $1,116 per school, or only a little more than 1/2 as much.

The average value of school property per pupil enrolled in 1924 was

$141 for the 1/2 most manufacturing states and $124 for the 1/2 least manufacturing states of the United States. This is shown in Table #186.

In the school communities, in the whole counties, and in the group of states, there is found a close relation between the amount of industrial development and the amount of investment per school, and per student. In other words, the community, the county, or the state that had the most manufacturing also had the largest investment in school buildings and equipment.

Value of School Equipment. The average investment in school equipment for the eight communities of Knox was $1,196.75 in 1926 and only $608.75 for the Anderson communities. This is shown in Table #156. The average value of school equipment for the eight communities of Knox increased from $793.75 in 1896 to $1,196.75 in 1926, while the value of equipment for Anderson County increased from $228.13 in 1906 to $608.75 in 1926. (Tables #157 and #158)

The average value of school equipment for the four most accessible communities of Knox was $1,991 and only an average $402.50 for the four least accessible communities. For the four most accessible communities of Anderson there was an average value of school equipment of $862.50, and only an average of $372.50 for the four least accessible communities. This is shown in Tables #163 and #164.

The average value of school equipment per school, as is shown in Table #168, for the four least accessible communities of Knox was $402.50, and an average of $862.50 for the most accessible of Anderson. This shows that the four most accessible communities of Anderson had more than twice as much school equipment as the four least accessible communities of Knox.

This shows that schools close to a medium manufacturing center are likely to be better equipped than schools some distance from a larger industrial development.

The average value of equipment per pupil enrolled in rural elementary schools was in 1923 $29.33 for the whole county of Anderson and $55.72 for the whole county of Knox, or almost twice as much for Knox. (Table #175) We have no data on the value of school equipment for Hawkins and Sullivan in 1914 or 1925. (Tables #176 and #177) As is shown in Table #184 the whole county of Sullivan, in 1923, had an average of $13.13 per rural person of rural elementary school property, while the whole county of Hawkins had only an average of $6.00.

This shows that both the communities and the counties which had the most manufacturing also had the best equipment for rural schools.

Number of Single Desks. Although single desks are much better than double ones, from this study we found no relation between amount of industrial development and the number of single desks. The probable reason for this is that desks last several years and these communities of Knox and Sullivan already had a supply of double desks. Many of the communities in Sullivan and Hawkins were out of desks at the time single desks became available, so they took the single seats.

Table #156 shows that there were an average of 98.88 single desks per community in the Knox communities and 94.13 for the eight Anderson communities. In 1896 there were no single desks in Knox communities and in 1906 there were none in the Anderson communities. (Tables #177 and #178)

In 1925 there were an average of 62.6 single desks per community in the eight communities of Hawkins County and only 27.5 for the Sullivan communities. This is shown in Table #176. There were no single desks in either the Hawkins or Sullivan communities in 1914. (Table #177).

We have no data as to the number of single desks for either the whole counties or the whole states.

Number of Double Desks per Community. Table #156 shows that the eight communities of Knox averaged 22 double desks per school, and that the eight communities of Anderson averaged 99.5 double desks. (Anderson had many desks that were not needed) Between 1896 and 1926 the eight communities of Knox reduced the average number of double desks from 99.5 to 22.0, replacing with single desks. (Table #157)

The eight communities of Anderson , as is shown in Table #158, increased the number of double desks from 65 in 1906 to 99.5 in 1926. They also had a large number of single desks. In fact they had many more desks than were needed.

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 44 double desks per school, and the four least accessible communities had none. This is shown in Table 163.

The number of double desks for the eight Hawkins communities was 8.14 per school, and 42.28 per school for the Sullivan communities.

In 1914 most of the seats were not desks but benches in Hawkins and Sullivan Counties. There was an average of 10.13 for Hawkins and 9.28 per school for Sullivan.

At that time not so very much relation is shown between the number of double desks and the amount of industrial development.

Enrollment per Teacher. Table #156 shows that in the eight communities of Knox the average enrollment per teacher was 44.9, and that the average enrollment per teacher for the eight Anderson Counties was 39.25.

Table #157 shows that the average enrollment per teacher in Knox was about the same for both 1896 and 1926, being 44.4 in 1896 and 44.9 in 1926. As is shown in Table #158, the eight communities of Anderson decreased in average enrollment per teacher from 41.5 in 1906 to 39.25 in 1926.

The average enrollemtn per teacher for the four most accessible communities of Knox was 47.5 and only an average of 42.25 for the four least accessible communities. (Table #163) The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average enrollment per teacher of 37.75 and the four least accessible communities averaged 42.5. (Table #164)

As is shown in Table #176, the eight communities of Hawkins averaged 43 enrolled per teacher and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged only 40 students per teacher. In 1914 the Hawkins communities had an enrollment of 47 per teacher and Sullivan an average of 41 per teacher. This is shown in Table 177.

School Water Supply. There was a much more satisfactory water supply in the Knox communities than there was in the Anderson communities. This is presented verbally just following Tables #156 and #174.

In 1925 the water supply was not satisfactory in either the Hawkins or the Sullivan communities. This is presented more fully just following Tables #176 to #183.

Number of Volumes in School Library. The eight communities of Knox averaged 101 volumes per school library in 1926 and the eight communities of Anderson averaged 100 volumes per school. (Table #156)

Table #157 shows that the number of volumes per school library for the eight communities of Knox increased from 12.5 in 1896 to 101 in 1926. The average number of volumes per school library for the eight communities of Anderson decreased from 116 in 1906 to 100 in 1926. This is shown in Table #158.

The four most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 104 volumes in each school library, and the four least accessible communities averaged 98 volumes. This is shown in Table #163.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 168 volumes in community library and the four least accessible communities averaged only 31 volumes. (Table #164)

The average number of books in rural school libraries for Anderson County was 3,022 and for the whole of Knox County an average of 3245 books. This gives only an average of 223 books more for Knox, but when we notice the value of books per school, we find the average value of rural school library books was only $1,979 in Anderson while for Knox the average was $3,250 or an average of $1,271 more per school community for Knox County.

As is shown in Table #176, there were an average of 14.43 volumes per school library for the eight communities of Hawkins and an average of 47.8 volumes per school library for the eight communities of Sullivan. Table #177 shows no books at all in either the Hawkins or Sullivan communities in 1914.

There were an average of 3,036 books in rural school libraries in 1924 for the whole county of Sullivan, and an average of 6,389 for the whole county of Hawkins. Also the books of Sullivan were valued at an average of $2,407 per school and for Hawkins an average value of $4,680 per school. (Table #184)

In 1924 the average number of books in rural school libraries was 4,009 for the 1/3 most manufacturing counties of Tennessee, 2,365 for the 1/3 medium manufacturing counties, and 1,512 per county for the 1/3 least manufacturing. This is shown in Table #185.

In the 1/2 most manufacturing states of the Union there were an average of 556 books in public libraries per 1,000 population (1920) and only an average of 461 books per 1,000 population for the 1/2 least manufacturing. This is shown in Table #186.

In every case, except the whole county of Sullivan compared with the

whole county of Hawkins, there was a slight increase in number of books for the community, county, or state having the most industrial development.

Number of Schools Having Medical Inspection. Medical inspection in schools is very important. It is just starting in many places, but it has waited too long to start. A large number of children go through life badly handicapped with some physical defect that could have been remedied had they known it early in life.

The eight communities of Knox averaged 0.75 schools inspected and the Anderson communities averaged only 0.13 of their schools inspected. This is shown in Table #156. In 1896, ax is shown in Table #157, no schools in the Knox communities were inspected, and none in the Anderson communities in 1906. (Table #158)

All the schools of the four most accessible communities of Knox had medical inspection, and only 1/2 were inspected in the four least accessible communities. (Table #163)

In the four most accessible communities of Anderson County there were 25% of the schools that received medical inspection, while none of the schools of the four least accessible communities received medical inspection. (Table #164)

There were no schools having medical inspection in either Hawkins or Sullivan communities in either 1914 or 1925. This is shown in Tables #176 and #177.

There is a close relation shown between the number of schools having medical inspection and the amount of manufacturing. That is, the Knox communities had a larger percentage of schools inspected than did Anderson, and the most accessible communities in each county had a larger percentage of schools inspected than did the least accessible.

Number of Schools Having Dental Inspection. In the eight communities of Knox, as is shown in Table #156, 3/4 of the schools had dental inspection but there were no schools in the Anderson communities having dental inspection.

In 1896 there were no schools in the Knox communities having dental inspection and in 1906 there were no schools in the Anderson communities having dental inspection. (Tables #157 and #158)

The four most accessible communities of Knox had all their schools dental inspected, but only 1/2 of the schools in the four least accessible communities had dental inspection. Neither of the four most or the four least accessible communities of Anderson had their schools dental inspected. (Tables #163 and #164)

None of the schools in either the eight communities of Hawkins or the eight communities of Sullivan had dental inspection in either 1914 or in 1925. This is shown in Tables #176 and #177.

Distance to High School. We have no data as to the distance to high school in either Knox or Anderson Counties for 1926, nor for 1896 in Knox, nor for 1906 in Anderson. This is shown in Tables #156, #157, and #158.

The average distance to a high school for the eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 was 6.4 miles, and only 5.4 miles for the eight communities of Sullivan. In 1914 the average distance to a high school for the Hawkins communities was 6.4 miles but for the eight communities of Sullivan the distance was 13.8 miles. This is shown in Tables #176 and #177.

This shows that as industry developed in Sullivan County the distance to high school decreased from 13.8 miles in 1914 to 5.4 in 1925. There were no manufacturing in Hawkins, and the distance to high school remained the same (6.4 miles) for both 1914 and 1925.

Amount Invested in High School Facilities. The high schools of the eight Knox communities had an average investment of $7,719 and the high schools of Anderson County had an average of only $1,900, or more than 4 times as much for Knox. (Table #156)

Table #157 shows that the average investment per high school increased from $250 in 1896 to $7,719 in 1926, for the eight communities of Knox.

The average investment per high school for the eight communities of Anderson increased from $500 in 1906 to $1,900 in 1926. (Table #158)

The average investment per high school for the four most accessible communities of Knox was $15,250, and for the four least accessible communities only $187. This is shown in Table #163.

The average investment per high school for the four most accessible communities of Anderson was $3,800, and there were no high schools in the four least accessible high schools. (Table #164)

The average high school investment for the four least accessible communities of Knox was $187.50 and $3,800 for the four most accessible communities of Anderson. This shows that it is better to be close to a medium well developed industrial center than to be further away from a larger industrial center. (Table #168)

There were no data as to the amount of investment in high schools in Hawkins and Sullivan communities for either 1914 or 1925.

It seems that Knox, a much more industrialized county than Anderson, has four times as much invested in high schools as Anderson communities per community; the four most accessible communities of Knox had more than eight times as much invested in high schools as did the four least accessible communities of Knox; and all the high schools were in the four most accessible communities of Anderson. From this we find a direct relation between the amount of industrial development and the amount invested in ghih schools.

Percentage of Elementary Enrollment in High School. Table #156 shows that 17.5% of the elementary enrollment for the eight communities of Knox were in high school in 1926, and only 13.75% of the Anderson communities. The percentage of elementary enrollment in high school has increased from 9.9% in 1896 to 17.5 in 1926 for the Knox communities. The percentage for Anderson County has increased from 9.4% in 1906 to 13.75% in 1926. The four most accessible communities of Knox had 24% of the elementary enrollment in high school, and the four least accessible had only 11% of elementary enrollment in high school. (Table #163)

As is shown in Table #164, the four most accessible communities of Anderson had 19.5% of elementary enrollment in high school and only 8% of elementary enrollment of the four least accessible communities of Anderson.

The percentage of elementary enrollment that was in high school was much greater for the four most accessible communities of Anderson than it was for the four least accessible of Knox. The percentage was 11% for the least accessible communities of Knox and 19.5% for the four most accessible of Anderson. This is shown in Table #168. Here we see that a much larger percentage of the children go to high school in the communities that are accessible to a medium well developed industrial center, than in communities further away from a very much larger industrial development.

Taking the whole county of Anderson, only 5.6% of the total school enrollment were enrolled in high school in 1923 while there were 14.2% of the whole of Knox County's school children enrolled in high school. Thus there was almost three times as large a percentage in high school in Knox as in Anderson. (Table #175)

Table #176 shows that in the eight communities of Hawkins there were 10.85% of the elementary enrollment in high school, and 5.3% of the Sullivan communities. In 1914 the eight communities of Hawkins had 7.07% of the elementary enrollment in high school and the eight Sullivan communities had no

high school attendance. (Table #177)

Going to high school is something that requires a considerable lapse of time to develop to the point where there are many in attendance. As Hawkins got a very large start of Sullivan it still remained a little ahead in 1925. Between 1914 and 1925 Sullivan increased its percentage from 0 to 5.3% while Hawkins gained only from 7.07 to 10.85. This shows that Sullivan communities increased much more rapidly than Hawkins.

We have no data for the whole county of Sullivan to show the percentage of total enrollment that was enrolled in High School. But for the whole county of Hawkins 5.8% of the total enrollment were in high school.

In 1/2 most manufacturing states of the United States 14.7% of the total school enrollment were in high school in 1924, and only 13.32% of the 1/2 least manufacturing states were in high school. (Table #186).

With the exception of the eight Hawkins and eight Sullivan communities, the communities, counties, and states having the most manufacturing also had the largest percentage of the total school enrollment in high school.

Number in College. The eight communities of Knox in 1926 had an average of 6.9 students in college, and the eight communities of Anderson had an average of only 2.3 per community. This is shown in Table #156. The average number of students who were in college from the eight Knox communities more than doubled between 1896 and 1926. They had an average of 3.3 in 1896 and an average of 6.9 in 1926. (Table #157) The average number of students in college from the eight communities of Anderson increased from 0.4 in 1906 to 2.3 in 1926. This is shown in Table #158.

The four most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 13.3 students in college and the four least accessible communities averaged only 2.0 students per community. (Table #163) As is shown in Table #164, the

average number of students in college from the four most accessible communities of Anderson was 3.3, and only an average of 1.3 for the four least accessible communities.

The four least accessible communities of Anderson had an average of two students in college, while the four most accessible of Anderson averaged 3.3 per community. (Table #168)

Table #176 shows that the eight communities of Hawkins had an average of 1.0 student in college in 1925, while the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 1.3 students. In 1914 the Hawkins communities did not have anyone in college, and the Sullivan communities averaged only 0.29 students. This is shown in Table #177.

This shows that the communities having the most manufacturing had the largest number of students in college. Possibly some of the large difference between the four most and four least accessible communities of Knox was due to the people of the former living near enough to the University of Tennessee to drive easily in mornings and drive home at night. But that could be done in any part of the county were good roads are available.

Special School Needs. The data on special school needs could not be tabulated but are presented verbally for Anderson and Knox Counties just following Tables #156 to #174.

The data on special school needs for Hawkins and Sullivan Counties are presented verbally just following Tables #176 to #183.

CHAPTER VII.

RURAL HEALTH.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Local Hospital Facilities and Distance to Hospital. Neither the eight communities of Knox nor the eight communities of Anderson had any local hospital facilities, and it was an average of 11.9 miles to a hospital in the eight Knox communities and 19.7 from the eight Anderson communities. This is shown in Table #187.

As Table #188 shows, the eight communities of Knox in 1896 had no local hospital facilities but the distance to hospital was the same as for 1926; that is, 11.9 miles.

Table #189 shows that in 1906 the eight communities of Anderson were an averaged distance to a hospital of 19.3 miles, or 0.4 miles less than 1926. They had no local hospital facilities in 1906. There were no local hospital facilities in either the most or the least accessible communities of Knox in 1926, and the distance to a hospital was 12.7 miles for the most accessible communities, and 11.0 miles for the four least accessible communities. This is shown in Table #194.

There was no local hospital facilities in either the most or the least accessible communities of Anderson in 1926 and it was an average of 18 miles to a hospital from the most accessible communities and 21 miles from the least accessible communities. These data are shown in Table #195.

As is shown in Table #207, the eight communities of Hawkins and the eight communities of Sullivan had no local hospital facilities in 1925, and it was

8.6 miles to hospital in Hawkins and only 6.25 miles in Sullivan. In 1914, as Table #208 shows, the distance to a hospital was less than half as much for Hawkins as it was for Sullivan.

This shows that as industrial development came to Sullivan, that is at Kingsport, the hospital came also. The distance to a hospital decreased some in Hawkins but not as much as in Sullivan. This also shows the distance to hospital to be very much less in Knox than it is in Anderson. The distance in miles is greater in the most accessible communities of Knox than in the four least accessible communities, but the roads are so much better in the most accessible that it is much easier to get to the hospital from them.

Number amd Age of Physicians. With the coming of industrial development the number of physicians in rural communities is becoming smaller. The development of the good roads and with the automobile it is no longer important for the physician to live in the country. Perhaps one of the greatest things that has caused the physician to leave the country is to be in town where he can use the hospitals, to be able to get advice from other physicians, and lights and other conveniences furnished in town, which are not so easily obtained in the country.

The rural communities in this study, though they had fewer physicians in 1926 than in 1906 or in 1896, yet their medical needs could more easily be met, as the car and good roads made it possible to come a long distance in a short time. The eight communities of Knox averaged 1.13 physicians and the eight communities of Anderson averaged only 0.25 physicians. The average age of physicians in Knox was 58 years, and for the eight communities an average of 54 years. (Table #187)

As is shown in Table #188, the average number of physicians for Knox communities decreased from 1.88 in 1896 to 1.13 in 1926, and the age of physicians increased from 43.3 years to 58 years.

In the four most accessible communities of Knox the average number of physicians was 2.0 and for the four least accessible communities only 0.25. The age of physicians for the most accessible communities was 57.5 and 60.0 for the four least accessible communities. This is shown in Table #194.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 0.5 physicians and the four least accessible communities had no physicians. The average age of physicians was 54 years. (Table #195)

In 1925 the eight communities of Hawkins averaged 0.25 physicians and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 0.63 physicians. The average age of physicians was 60.0 for Hawkins and only 48.0 for Sullivan. (Table #207)

In 1914 the eight communities of Hawkins had 0.63 physicians and the eight communities of Sullivan an average of 1.38 physicians. The average age of physicians for Hawkins was 39 and for Sullivan 36 years. (Table #208)

This study shows very clearly that in general young physicians are not going back to rural communities; at least, they are not in these four sections, containing a total of 32 communities.

It is safe to say that the reduction in number of physicians that has come in the communities studied was not due to industrial development. Neither has the increasing age of rural physicians been due to industrial development. On the other hand, when a young physician does go to a rural community he is apt to go to a place where industry is developing so the people can have money with which to pay hom for his service, and where the roads are better.

In a rural community in an industrialized area the better roads which are developed enable a physician to serve a larger community and live in town, since the automobile and good roads have come; hence the number of physicians per 1000 population would tend to decrease. But on the other hand people in such an area are more enlightened and hence ask for the services of a physician at times when he would never be called in an isolated section.

Distance to a Physician and Percentage of the People Having Telephone Connection with a Physician. There were a few communities which did not have a local physician, and in those communities the distance to one is given. This is a more nearly correct index to the effect of manufacturing than is the number of physicians. Table #187 shows that the average distance to a physician was 1.63 miles for the eight Knox communities in 1926 (the communities having local physician were called 0 distance). While the average distance to a physician for the eight Anderson Counties was 3.5 miles.

The eight communities of Knox had 3.31% of their people with telephones and there connection with a physician in 1926, while the eight communities of Anderson had 4.8%.

Table #188 shows that the average distance to a physician increased only 0.32 miles for Knox communities. That is, the distance in 1896 was 1.31 miles and in 1926 1.63 miles. The percentage of people having telephone connection with a physician increased from 0 in 1896 to 3.31% in 1926 in Knox.

Table #189 shows that the distance to a physician for the eight Anderson communities increased from 2.75 in 1906 to 3.5 miles in 1926. There were no telephones to physicians in 1906, but 4.8% of the people had such telephone connections in 1926.

In the four most accessible communities of Knox all had local physicians, while the average distance to a physician from the four least accessible communities of Knox was 3.25 miles. 3.46% of the people had telephones connected with a physician in the four most accessible, and only 2.76% in the four least accessible communities. This is shown in Table #194.

As is shown in Table #195, the average distance to a physician was, in 1926, 2.38 miles for the four most accessible communities of Anderson and 4.63 for the four least accessible communities. 4.9% of the people had telephones connected with physicians in the most accessible communities and 4.44% in the four least accessible communities of Anderson.

The average distance to a physician was 4.38 miles for the Hawkins County communities and 1.38 miles in Sullivan County. Only 11% of the people of the Sullivan communities had telephones to a physician. This is shown in Table #207.

In 1914 the average distance to a physician was 2 miles for the Hawkins communities and only 0.6 miles for the Sullivan communities. No data were available as to the number of telephones to a physician for either Hawkins of Sullivan communities. (Table #214)

This study indicates that there is a relation between the amount of manufacturing developed and the distance to a physician. That is, the communities with the most industrial development had the shortest distance to a physician. In most cases, too, the county having the most manufacturing had the largest percentage of the people with telephone connections with a physician.

Number of Dentists, Age, Distance to, Percentage of People Having Telephones to a Dentist, and Communities Visited by a Dentist. In 1926 there were no dentists in the eight communities of Knox, and only an average of 0.13 in the eight communities of Anderson. As there were no dentists there would be no age of dentists, but for the Anderson communities the average age was 25 years. The average distance to a dentist for the Knox communities was 9.8 miles, and only 6.5 miles for the Anderson communities. 3.86% of the people of the Knox communities had a telephone to a dentist and 4.67% of the people in Anderson. There were no visits made to the communities by dentists in either Knox or Anderson County. All these data are shown in Table #187.

The eight communities of Knox averaged 0.13 dentists in 1896 and none in 1926. The average age of dentists in Knox was 25 years in 1896. The average distance to a dentist was 11.2 miles in 1896 and 9.8 miles in 1926. None of the people had telephones to a dentist in 1896 and 3.86% had tele-

phone connection with a dentist in 1926. No visits were made to communities in either year. This is shown in Table #188.

The eight communities of Anderson averaged 0.13 dentists in 1906 and 0.25 dentists in 1926. The average age was 40 years in 1906 and 25 years in 1926. This shows that some young dentists have gone in. The average distance to a dentist was just the same in 1926 as it was in 1906; that is, 6.5 miles.

In 1906 only 1.5% of the people had telephones connected with a dentist, and 4.67% of the people had such telephone connection in 1926.

No visits were made by dentists to the communities of Anderson in either year. (Table #189)

As Table #194 shows there were no dentists in either the most or the least accessible communities of Knox. Therefore we would have no age reported. It was an average of 10 miles to a dentist from the four most accessible communities and 9.5 miles from the four least accessible (much better roads in the most accessible). 3.66% of the people in the four most accessible communities had telephones to dentists, and 4.81% of the people of the four least accessible communities had telephones. No visits were made to communities in either the four most or four least accessible communities.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 0.25 dentists and the four least accessible communities had none. The average age for the four most accessible was 25 years and no age for the four least accessible communities.

The average distance to dentist from the four most accessible communities was 6.1 and 6.9 for the four least accessible communities. 4.9% of the people of the four most accessible communities had telephones and only 4.15% of the four least accessible communities. No communities were visited in either the most or the least accessible communities. This is shown in Table #195.

Neither the eight communities of Hawkins nor the eight communities of Sullivan had a dentist in 1925. The average distance to dentist was 6.75 miles for Hawkins communities and 6.25 miles from the Sullivan communities. 11.7% of the people of Hawkins had telephones to dentist, and 49.6% had tlephones in Sullivan County. No visits were made to communities in either set of communities. (Table #207)

In 1914 neither the eight communities of Hawkins nor the eight communities of Sullivan had a dentist. It was 6.75 miles to a dentist in Hawkins County and 15.4 miles to dentist in Sullivan. No data was found as to the number of people who had telephones in both counties. There was an average of 0.38 visits made to communities in Hawkins communities and an average of 0.88 visits per community in the Sullivan section.

This study does not show any relation between the amount of industrial development and number of dentists, age, distance, etc.

Amount of Infectious Diseases. There was no data as to the amount of infectious diseases in Anderson and Knox communities. This is shown in Tables #187 to #205.

The data on infectious diseases for Hawkins and Sullivan Counties could not be tabulated, but is presented verbally just following Tables #207 to #214.

Amount of Child Labor Used Harmful; Number Harmful Effects. Table #194 shows that children were not used harmfully in either the eight communities of Knox or the eight communities of Anderson. Therefore there were no harmful effects.

Table #188 shows that there was no harmful use of children in 1896 in the Knox communities, and Table #189 shows that children were not used harmfully in 1906 in the eight Anderson communities.

Tables #207 and #208 show that there was no harmful use of children in either the eight Hawkins or the eight Sullivan communities in either 1914 or 1925.

The general opinion among those who are against industrial development is that if industry d evelops children will be worked harmfully. This study does not show any harmful effects in either Knox or Sullivan Counties, which are both industrial centers.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHURCHES.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

The eight communities of Knox in 1926 averaged 3.75 churches per community and the eight communities of Anderson averaged five churches. There were on the average of 264 people per church in Knox, and only 165.38 in the Anderson communities. This is shown in Table #218.

The average number of churches for the Knox section increased from 2.25 in 1896 to 3.75 in 1926 and the average number of churches per community for the Anderson section increased from 2.5 in 1906 to 3.0 in 1926. The number of people per church in Knox decreased from 399.38 in 1896 to 264 in 1926 and the average number of people per church for the Anderson section decreased from 198.13 in 1906 to 165.38 in 1926. These data are shown in Tables #219 and #220.

The fo r most accessible communities of Knox averaged 6.0 churches, and the four least accessible communities averaged 1.5 churches. The number of people per church was 315.5 for the four most accessible, and only 212.5 for the four least accessible communities of Knox.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged the same number of churches as did the four least accessible communities. That is, an average of 3 in each. But the most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 202 people per church, while the four least accessible communities averaged only 128.75 people per church.

Table #238 shows that both the eight communities of Hawkins and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 2 churches per community. But the

eight communities of Hawkins averaged only 151.5 people per church, while the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 283 people per church.

In 1914, as Table #239 shows, the eight communities of Hawkins averaged 1.86 churches. The Hawkins communities then averaged 151.5 people per church, and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 270.8 people per church.

In this study we find no relation between amount of industrial development and the number of churches; but a very close relation between the number of people per church and industrial development.

There were more churches in Anderson than in Knox and therefore much fewer people per church. There were more churches in the most accessible communities of Knox than in the least accessible of Knox, yet more people per church in the most accessible. There were the same number of churches in the four least accessible communities of Anderson as there were in the four most accessible, and therefore more people per church in the most accessible communities. The same number of churches per community existed in Hawkins as in Sullivan, but more people per church were found in Sullivan.

Per Cent of People Church Members. The eight communities of Knox had a smaller percentage church members than did the eight communities of Anderson and yet the whole county of Knox had 4.2% more church members than did the whole county of Anderson. The most accessible and the least accessible communities of Knox had about equal percentage of church members.

The eight Hawkins communities had a larger percentage of church members than did the eight communities of Sullivan, and the whole county of Hawkins had 2.1% more church members than did the whole county of Sullivan. The 1/3 most manufacturing counties of Tennessee had a larger percentage of church members than did either the 1/3 medium or 1/3 least. The 1/2 most manufacturing states had a much larger percentage of church members than did the

1/2 least manufacturing states. When we take a large section, such as a whole state or the whole United States, we find that the counties of that state that have the most manufacturing have also the largest percentage of church members, and the states with the most manufacturing have the largest percentage of church members.

The reason a group of counties or a group of states that have the largest amount of manufacturing also have the largest percentage of church members is that the most manufacturing sections have more wealth with which to pay for good ministers, to build good churches, etc.

Table #218 shows that the eight communities of Knox had 26.5% church members, and the eight communities of Anderson had 46.75%. The percentage of church members in Knox has increased from 24.37 in 1896 to 26.5 in 1926, and from 39 in 1906 to 46.75 in 1926 for the eight communities of Anderson. This is shown in Tables #219 to #220.

The four most accessible communities of Knox, as is shown in Table #225, had 26.18% church members, and the four least accessible communities had 26.75% church members. The four most accessible communities of Anderson had 43.0% church members and the four least accessible of Anderson had 50.5% church members. This is shown in Table #226. Table #237 shows that the whole county of Anderson had 38.6% church members and the whole county of Knox had 42.8% church members. This is 4.2% more for Knox County.

The eight communities of Hawkins had 48.2% of their people church members and the eight communities of Sullivan had 35.8. (Table #238)

As is shown in Table #246, the whole county of Sullivan had 34.3% church members and the whole county of Hawkins had 36.4% church members.

The 1/3 most manufacturing counties of Tennessee had in 1916 36.5% church members, the 1/3 medium manufacturing had 36% church members, and the 1/3 least manufacturing had 34.6% church members. This is shown in Table #247. The 1/2 most manufacturing states of the United States had

in 1916 42% church members, and the 1/2 least manufacturing states had 36.5% church members. This is shown in Table #248.

Percentage Condition of the Church Buildings. We have no data as to the percentage condition of church buildings in either the Knox or Anderson County communities. But the condition of church buildings was 74.4% adequate in Hawkins County and 80% adequate in the eight communities of Sullivan. In 1914 the condition of church buildings was 71% adequate in Hawkins and 80% adequate in Sullivan. This is shown in Table #239. These data are inadequate to determine whether or not there is any relation between the amount of industrial development and percentage condition of church.

Number of Resident Ministers. The eight communities of Knox had an average of 1.5 resident ministers, while the eight communities of Anderson averaged only 0.63 resident ministers. This is shown in Table #218.

The average number of resident ministers increased from 1.13 in 1896 to 1.5 in 1926 for the eight communities of Knox. For the eight Anderson communities the average number of resident ministers increased from 0.38 in 1906 to 0.63 in 1926. (Tables #219 to #220)

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 3 resident ministers per community, while the four least accessible communities had none. The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 0.5, while the four least accessible communities averaged 0.75 resident ministers. (Tables #225 to #226)

Tables #238 to #239 show that the eight Hawkins communities averaged 0.13 resident ministers in 1925 but had none in 1914. The eight communities of Sullivan had no resident ministers in either 1925 or 1914.

Our data on this point are too meager to determine definitely as to

whether or not there is a direct relation between the amount of industrial development and the number of resident ministers.

Total Church Membership; Membership per Church. The eight communities of Knox had an average of 240 church members, and the eight communities of Anderson averaged only 189.4 church members. The Knox communities averaged 62.13 members per church and the Anderson communities 66.38 members. This is shown in Table #218. The total church membership per Knox community increased from 180.6 in 1896 to 240 in 1926, while the average membership per church decreased from 72 in 1896 to 62.13 in 1926. (Table #219)

The average total church membership for the eight Anderson communities increased from 153.1 in 1906 to 189.4 in 1926, while the membership per church increased from 59.88 to 66.38. This is shown in Table #220.

The four most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 406 church members per community, and the four least accessible had an average of only 74 members in 1926. The four most accessible of Knox communities averaged 73 members per church, and the four least accessible averaged 51.25 members per church. (Table #225)

The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 238.7 church members per community and the four least accessible averaged 140 members per church. There was an average of 77.75 members per church in the four most accessible communities of Anderson and only an average of 55 members per church for the four least accessible communities. This is shown in Table 226.

As is shown in Table #238, the eight communities of Hawkins had an average of 149 church members per community, while the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 119 church members per community. But while the Hawkins section averaged 80 members per church the Sullivan section averaged

81 members per church. (Table #238) In 1914 the eight Hawkins communities averaged 119 church members per community, and the Sullivan sections averaged 117 members per community. In Hawkins there was an average of 71.3 members per church in 1914, and in Sullivan an average of 86.6 members per church. This is shown in Table #239.

The communities in the most manufacturing counties had the largest church membership per community. The most accessible communities of both areas also had a much larger church membership than the least accessible communities. From this we can safely say that as industry develops the total church members increase. Relation between the number of members per church and the amount of industrial development is not so close because in some communities there are so many denominations that there is more churches than are really needed to take care of all the people -- if they could see alike in denominational matters.

Frequency of Church Services per Month. The eight communities of Knox averaged 1.9 church services per month while the eight communities of Anderson averaged only 1.3 services. (Table #218) The frequency of church services for Knox County increased from one time per month in 1896 to 1.9 times in 1926, while for the Anderson communities the increase was from 1.3 per month to 1.5 times per month. (Tables #219 and #220) The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 2.3 church services per month and the four least accessible communities averaged 1.5 services per month. This is shown in Table 225.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 1.5 church services per month and the four least accessible averaged but one. (Table #226)

The eight communities of Hawkins averaged 1.3 church services per month while the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 1.4 services per month. This is shown in Table #238. In 1914 the Hawkins communities averaged 1.1 church service per month and the Sullivan communities averaged 1.3 services per month.

The communities in the counties where the most manufacturing development had taken place had the largest number of church services per month. Also, the most accessible communities in each county had a much larger number of services per month than did the least accessible communities. This shows that the more industry is developed the more frequent the people will have church services. Where industry has developed, the general prosperity of the community is better, and the people have more money with which to pay a good minister on full time, or one half time, rather than on 1/4 time.

Total Sunday School Enrollment and Enrollment per Church. The average Sunday school enrollment per community was 178.75 for the Knox communities and 108.75 for the Anderson section. This was an average of 50.75 per church for Knox, and 48.25 per church for Anderson. These data are shown in Table #218. The average total Sunday school enrollment per community for the eight Knox communities increased from 128.13 in 1896 to 178.75 in 1926, while the number enrolled in Sunday school per church decreased from 56.25 to 50.75 from 1896 to 1926, due to an increase in the number of churches. This is shown in Table #219.

The average Sunday school enrollment per community increased from 71.25 in 1906 to 108.75 in 1926 for the eight communities of Anderson, while the enrollment per church increased from 43.88 to 48.25. This is shown in Table #220.

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 301.25 enrolled in Sunday school per community, and the four least accessible communities averaged only 56.25 per community. The most accessible averaged 55.25 per church and the least accessible communities averaged 46.25 Sunday school enrollment per church. (Table #225)

As is shown in Table #226, the average Sunday school enrollment per community for the four most accessible communities of Anderson was 146.25, while it was only 71.25 for the four least accessible communities.

The eight communities of Hawkins County had an average Sunday school enrollmant of 83.75 per community, and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 98.75 per community. The Hawkins section had an average enrollment of 44 per church, and Sullivan an average of 61 per church. This is shown in Table #218. As is shown in Table #239, the total Sunday school enrollment per community in 1914 was 90.71 in Hawkins and 78.57 for the Sullivan section. The enrollment per church in Hawkins was 49.7 and 58.0 for Sullivan. This is shown in Table #239.

The counties having the largest amount of industrial development had the largest average total Sunday school enrollment per community. Also the most accessible communities had a much larger enrollment than did the least accessible communities. In 1914 Hawkins had a larger Sunday school enrollment that did Sullivan, but in 1925 Sullivan had an average enrollment of 15 more than did Hawkins.

It seems safe to say that a development of industry increases the Sunday school enrollment.

Number of Singing Services per Month. There is apparently no relation between industrial development and the number of singing services per month.

Table #218 shows that the eight communities of Knox averaged 1.57 singing services per month and Anderson had an average of 1.43 per community. The number of singing services per month in Knox County decreased from 1.71 in 1896 to 1.57 in 1926. (Table #219)

The number of singing services per community in Anderson decreased from 1.5 in 1906 to 1.43 in 1926. This is shown in Table #220.

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 0.33 singing services per month and the four least accessible communities averaged 2.5 singing services per month. (Table #225) The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 2.0 singing services per month and the least accessible communities of Anderson averaged but 0.67 singing services. This is shown in Table #226.

As Table #238 shows, the eight communities of Hawkins averaged but 0.62 singing services per month, and the Sullivan communities averaged 0.37 singing services per month.

In 1914 the Hawkins section had an average of 0.5 singing services per month, and the Sullivan communities averaged 0.37 singing services per month. This is shown in Table #239.

Annual Budget (Current Expenses) and Investment in Buildings and Equipment. The eight communities of Knox had an average annual budget of $1581.25 and the eight communities of Anderson averaged only $441.25. The Knox communities had $4750 invested in buildings and equipment and the Anderson communities had only $2750 invested. This is shown in Table #218.

The annual budget for Knox communities increased from $563.75 in 1896 to $1581.25 in 1926. The amount invested in buildings and equipment increased from $3475.00 to $4750. This is shown in Table #219.

The annual budget for Anderson County increased from $180 in 1906 to $441.25 in 1926 and the amount invested in buildings and equipment increased from $2275 to $2750. (Tables #220) The four most accessible communities of Knox had an annual budget of $2750 per year and the four least accessible communities had $412.50 annual budget. The investment in buildings and equipment was $7750 for the four most accessible and only $1750 for the four least accessible communities of Knox County. (Table #225)

As is shown in Table #226, the annual budget for the four most accessible communities of Anderson was $787.50 and only $95.00 for the least accessible communities. The amount invested in buildings and equipment was $4375 for the most accessible and $1375 for the four least accessible communities. This is shown in Table #226.

The annual budget for the eight communities of Hawkins was $184 and an average of $277 for the eight communities of Sullivan. We have no data as to the amount invested in buildings and equipment in these counties. (Table #238)

The communities which are located in the counties with most manufacturing are the communities having the largest annual budget, and also having the largest amount invested in buildings and equipment. The most accessible communities had a much larger annual budget and investment in buildings and equipment than had the least accessible communities. That is, the Knox communities had both a larger budget and a larger investment than did the Anderson communities; and the most accessible communities of both counties have a larger budget and a larger investment than did the least accessible communities.

Hawkins County had a much smaller annual budget than did Sullivan. We have no data as to the relative investment in buildings and equipment in these two counties.

Number of Abandoned Churches. The eight communities of Knox in 1926 had no abandoned churches, while the eight communities of Anderson averaged 0.25 per community. These data are shown in Table #218.

In 1896 the Knox communities had no abandoned churches, and in 1906 the eight communities of Anderson had none. (Tables #219 and #220) Neither the most nor the least accessible communities of Knox had abandoned churches in 1926, as is shown in Table #225. The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 0.5 abandoned churches, and the four least accessible had none. (Table #226)

As is shown in Table #238, there were no abandoned churches in the eight communities of Hawkins but an average of 0.13 abandoned churches in the eight communities of Sullivan.

In 1914 there were no abandoned churches in either Hawkins or Sullivan communities.

In this study we have found no direct relation between the amount of industrial development and the number of abandoned churches.

Education of Pastor; Number of Grades Finished and Percentage Adequate. It will be noticed, if the tables are referred to, that both grade and percentage adequacy are listed as "no data". This is because in one set of counties the education of pastors was given in grades and in the other as percentage adequate. So in this discussion only one will be mentioned.

In Table #218 we see that the pastors of the eight communities of Knox had on the average completed 12.5 grades, while the pastors of Anderson County had completed only an average of 9.25 grades.

The education of pastors for the eight communities of Knox increased from 7.38 grades in 1896 to 12.5 grades in 1926. (Table #219) The education of pastors for the eight communities of Anderson County increased from 6.5

grades in 1906 to 9.25 grades in 1926. This is shown in Table #220.

The four most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 11.75 grades completed by their pastor, and the least accessible communities averaged 13.25 grades. (Table #225) The most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 10.25 grades completed by pastors, and the least accessible of Anderson an average of 8.25 grades. This is shown in Table #226.

The education of pastors was said to be 68.5% adequate in the eight communities of Hawkins, and only 60% adequate in the eight communities of Sullivan. In 1914 the education of pastors was said to have been 63.3% adequate, and only 57.5% adequate for Sullivan communities.

From this study we can draw no definite conclusions between the amount of industrial development and the amount of education of pastors.

Special Needs of Church; and Number of Needs Reported. In this study we find a direct relation between amount of industrial development and the number of church needs recognized by the membership. In some of the least accessible communities they reported having no needs. The fact is, these people do not see their church needs, although the needs are there.

Special needs for Knox and Anderson could not be tabulated, but is presented verbally just following Tables #218 to #236.

As is shown in Table #218 the Knox section had an average of 1.75 church needs and the Anderson section an average of 2.15

The most accessible communities of Knox, as is shown in Table #225, had an average of 2 church needs, and the least accessible communities averaged 1.5 church needs. The most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 2.25 church needs and the least accessible communities averaged 2 church needs. This is shown in Table #226.

The churches are in better condition in the most accessible communities, as best we could tell, based on the statements of the leading members in these communities. As is shown in Table #238, the eight communities of Hawkins averaged 1.25 church needs, and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 2.6 church needs.

There is a direct relation between amount of industrial development and the number of church needs as given by the members, the members of churches in the industrial areas being more wide awake to what a church should be and hence listing more needs.

CHAPTER IX.

RURAL RECREATION.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Number of Church Socials per Year. The data on this topic were collected from the teachers of the various communities, the information being secured for one year only.

The eight communities of Knox averaged 7.3 church socials per year per community in 1926, while the eight communities of Anderson averaged 12. (Table #249)

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 8.7 church socials, and the four least accessible averaged only 6 church socials. (Table #250)

The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged but 1.7 church socials, while the four least accessible communities averaged 19.8 church socials. This is shown in Table #251.

The eight communities of Hawkins averaged 3 church socials in 1925 and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged only 2.2 church socials. This is shown in Table #256.

The five most accessible communities of Hawkins averaged 1.5 church socials, and the three least accessible communities averaged 4.5 church socials. This is shown in Table #257.

In every case, the communities with the least industrial development had the largest number of church socials. This is largely because of the fact that in the more isolated areas many other forms of recreation are often frowned upon, and are to a large extent undeveloped.

Number of School Entertainments per Year. The eight communities of Knox averaged 6 school entertainments per year, while the eight communities of Anderson averaged 3.1 in 1926. This is shown in Table #249. The four most accessible communities of Knox arranged 10 school entertainments, and the four least accessible communities averaged 2 entertainments per year. This is shown in Table #250.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 4.7 school entertainments, and the four least accessible communities averaged only 2 school entertainments per year. (Table #251)

Table #256 shows that the eight communities of Hawkins averaged 2.8 school entertainments per year and that the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 3 in 1925.

Table #257 shows that the five most accessible communities of Hawkins averaged 3.5 school entertainments per year, while the three least accessible communities averaged only 2.

In this we find a direct relation between amount of industrial development and number of school entertainments. That is, the communities having most development of industry had the largest number of school entertainments. The reasons for this larger number of school entertainments are: (1) more people to go to the entertainment; (2) more money with which to pay to see entertainments; (3) better schools and more progressive teachers.

Number of Ice Cream and Pie Suppers Per Year. The eight communities of Knox averaged 2.4 ice cream suppers per community in 1926, while the eight communities of Anderson averaged only 1.3 ice cream suppers. The Knox communities averaged 1.6 pie suppers per community per year while the Anderson communities averaged 2.3. (Table #249)

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged the same number of ice cream suppers as did the four least accessible communities; that is, 3. The most accessible communities of Knox averaged 2.5 pie suppers, but the four least accessible communities averaged only 1. This is shown in Table #250.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 2 ice-cream suppers per community, while the four least accessible averaged only 0.7 ice cream suppers. The most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 2 pie suppers, while the four least accessible averaged 2. (Table #251)

The eight communities of Hawkins averaged 2 ice cream suppers and 1.5 pie suppers, while the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 2.7 ice cream suppers and 2.7 pie suppers. This is shown in Table #256.

The four most accessible communities of Hawkins averaged 2 ice cream suppers, and 1.5 pie suppers, and the four least accessible communities averaged just the same. (Table #257)

This study indicates that the communities with the most industrial development have the largest number of ice cream suppers; and with but one exception they have also the largest number of pie suppers. This one exception is Anderson with more pie suppers than Knox.

Number of Ball Games and Picnics per Year. The eight communities of Knox averaged 22.3 ball games and 5.8 picnics per community in 1926, and the eight communities of Anderson averaged 6.9 ball games and only one picnic per community per year. This is shown in Table #249.

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 27.3 ball games and 7.8 picnics per year, and the four least accessible communities averaged 7 ball games and 1.3 picnics. (Table #250) The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 8.3 ball games and 1 picnic and

the four least accessible communities of Anderson averaged 5.8 ball games and 1 picnic. The two sections of Anderson were even on picnics but there was an average of 2.5 more ball games for the four most accessible communities. (Table #251)

The eight communities of Hawkins averaged 10.5 ball games and the eight communities of Sullivan 7.6 ball games. The Hawkins section averaged 4.3 picnics, and Sullivan averaged only 2.5 picnics. These data are shown in Table #256.

The most accessible communities of Hawkins averaged 20 ball games, and the three least accessible averaged one. The five most accessible communities of Hawkins averaged five picnics and the three least accessible communities averaged 3.5. Table #257.

This shows Knox with more ball games and picnics than Anderson, and it shows the most accessible communities of each county with more ball games and picnics than the least accessible communities. Hawkins had a slightly larger number of ball games and picnics than Sullivan, but the most accessible communities of Hawkins had a much larger number than the least accessible communities.

Number of Fairs per Year. The eight communities of Knox had an average of 0.8 community fairs per year, and the eight communities of Anderson averaged only 0.4 community fairs in 1926. (Table #249)

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged one community fair per community per year, and the four least accessible communities had none. (Table #250) The four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 0.7 community fairs and the four least accessible communities had none. This is shown in Table #251.

bThe eight communities of Hawkins averaged 0.5 community fairs and the

eight communities of Sullivan averaged 0.3 community fairs per community per year. There was no difference in number of fairs for the most and least accessible communities of Hawkins. That is, there was an average of 0.5 for each community.

The most accessible communities are much more likely to have fairs, as is shown by the fact that all the fairs for the Knox and Anderson sections were in the most accessible communities.

Number of Card Parties and Dances per Year. The eight communities of Knox averaged 4.2 card parties per community per year and 15.3 dances per year in 1926, while the eight communities of Anderson had no card parties and no dances. (Table #249)

The four most accessible communities of Knox averaged 7.5 card parties but no dances in 1926. The four least accessible communities of Knox averaged only 2 card parties, but they averaged 20.3 dances per year. Local dances are confined mostly to the inaccessible communities. (Table #250)

The eight communities of Hawkins averaged 1.5 card parties and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged eight card parties in 1925. The Hawkins communities had no dances, and the Sullivan communities had an average of 2.8 dances in 1925. This is shown in Table #256.

It is apparent that these two forms of rural recreation are in general more highly developed in the industrial areas.

Number of Movies per Year. There were no movies in either Knox or Anderson communities in 1925. This is shown in Tables #249 to #255.

Table #256 shows no movies in Hawkins County, and only an average of 1.7 movies per community for the Sullivan communities in 1925.

There is such a small number of movies that there can be no special relation between the amount of industrial development and the number of movies.

CHAPTER X.

MISCELLANEOUS.

WHAT EFFECT HAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAD ON:

Home Conveniences: (a) Percentage of Homes Having Running Water; (b) Percentage of Homes Having Lights Other than Oil; (c) Percentage of Homes Having Furnace Heat. The eight communities of Knox had an average of 2.76% of homes having running water, while Anderson had only 0.39%. Knox had an average of 7.2% of homes with lights other than oil, and Anderson only 1.9%. Knox had an average of 0.9% of homes with furnace heat and Anderson had none. These data are shown in Table #258.

In 1896 the eight communities of Knox had no running water, no homes with light other than oil, and no furnace heat. (Table #259) In 1906 the eight communities of Anderson had no homes with running water, no lights other than oil, and no furnace heat. This is shown in Table #260.

In 1926 the most accessible communities of Knox had an average of 2.25% of homes with running water, while the least accessible communities averaged 3.28% of homes with running water. The most accessible had 8.5% of homes with lights other than oil, and the least accessible communities averaged only 5.8%. The most accessible communities averaged 0.7% with furnace heat, and the least accessible communities averaged 1.1%. This is shown in Table #265.

In 1926 the four most accessible communities of Anderson averaged 0.25% of homes with running water, and the four least accessible averaged 0.33%. The most accessible communities averaged 2.25% of homes with lights other than oil, and the least accessible averaged 1.5%. Neither the most nor the

least accessible communities had any homes with furnace heat. This is shown in Table #266.

The whole county of Anderson had 20.2% of families with lights other than oil, while in Knox 64.7% of the homes have lights. This is shown in Table #277.

In 1925 the eight communities of Hawkins averaged 2.1% of homes having running water, while the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 2.56%. Hawkins had 3.33% of homes with lights other than oil while Sullivan averaged 3.98%. Hawkins had 0.48% of its farm homes with furnace heat, and Sullivan 0.25%. This is shown in Table #278.

As is shown in Table #279, neither the Hawkins nor the Sullivan areas had running water, lights other than oil or furnace heat in 1914.

As is shown in Table #282, the five most accessible communities of Hawkins had 1.82% of their homes with running water in 1925, 22.2% with lights other than oil, and 7.8% with furnace heat, while the three least accessible communities had nose of these home conveniences.

With but one exception the communities in the counties with the most manufacturing had the largest percentage of homes with home conveniences. This is true to a somewhat less degree in regard to furnaces than with either lights or running water. There are very few furnaces in use in any of these communities, and the few that are in use perhaps are there just because the owner visited where furnace heat was used, and came home and had a furnace put in.

In general we can say that the communities with the largest amount of industrial development have the largest number of home conveniences.

Musical Instruments: (a) Percentage of Homes Having Piano or Organ; (b) Percentage of Homes Having Radio; (c) Percentage of Homes Having Phonographs. The rural home is rapidly being changed from a place of drudgery

to a place of pleasure by the use of home conveniences, and it is being changed from a place of dread to a place much longed for, by the use of musical instruments such as pianos, radios, and phonographs. For several years a few of the rural people have had organs and phonographs but not many rural people had pianos until within the last five years did many people in rural communities have radios; and with the rapid reduction in price and the increase in efficiency of the radio, it is to be expected that in the near future a very large number of rural people will have them. With but few exceptions the communities with the most manufacturing have the largest percentage of homes with musical instruments.

As is shown in Table #258, the eight communities of Knox in 1926 averaged 19% of their homes with pianos or organs, and 13.5% for Anderson. 1.8% of the homes in the Knox section had radios and 1.65% in Anderson. 17.2% of rural homes have phonographs in the Knox section and 25.1% in Anderson.

In 1896 only 8.5% of homes of the Knox section had pianos or organs, and in 1926 19.0% of homes had pianos or organs. In 1896 there were no radios, and in 1926 1.8% of homes had radios. For 1896 we have no data on phonographs, but in 1926 17.2% of homes had phonographs. This is shown in Table #259.

In the four most accessible communities of Knox in 1926 24.0% of homes had pianos or organs,, and the four least accessible had 13.9%. The most accessible communities of Knox had 2.2% of homes with radios, and the least accessible communities 1.35%. 15.8% of the homes in the most accessible communities had phonographs and 18.2% of the homes in the least accessible had them. This is shown in Table #265.

In the four most accessible communities of Anderson there were 14.7% of the homes having pianos or organs in 1926, 1.85% having radios, and

10.85% having phonographs. In the four leaxt accessible communities of Anderson there were 12.35% of the homes having pianos, 1.45% had radios, and 32.2% had phonographs. (Table #266)

In the eight communities of Hawkins 19.08% of their homes had pianos or organs in 1925, and the eight communities of Sullivan had 19.95% of homes with pianos and organs. In Hawkins 0.72% of the homes were equipped with radios, and 0.50% of the Sullivan section had radios. 20% of the homes in Hawkins had phonographs and 27.2% in Sullivan had them.

In 1914, in the eight communities of Hawkins 18.65% of homes had pianos or organs, and 17.71% of the homes in Sullivan had them. There were no radios in either Hawkins or Sullivan in 1914. We have no data on the percentage of homes having phonographs at that time.

Morals: Number of Centers of Immorality; Percentage of Law Enforcement. It is not easy to get correct data on these two subjects, due to the fact that some people call one thing a center of immorality and someone else not notice it. One person will say law is enforced 100% and another man may think it enforced only 80%. This is true, and yet each person thinks he is honest and right in his statement.

We find that in the least accessible communities the people do not notice the lack of law enforcement as much as they do in the most accessible communities; and also they do not notice immorality as quickly as do the people of the most accessible communities. This accounts, in part, for the conflicting data presented below. From the figures shown in this connection it would seem that the communities with the least manufacturing had the largest number of centers of immorality, and the least amount of law enforcement. However, the difference between any two comparisons is not large and could possibly be accounted for by the difference in the

interpretation of the term "centers of immorality."

As is shown in Table #258 there were an average of 0.88 centers of immorality for the eight communities of Knox and only 0.25 for the eight communities of Anderson. Knox had 65% law enforcement and Anderson 78.1%.

The eight communities of Hawkins had 0.3 centers of immorality, and the eight Sullivan communities had 0.5 centers. Hawkins had 88.6% of law enforcement, and Sullivan had 90.6% of law enforcement. This is shown in Table #278.

Trading Center: Distance to; Percentage Satisfactory. The distance to a trading center for the eight communities of Knox was 5.3 miles, and for Anderson it was 6.3 miles in 1926. The trading centers for Knox were 76.3% satisfactory, and only 72.5% satisfactory for Anderson. This is shown in Table #258.

The distance to a trading center for the eight Knox communities has increased from 3.3 miles in 1896 to 5.3 miles in 1926. And the percentage of satisfaction increased from 61.3% to 76.3%. This is shown in Table #259. The distance to a trading center in Anderson decreased from 7.8 miles in 1906 to 6.3 miles in 1926 and the percentage satisfaction increased from 61.3% to 72.5%. (Table #260)

Table #265 shows that the distance to a trading center for four most accessible communities of Knox was 6 miles and for the four least accessible of Knox 4.5 miles. For the most accessible communities of Knox the trading centers were 80% satisfactory, and for the least accessible only 72.5 satisfactory. For the four most accessible communities of Anderson the distance to a trading center was 6.2 miles, and for the least accessible 6.4 miles. In both the least and the most accessible the trading centers were 72.5% satisfactory. (Table #266)

The eight communities of Hawkins had an average distance of 6.8 miles to trading center in 1925 and the eight communities of Sullivan averaged 6.4 miles. For Hawkins the trading centers were 82% satisfactory, and for the Sullivan section the trading centers were 90% satisfactory. This is shown in Table #287.

Table #279 shows that in 1914 the distance to a trading center was 6.8 miles for Hawkins and for Sullivan 13.8 miles.

In Hawkins the trading centers were 81% satisfactory in 1924 and for Sullivan 82% satisfactory.

This shows but little relation between distance to a trading center and manufacturing development, but a close relation between percentage satisfactory of trading centers and amount of industrial development. That is, the county or community with the most manufacturing had the most satisfactory trading centers.

Tax Rate per $100 This study shows that the county having the most manufacturing has the lowest tax rate. This is because the added wealth due to the manufacturing bears part of the tax burden, thus increasing the base and lowering the rate.

The tax rate for Knox County was $1.00 per $100 of property in 1926, and for Anderson it was $1.40. (Table #258)

The tax rate for Knox has decreased from $1.19 in 1896 to $1.00 in 1926, as is shown in Table #256.

The tax rate for Anderson decreased from $2.25 in 1906 to $1.40 in 1926, as is shown in Table #260.

The tax rate for Hawkins County was $1.90 in 1925, and the rate for Sullivan was $1.61. (Table #278)

In 1914 the tax rate was $1.30 for Hawkins and $1.90 for Sullivan.

Percentage of Community Planning. The eight communities of Knox had no community planning, and the eight communities of Anderson had only 0.5% as much as they should have had in 1926. (Table #258)

In 1896 the eight communities of Knox had no community planning, and in 1906 the eight communities of Anderson had no community planning. This is shown in Table #259 and #260.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson had an average of 7.5% as much community planning as they should have had, and the four least accessible communities had only 2.5% as much as they should have had.

We have no data as to the amount of community planning in Hawkins and Sullivan Counties. Tables #278 to #284.

From the above data we are not able to derive any definite conclusions as to the relationship between the amount of industrial development and the amount of community planning in a community.

Community Loyalty or Spirit: Percentage Adequate. As is shown in Table #258, the eight communities of Knox had 70% of community loyalty, and the eight communities of Anderson had 70% of loyalty.

Between 1896 and 1926, the eight communities of Knox increased community spirit from 62.5% to 70.0%. This is shown in Table #259.

Between 1906 and 1926 in the eight communities of Anderson the loyalty or spirit increased from 55% to 70%. This is shown in Table #260.

The community spirit was 85% for the four most accessible communities of Knox and 55% for the four least accessible communities of Knox. The community spirit was the same for Anderson as it was for Knox; that is, 85% for the most accessible communities and 55% for the least accessible communi-

ties.

The community loyalty or spirit was 60% for the eight communities of Hawkins and 78.5% for the eight communities of Sullivan. (Tables #278)

In 1914 the community spirit was 55% in Hawkins and 73% in Sullivan. This is shown in Table #279.

Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: Harmful; Beneficial. Data on the Anderson and Knox communities could not be tabulated, but is presented verbally just following Tables #258 to #276.

Neither could the data on the Hawkins and Sullivan communities be tabulated, and it is also presented verbally just following Tables #278 to #285.

CHAPTER XI.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

When we consider the coming of industrial development to a rural town or county we find that some people believe that it will be harmful to the agriculture of the nearby communities. Until we had collected and analyzed extensive data on the various phases of agriculture we were unable to determine authoritative as to whether or not this was true. That is, we could not state just what effect the coming of the manufacturing industry has on each division of the nearby agricultural industry.

After considering very carefully all the available data on each point, such as size of farm, number of owners, tenancy, empty houses, value of land, marketing facilities, etc., we find that in general the development of industry has had but little harmful effect on agriculture.

Before arriving at the above general conclusion we considered all the small points, and determined what effect manufacturing had had on each of these points.

We found that the crop yields were just as high, and in some cases much higher, in the counties having the best development of industry. The farms have been reduced in size more rapidly in the communities with most manufacturing. This gives the farmers a chance to live on small farms and let some members of the family work in town. When we consider that these boys and girls would otherwise leave home to work in town, if they could

get work near home, we believe it to be a fine thing to have this work near them.

The number of owners in the most manufacturing counties has increased more rapidly than in the least manufacturing counties, while the number of tenants has decreased more rapidly in the counties of most manufacturing. In fact, in one of the laast manufacturing counties studied the number of farm tenants increased.

The number of hired men has decreased in both the counties that have mamufacturing and in those that do not have manufacturing. This fact is thought by some farmers to be a harmful effect, especially those farm owners who would like to get a man for about $20 per month. But this reduction in number of hired men is in reality a fine thing, for it shows that these men have been promoted to something better. That this scarsity of hired men is not harming the agriculture of these regions is shown by the fact that every community studied had plenty of farm labor. The counties of most manufacturing paid the highest wage for farm labor. This makes these communities more prosperous because these hired men with higher wage were able to live better.

There was more idle land in the counties with the least manufacturing. This is because the farms have been divided, in the most manufacturing counties, and a much larger number of people per square mile are living in these counties. That is, they live on small farms, allowing some members of the family to work in town and return home at night. The other members of the family work the farm and all enjoy the freedom of the country. Where one member of a family works in town, returning home at night it has two good effects: (1) it adds to the income of the family, which is very important; and (2) it gives an opportunity to the family to get new ideas from the city.

The land that was idle was owned by men living in the communities. It was idle for various reasons, such as being too poor, too rough, not needed, and in a few cases by owners who had moved to town to work.

There were very few empty houses in either the counties with little or with much manufacturing. The highest average number in any community was two. There is an average of only 0.7 more empty houses in the counties with most manufacturing. This is such a small amount that it need not be considered.

The empty houses in each of these counties were in such poor condition, with few exceptions, that they were not suitable to live in. But they had been vacant for only a few months, on the average. In most cases they were vacant because of poor condition.

Perhaps no one thing has been affected more by industrial development than has the price of land per acre. Before the development of industry the price of land was the same for Anderson and Knox and also the same for Hawkins and Sullivan. In 1926 the average price of land was $8 higher per acre in Knox than it was in Anderson. In 1925 the price of land in Sullivan was almost twice as high as it was in Hawkins, this being because of such a demand for small country homes around Kingsport.

When we express the increase in land value in percentages we find that the land of Knox communities increased 189.9% in value while that of the Anderson communities only 108.3%. The land value of the Hawkins communities increased only 96.61% while the land of Sullivan increased 262.1% in value.

To a very large extent, the prosperity of a group of farmers can be measured by the amount of improved farm machinery which they employ. This is true, because a farmer can be, and usually is, more efficient if he has the improved farm machinery. In this study are found the counties with most manufacturing having the largest amount of improved farm machinery.

It has been found in many studies that the greatest profit to be had from livestock comes from purebred livestock. There was six times as many purebred livestock in Sullivan as there was in Hawkins, and eight times as many in Knox as in Anderson.

To have the most profitable dairy one must have a silo so he can have succulent feed during the winter. This not only makes possible a higher production but it decreases the cost of feeding. In 1926 there were more than 10 times as many silos in the Knox communities as in the Anderson communities, and 25% more in Sullivan than in Hawkins.

The type of farming now in the counties studied is general farming with more truck crops, tobacco, and dairying than formerly. The counties with the most manufacturing have the more nearly specialized type of farming. Formerly the type of farming was general with corn, hogs, and beef cattle as the main sources of income. Farmers changed their type of farming somewhat because they found a more intensive type of farming more profitable, especially near the industrial centers.

In none of these communities have there been many movements to improve farming except what the county agent has done. But the industrial counties are usually the ones that have such agents.

Improved roads are increasing rapidly in all parts of the state. But the increase has been much more rapid in the counties with the greatest development of industry.

The automobile has been a great factor in removing the isolation of farm folks. It is an economic asset to farmers, even more than to many other classes of business men. The automobile saves a large amount of time for a farmer by enabling him to go after needed parts of machinery and supplies, or seeds, without much loss of time. It also saves the teams a great deal of time. If a man had to drive his horse to town every time he breaks

a piece of machinery or needs supplies it would take a great deal of time for the horse as well as for the man.

The small truck is filling a dual place. That is, it is used to haul farm products, and by the family as a car in which to go to church or to go visiting.

There is a much larger number of both trucks and cars in the counties with the most mamufacturing.

The number of railroads in a county is not affected by industrial development unless there is a very large amount of freight to be hauled. In case a new railroad is being built, if it can be made to enter a large city by going only a few miles, than the builders always try to run through that city.

The kind of road to the railroad is determined largely by the progressiveness or non-progressiveness of the people that travel this road. A good road helps the farmers very much in getting their product to the railroad.

In this study we find but little difference in the distance to railroad for the most and least manufacturing communities, but the condition of highways to the railroads is very much better for the most manufacturing counties. Railroad service in the counties of most manufacturing is also better than in the rural areas.

The rural telephone is of great importance in improving the condition of rural people. It is one of the most economical means of communicating with other people, saving hours of time and miles of travel by the farmers and their families being able to transact business, make appointments, and to order things sent out from town.

The counties having the most manufacturing not only have a larger number of rural telephones but they have a larger percentage of the people

with telephones, and also a higher efficiency in service.

The rural mail service has done much to bring to the rural people new ideas through newspapers and agricultural journals. Because the mail service is furnished by the government it is affected but little by industrial development.

In all the communities studied, there is a very large percentage of the people reached by mail service. The average was from 92% to 97%. It happens that less than 2% more people are served by rural mail carriers in the counties of least manufacturing.

In conclusion, we find that the counties with the greatest industrial development have the largest amount of improved roads, the largest number of automobiles and tractors, have better railroad service, have both the largest percentage of people with telephones and the most efficient service, and with only 2% fewer people reached with rural mail service. We therefore conclude that the development of industry has improved transportation and communication facilities for rural people and hence has improved this phase of rural life.

Only in recent years have the farmers seen either the need for or the time for organizations among themselves. Therefore the number of farmers' organizations is as yet small in all the communities studied.

There must be some good leader to organize and manage community clubs, etc. and most communities depend on the county agricultural agent or on the home agent to be this leader. Therefore the kind of agent, or whether a county has such agent or not, has more affect on farmers' organizations than does the development of industry directly. But the counties having most industry have the most agents of this kind and keep these agents more steadily. Hence indirectly the industrial development

has a decided effect on the number of farmers' organizations.

Each and every community studied had plenty of credit available but the interest rate was lower in the counties having the most manufacturing. All the communities studied have farm loan association, but many of the farmers who perhaps should do so are not taking advantage of it.

There were more wealthy people and fewer real poor people in the counties having the most manufacturing.

The market for bulky products is about the same in the most as it is for the least manufacturing counties. This shows no harmful effect in that respect.

Things other than the development of industry may possibly affect the number of people working at local industry, but the daily wages paid is higher in the counties with most manufacturing. There were more people working at local industry in the Knox communities than in the Anderson communities, but the reverse is true in the other two counties. That is, Hawkins had more people working at local industry than did Sullivan.

There is a very much larger percentage of the people in the counties with most manufacturing who are able to obtain outside work, and there is also a larger number of people so working in the most manufacturing counties.

From this study we see no harm done to financial opportunities by the development of industry; and on the other hand find that in several respects it has improved these opportunities.

There were almost twice as many people in the counties with the largest amount of industrial development. This is because there is a greater demand for their labor, in town, and also a better market for farm products.

The development of industry has not caused a large number of foreigners

to come into these rural communities; in fact the counties with most manufacturing have a smaller number of foreigners than have the least manufacturing counties.

Neither has industrial development caused the number of negroes to increase, but on the other hand the number of negroes has actually decreased in both the Knox and the Sullivan communities, while the number has remained the same in the Hawkins community and slightly increased in Anderson. Although the actual number of negroes was about one per community more in Knox and Sullivan than in Hawkins and Anderson, the number is decreasing in the Knox and Sullivan communities.

When we compare the percentage increase in total population we find that the counties having the most manufacturing had much the largest percentage increase in population.

The Anderson communities increased 1.7% more than did the Knox communities but Sullivan increased more than 12% more than did Hawkins.

The causes of the increase in population in the counties with manufacturing were: the natural increase in population where most of the people remain; the moving in of people to work in industries; and some farmers moving in and buying farms to be near a good market.

The main reason for those leaving, especially from Hawkins, was to go to industrial centers to work.

The few who have left the communities of most manufacturing have been men and their families, while a large percentage of those leaving the communities of least manufacturing were unmarried men and girls. The reason the unmarried people left the non-manufacturing counties was: they were not unsatisfied with the economical conditions of their houses, and as there was no work to do near home, they had to leave in order to get work.

Almost all of those coming into the communities studied, including the

industrial areas, were men and their families, and with very few exceptions were good citizens. Those moving came because of better roads, better schools, or to get more outside work.

It appears then, that the development of industry has not increased either foreigners or negroes; it has not decreased population, but on the other hand has increased it; it has not caused the young people to leave; and neither has it caused undesirable people to move into the community. Conversely, it has caused many of the young folks to remain at home, and has caused many very desirable people to move into the communities of the counties of the most manufacturing. Therefore we are forced to conclude that the development of industry has had a beneficial effect on rural population in the four counties embraced in this study.

The counties having the largest amount of manufacturing have their school buildings in the best state of repair, and also have the largest school buildings. These counties also had the largest number of school rooms per community.

The value of school equipment was almost twice as great for Knox as it was for Anderson. We had no data on value of equipment for Hawkins and Sullivan.

In all four of the counties studied, the average enrollment per teacher was higher than it should have been. There was an average of one more student per teacher in the most manufacturing counties.

The water supply in several of the communities studied was far from what it should have been, but it was much better in the counties containing the most manufacturing. Wells or sanitary drinking fountains are now being substituted for springs.

The average number of volumes in the school libraries included in this study was much lower than it should have been, but the number of volumes was larger for the counties having the most manufacturing.

In 1925 there were no schools, in either of the communities studied in Hawkins and Sullivan, that had medical inspection. There were six out of the eight communities of Knox County with medical inspection, and one school in Anderson had medical inspection.

Six out of the eight schools studied in Knox County had dental inspection, while none of the schools studied in Anderson, Hawkins, or Sullivan had dental inspection. It is very important to have medical and dental inspection in schools, as many of the ills of children can easily be corrected at this stage of their life. Development of industry has not hindered either medical or dental inspection in schools in any county, and has greatly expanded it in one county.

We have no data as to the distance to high schools from the communities studied in Anderson and Knox Counties, but the distance is one mile less in the Sullivan communities than in the Hawkins communities.

A very much larger percentage of the elementary school enrollment of Knox is high school than of Anderson, but a larger percentage of the elementary enrollment of Hawkins is in high school than in Sullivan. When we combine Knox and Sullivan the percentage of elementary enrollment in high school in the two about equals the combined percentage of Hawkins and Anderson. This, at least, shows that on the average industrial development has not hindered the young folks from going to high school.

Both of the counties with a large amount of manufacturing have more students in college than have the two counties with less manufacturing.

When we find that the rural school houses of the most manufacturing counties are larger and in better condition; that there are more rooms per school; the value of school equipment larger; the enrollment per teacher

but one greater; the water supply in much better condition; the number of volumes in library larger; a larger number of schools with medical and dental inspected; the investment in high school facilities larger; and the number of students in college larger, we are forced to the conclusion that the development of industry has had a beneficial effect on the rural schools.

The distance to a hospital was very much less for the counties having the largest development of industry. Also, there were almost three times as many physicians in the two counties having the most manufacturing as in the counties with least manufacturing. A very much larger percentage of the people in the most manufacturing counties have telephone connections with a physician.

We have very little data as to dentists, but we do know that but one community out of the thirty-two studied had a local dentist. The distance to a dentist is slightly more in the counties of most manufacturing, but as the roads are better, and more of the people have cars, and as one does not have to go often, this is not of great importance. The counties with most manufacturing have a much larger percentage of their people with telephones to a dentist.

We have no data on amount of infectious diseases in the communities of Anderson and Knox, but in Hawkins and Sullivan we found that while the amount of typhoid was decreasing in both counties it had decreased much more rapidly in Sullivan than it had in Hawkins.

Children were not required to do harmful work in either of the thirty-two communities studied. Therefore there were no harmful effects of child labor due to the development of manufacturing.

In view of the above facts we must conclude that the development of industry has had a beneficial effect on health. In no case has it been harmful, and in many cases, as pointed out above, it has been helpful.

The statement has been made that industrial development in an agricultural region is harmful to the rural church. In the thirty-two communities studied we found that those located in the areas with most manufacturing had a slight larger percentage of church members, and we also found that when we took the whole counties the ones with most manufacturing had the largest percentage of church members. The one-third most manufacturing counties of Tennessee have the largest percentage of church members, the one-third medium manufacturing counties have the second highest percentage, and the one-third least manufacturing have the smallest percentage of the population church members.

The one-half most manufacturing states of the Union has a very much higher percentage of church members than does the one-half least manufacturing states.

The number of church services per month was larger, and the church attendance was much larger, in the counties with the most manufacturing.

The Sunday school is a good index to the condition of the rural church. The total Sunday school enrollment was much larger in the counties with the most manufacturing.

The annual budget for current expenses, and the amount invested in buildings and equipment, are both good indicators of the interest people have in their church. Both are larger in the counties with the most manufacturing.

The counties with the most manufacturing also have the best educated pastors.

In conclusion: the counties with most manufacturing have the largest percentage of people church members; the church services are more frequent per month; they have a larger church attendance; the Sunday school enrollment is larger; the annual budget and investment in buildings and equipment is larger; and the pastors are better educated. All this indicates a beneficial effect of industrial development on the rural church.

The lack of the right kind of recreation has done a great deal to cause boys and girls in some parts of the country to become dissatisfied with country life. In recent years much has been done in some regions to improve rural recreation by means of church socials, school entertainments, ball games, picnics, movies, etc.

The number of church socials was larger in the counties with least manufacturing. It seems that the church is taking this up because no other agency has done so. But on the other hand, the number of school entertainments was much larger in the counties of most manufacturing.

The number of ice cream suppers was larger, and the number of pie suppers was only 0.1 smaller, in the counties with most manufacturing.

Both the number of ball games, and the number of picnics was larger in the counties with most manufacturing.

In one set of counties the number of fairs was larger in the most manufacturing; and in the other set the number of fairs was larger in the county having least development of industry.

The number of both card parties and dances was very much larger in the counties with the largest development of industry.

A few of the communities in Sullivan had movies, while none of the communities in the other counties had any recreation facilities of this kind.

The total number of social functions in Knox and Sullivan communities was very much larger than the total number in the Hawkins and Anderson communities. We are forced to the conclusion that the development of industry has had a beneficial effect on rural recreation.

The communities studied in Knox had a larger number of homes with all three home conveniences; that is, water light, and furnace heat than had the communities in Anderson; the communities in Sullivan had more homes with running water, but fewer with light and furnace heat. This indicates that the development of industry has not hindered the development of home conveniences.

The total number of homes having musical instruments was much larger in the counties with most manufacturing. That is, the number of pianos or organs was larger in the most manufacturing counties, in both sets of counties. The number of radios was about equal. That is, Hawkins had more radios than Sullivan, and Knox had more than Anderson. The number of phonographs was about equal in the most and the least manufacturing counties. Sullivan had about as many more than Hawkins as Anderson had more than Knox.

The data collected shows that the counties with the most manufacturing had the largest number of centers of immorality; but this may be largely because the people of the other counties do not consider some of these things as closely as do the folks in the most manufacturing areas. Our data also show that the law is better enforced in Anderson than it is in Knox, but also much better in Sullivan than in Hawkins.

The trading centers are much more satisfactory in the communities with most manufacturing.

The tax rate is considerably lower in Knox and Sullivan than it is in Hawkins and Anderson. The people of the most manufacturing communities have

the most loyal community spirit.

In summary then we conclude that the development of industry has a beneficial effect on home conveniences; on the number of musical instruments; has not had a very bad effect on morals; has greatly benefitted the trading centers; has increased community spirit; and has not brought about any other harmful changes of which we could learn. Therefore the development of industry has on the whole proven beneficial to those phases of rural life mentioned above.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The fact that this study has revealed but very few harmful effects of industrial development on rural welfare, and that a large number of beneficial effects are indicated, seems to justify the following recommendations:

Since the beneficial effects of a small industrial development in a rural community that is easily accessible is greater than the influence of a much larger industrial development on communities that are poorly accessible, we are convinced that one of the best things that could come to many of the strictly rural communities of Tennessee would be a development of industry in their midst.

In the early days of the Southern farmers the negro slaves were used to doing much of the farm work. The negroes were poorly suited to use of improved machinery, and therefore the South has remained backward in the use of machinery and also in the development of industry. We recommend that a different kind of slaves now be used to do much of the work in the South. The slaves that we recommend for this, however, are the power slaves. "It is human nature for a man to use a tool until it is almost blunt rather than to treadle a grindstone; whereas a switch on a motor-driven grinder

invited his soul." (Page 9, "Electric Development as an Aid to Agriculture," by G. E. Tripp.)

If a number of farmers near a little village, or in a rural section, decide that they want electrical power on their farms, it can be secured if they will see that some industry will come there. For then the poorer company will "tap" the line to furnish power for this industry, and will then be willing to run a line of low voltage out from this industry to the farmer. In other words, without the help of the industry the step down required to run this line direct to the farmers would make the power too expensive for the farmer to use.

Instead of building more factories in cities that are already over-industrialized we should build the new factories in the small towns or small villages. We do not mean that any of the factories already established should be moved but there will be a need for new factories and these should be placed in communities that are at present over-agriculturalized. Every indication is that this policy would prove mutually beneficial both to the surrounding rural area and to the factories themselves.

PART III.

APPENDIX.

AGRICULTURE

Table 1. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY - 1926

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County	Eight Communities Anderson County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	76.88	83.8
Number Owners	144.0	100.0
Number Tenants	55.6	9.9
Number Hired Men	29.6	0.65
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	65.0	70.0
" " Wages	$ 1.72	$ 1.56
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	65.0	70.0
Non-resident Land Owners	1.25	2.25
Idle Land--%	19.75	25.63
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	2	1.1
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 61.25	$ 53.13
% Increase in Value	189.9	108.3
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	75.8	73.75
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	75.7	72.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	22.9	2.9
" " " No. Tractors	6.25	1.38
No. Purebred Livestock	350.75	42.00
Alfalfa, Acres	2.5	2.0
Silos, Number	13.75	1.25
No. Acres Lime Used	7.12	4.13
Markets Available, Number	1.0	1.38
Marketing Facilities		
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0.75
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.75
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	1.75	0.88
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0.13	0.88
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Knox County with Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County - 1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: There has been a greater increase in crop yield in Knox County than there has been in Anderson; about 20% for Knox and 10% for Anderson.

Kind of Tenants: The larger percentage of tenants pay share rent. In Knox about 10% pay cash, while in Anderson only about 5% pay cash. In both counties practically all the tenants are native whites.

Who Owns Idle Land: In every one of the sixteen communities studied in these two counties the idle land is owned by people in the community. That is, it is a part of an adjoining farm.

Why Land Is Idle: The percentage of idle land in Anderson in 1926 was more than the percentage in Knox, being 26% in Anderson and only 18% in Knox. There is but little difference in the reasons for this idle land in the two counties. In Anderson there seems to be more idle due to erosion. The largest amount is idle in Anderson because it is too low in fertility to be farmed at a profit; it is submarginal. The main reason given in Knox County for the land's being idle is that it is too rough and too low in fertility.

Character of Empty Houses: All vacant houses in Anderson County were from poor to fair in condition. In Knox also most of them were from poor to fair, but a few were good and were left vacant because the owners went away to work.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: The average for Knox County is six months, while two were vacant as long as twelve months. The average for Anderson County is 4.5 months. Several communities have none at all vacant.

Why Houses Were Empty: The reasons for houses being vacant in Knox are: (1) bad condition, (2) rent too high, (3) owners moved to town to work. The reasons in Anderson County for empty houses are (1) poor condition, (2) moved away to work.

Marketing Facilities: Clinton and Coal Creek both furnish a small market to Anderson, but both together cannot handle more than about a dozen farmers could grow. The farmers of the eight communities of Knox can find a market for almost anything they have to sell in Knoxville.

(next page)

AGRICULTURE.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Knox County with Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County - 1926: (continued)

Type of Farming Now: The type of farming in Knox is still classed as general farming, though we found a few specialized farmers. The main sources of cash were: tobacco, dairying, and some truck crops. The type in Anderson County was further from the specialized. They practice general farming with tobacco, dairying, and a little of: (1) fruit, (2) vegetables, and (3) poultry as cash income.

Why Type of Farming Has Changed: With better market and better roads the farmers found tobacco, dairying, and truck crops more profitable. In Anderson County the farmers found that corn and wheat were less profitable than tobacco, dairying, fruit, and vegetables, since they have the good roads to markets.

Some Farmers' Needs: In Anderson they need to improve their soil by the use of lime and growing of legumes. They also need cooperative markets. In Knox they need more lime, more legumes, more green manure, cooperative marketing, and application of scientific methods in agriculture. Better markets are very badly needed in the inaccessible communities.

Table 2. . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County 1896	Eight Communities Knox County 1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	158.5	76.88
Number Owners	85.0	144.0
Number Tenants	67.9	55.6
Number Hired Men	52.1	29.6
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	77.5	65.0
" " Wages	$ 0.54	$ 1.72
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	77.5	65.0
Non-resident Land Owners	0.84	1.25
Idle Land--%	14.0	19.75
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	1.9	2.0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 21.25	$ 61.25
% Increase in Value	-	188.2
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	65.0	75.6
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	64.3	75.7
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	10.6	22.9
" " " No. Tractors	0	6.25
No. Purebred Livestock	27.13	380.75
Alfalfa, Acres	0	2.5
Silos, Number	0	13.75
No. Acres Lime Used	0.65	7.12
Markets Available, Number	1.0	1.0
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	0	1.75
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0.13
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Knox County in 1896 with the Average of The Same Eight Communities in 1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: The eight communities of Knox had an increase of crop yield of about 15% between 1896 and 1926.

Kind of Tenants: In 1896 less than 5% of rent were cash. In 1926 10% of tenants paid cash rent. In both periods the tenants were white natives.

Who Owns Idle Land: In 1896 all the idle land was owned by the farmers of the community. In 1926 five farms were all idle and owned by men who had moved to town to work.

Why Land Was Idle: The same amount of land was idle in 1926 as was idle in 1896. In 1896 it was reported to be idle because it was (1) poor, (2) no market, (3) too rough. In 1926 the land was reported to be idle because: (1) of poor land, (2) of high labor, (3) too rough.

Character of Empty Houses: In 1896 vacant houses were all reported to be in good condition. In 1926 the vacant houses ranged from poor to good in condition.

How Long Houses Were Empty: In 1896 we have no data as to how long houses were vacant. In 1926 the average time was six months.

Why Houses Were Vacant: In 1896 the houses were not needed. In 1926, in bad condition, rent too high, or owners moved to town.

Marketing Facilities: The roads to market have greatly improved, and the local demand for farm products has increased very much since 1896.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: The type of farming in 1896 was general, with a little wheat, a few hogs, and a few beef cattle to sell. In 1926 general farming with tobacco, trucking, and dairying as cash crops.

Why Type of Farming Changed: The farmers find tobacco, dairying, and trucking more profitable as cash crops, with the coming of better markets.

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1896 markets were needed, purebred livestock, better roads, scientific methods of farming, better tools. In 1926 farmers needed cooperative buying and selling, lime and legumes, more use of green manure, better machinery, and needed to take better care of what machinery they already had.

Table 3. . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Anderson County 1906	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	118.8	83.8
Number Owners	63.0	100.0
Number Tenants	24.9	9.9
Number Hired Men	24.2	0.65
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	70.0	70.0
" " Wages	$ 0.56	$ 1.56
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	70.0	70.0
Non-resident Land Owners	0	2.25
Idle Land--%	18.38	25.63
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	1.9	1.1
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 21.88	$ 53.13
% Increase in Value	-	108.3
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	88.3	73.75
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	72.5	72.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	0.6	2.9
" " " No. Tractors	0	1.38
No. Purebred Livestock	0.38	42.00
Alfalfa, Acres	0	2.0
Silos, Number	0	1.25
No. Acres Lime Used	0	4.13
Markets Available, Number	1.13	1.38
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0.75
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.75
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	0.5	0.88
Type of Farming - New	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0.15	0.88
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with the Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: The eight communities of Anderson County had an increase in crop yield of 8% between 1906 and 1926.

Kind of Tenants: In 1906 all tenants paid share rent, while in 1926 about 5% of the tenants paid share rent. The tenants were all white native in both periods.

Who Owns Idle Land: The farmers of the community owned the idle land in both 1926 and 1906.

Why Land Was Idle: In 1906 the land was not needed, there was poor markets and poor marketing facilities, much of the land was rough, and the fertility low. In 1926 the idle land was eroded and rocky, and the fertility was low, while labor was high.

Character of Empty Houses: In 1906 they ranged from poor to good in condition. In 1926 they ranged from fair to good.

How Long Houses Were Empty: In 1906 the average was three months, while in 1926 the average was four and one-half months.

Why Houses Were Empty: In 1906 some were empty because of their poor quality. Others were empty because the owner had moved to town. In 1926 the same reasons were given, namely: poor condition of empty houses, and the moving of the owners to town to work.

Marketing Facilities: The local market for the eight communities in Anderson did not increase very much between 1906 and 1926. It is still relatively poor. The roads have been improved, and some of the more valuable products can be hauled to Knoxville.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: In 1906 the type was general with a little wheat, corn, hogs, and beef cattle to sell. In 1926 the type was general with tobacco and a little fruit, vegetables, poultry, and dairy products.

Why Type of Farming Changed: With better roads and better markets the tobacco, fruit, vegetables, poultry, and dairying is found more profitable.

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1906 they needed a better market, needed to use lime, legumes, and rotation, more scientific methods of farming. In 1926 they needed cooperative marketing, crop rotation, lime, and legumes.

Table 4. . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1896	Most Accessible Knox County 1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	200.0	81.25
Number Owners	117.0	250.00
Number Tenants	141.6	118.3
Number Hired Men	93.3	62.5
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	78.7	65.0
" " Wages	$ 0.49	$ 1.75
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	78.7	65.0
Non-resident Land Owners	1.67	0.25
Idle Land--%	6.25	5.25
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	3.75	1.75
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	23.25	$ 87.50
% Increase in Value	-	199.1
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	65.0	81.25
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	62.5	77.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	15.0	37.5
" " " No. Tractors	0	11.5
No. Purebred Livestock	54.0	684.0
Alfalfa, Acres	0	5.0
Silos, Number	0	27.0
No. Acres Lime Used	1.25	13.25
Markets Available, Number	1	1
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	0	1.75
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0.25
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox in 1896 and in 1926:

Percentage Increase of Crop Yield: Between 1896 and 1926 the crop yield of four Knox County communities increased more than 15%.

Kind of Tenants: In 1896 there were only about 10% of the renters paying cash, while in 1926 they paid over 15% cash rent. The type of renters was just as high in 1926, in both cases being white natives.

Who Owns Idle Land: In both periods all the idle land was owned by the farmers of the community.

Why Land Was Idle: The same percentage of land was idle in 1896 as in 1926. The reasons given for idle land in 1896 were the same as 1926, that is, the idle land was poor, or rough; while in 1926 this additional reason is given: labor too high to farm poor, rough land at a profit.

Character of Empty Houses: The vacant houses were all frame and ranged from fair to good on condition.

How Long Houses Were Empty: In 1896 no data could be obtained on the time houses were vacant. In 1926 the average was six months.

Why Houses Were Empty: In 1896 is reported that some of the houses were not needed, this being the reason for their being vacant. In 1926 one was in bad shape, the others the rent too high.

Marketing Facilities: The population of Knoxville has more than doubled since 1896, therefore the demand for farm products has increased a large amount.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: The type in 1896 was general with wheat and corn, with some hogs and beef cattle, while in 1926 it was still essentially general, but very much more toward special with tobacco, dairying, and truck crops as the principal cash producers.

Why Type of Farming Changed: With better roads and better markets, tobacco, dairying and vegetables are more profitable.

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1896 they needed scientific knowledge of methods of farming, purebred livestock, better markets, and better farm machinery. They needed to take better care of what machinery they already had. In 1926 they still needed the scientific methods, cooperative marketing, lime, and legumes. But local market facilities were much better than formerly.

Table 5. . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County 1906	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	131.25	76.25
Number Owners	87.0	141.0
Number Tenants	40.0	7.0
Number Hired Men	45.0	1.3
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	80.0	68.7
" " Wages	$ 0.56	$ 1.69
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	80.0	68.7
Non-resident Land Owners	0	0.5
Idle Land--%	16.25	16.25
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	1.25	0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 28.75	$ 75.00
% Increase in Value	-	185.7
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	70.0	73.75
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	72.5	72.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	0.7	2.8
" " " No. Tractors	0	1.75
No. Purebred Livestock	0.75	53.0
Alfalfa, Acres	0	4
Silos, Number	0	2.5
No. Acres Lime Used	0	5.25
Markets Available, Number	1.00	1.25
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	1.00
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.75
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	0.25	0.5
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0.5	1.0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with Average of Same Communities in 1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: Between 1906 and 1926 the crop yield of the four most accessible communities of Anderson increased over 10%.

Kind of Tenants: In 1906 all the tenants paid share rent. In 1926 about 5% of farms rented for cash rent. The tenants in 1926 were just as high type as were the tenants in 1906, in both cases being white natives.

Who Owns Idle Land: The idle land was owned by farmers of the community.

Why Land Was Idle: In 1906 land was not needed, poor market, and submarginal land. In 1926 high labor made farming unprofitable on the poor rough lands. There was also a general overproduction of food in the country at that time.

Character of Empty Houses: In 1926 none were vacant. In 1906 they ran from fair to very poor in condition.

How Long Houses Were Empty: In 1926 none were empty. In 1906 the average period was three months.

Why Houses Were Vacant: In 1926 none were vacant. In 1906 former resident moved to town in one case, and the others were vacant because houses were in too poor condition to live in.

Marketing Facilities: The local market did not increase very much between 1906 and 1926. The roads were improved, and for crops that are valuable enough to haul long distances, the Knoxville market has been enlarged and improved.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: In 1906 the type was general, with a little wheat, corn, hogs, and beef cattle to sell. In 1926 still general, with considerable tobacco, dairy products, and truck crops to sell.

Why Type of Farming Changed: Tobacco, dairying, and truck growing more profitable, due to the development of markets and construction of good roads.

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1906 they needed better local markets, diversification of crops, and rotation of crops. In 1926 cooperative marketing, rotation of crops, organization of farmers.

Table 6. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1896	Least Accessible Knox County 1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	118.8	72.50
Number Owners	58.0	64.0
Number Tenants	12.5	8.5
Number Hired Men	21.3	7.7
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	76.25	65.0
" " Wages	$ 0.59	$ 1.69
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	76.25	65.0
Non-resident Land Owners	0	2.25
Idle Land--%	21.75	34.25
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	0	2.25
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 13.00	$ 55.00
% Increase in Value	-	169.2
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	65.0	70.0
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	66.6	73.3
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	6.3	8.3
" " " No. Tractors	0	1.0
No. Purebred Livestock	0.25	18.0
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0	0.5
No. Acres Lime Used	0	1.00
Markets Available, Number	1	1
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	0	1.75
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County in 1896 with Average of Same in 1926:

Percentage Increase of Crop Yield: The crop yield of the four least accessible communities of Knox was the same in 1926 as it was in 1896.

Kind of Tenant: There is no difference in the kind of tenancy, as it was all share in both years. There is also no difference in the kind of renters, as they were white natives in both periods.

Who Owns Idle Land: In 1896 all was owned by farmers of the neighborhood. In 1926 five farms were idle and owned by farmers who have moved to town to work.

Why Land Was Idle: In 1896 land was idle because of poor market; too rough and too poor to farm at a profit under the circumstances. In 1926 it was idle because it was too rough, too poor, and high labor, making farming unprofitable on this poor, rough land.

Character of Empty Houses: In 1896 all the houses were full. In 1926 the vacant houses were frame and they ranged from good to poor in conditions.

How Long Houses Were Empty: In 1896 all houses were full. In 1926 the empty houses averaged six months being vacant.

Why Houses Were Empty: In 1896 none were vacant. In 1926 a few were vacant because (1) not needed, and (2) the owners had moved to town to work.

Marketing Facilities: The marketing facilities had improved very much between 1896 and 1926, both in demand for products and roads over which to bring the products.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: The type in 1926 was general farming with tobacco and a small amount of dairying and truck growing as a source of money. In 1896 general farming, with wheat, corn, hogs, and beef cattle as cash income.

Why Type of Farming Changed: Tobacco, dairying, and trucking more profitable.

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1896 they needed to improve land with lime and legumes, and farm more intensive and more scientifically, with better local markets being especially needed. In 1926 they needed to improve their soil with lime and legumes, use scientific methods, and cooperate in buying and selling.

Table 7. . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Anderson County 1906	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	106.25	91.25
Number Owners	46.0	69.0
Number Tenants	13.5	12.5
Number Hired Men	3.3	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	80.0	71.25
" " Wages	$ 0.56	$ 1.44
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	80.0	71.25
Non-resident Land Owners	0	4.0
Idle Land--%	20.5	35.00
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	2.5	2.25
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 15.00	$ 31.25
% Increase in Value	-	108.3
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	62.5	67.5
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	70.0	67.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	0.5	3.0
" " " No. Tractors	0	1.0
No. Purebred Livestock	0	31.0
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0	0
No. Acres Lime Used	0	3.0
Markets Available, Number	1.25	1.5
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0.5
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.75
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	0.25	0.5
Type of Farming - New	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0.75
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: In the four least accessible communities of Anderson crop yield increased about 5% between 1906 and 1926.

Kind of Tenants: In 1906 all tenants paid share rent. In 1926 all except one paid share rent. In both periods they were white natives.

Who Owns Idle Land: Farmers of the community owned all the idle land in 1926, just as they did in 1906.

Why Land Was Idle: In 1906 some of the farms were too large, fertility in some places was exhausted, land submarginal. In 1926 labor too high to farm poor rough land profitably, and not many tenants wanting to rent, especially if the land was not fertile and the house not good.

Character of Empty Houses: In 1906 all were filled. In 1926 the vacant houses were from fair to good in condition.

How Long Houses Were Empty: In 1906 there were none. In 1926 the average was nine months.

Why Houses Were Empty: In 1906 none were vacant. In 1926 the people had left the community to get more profitable work elsewhere.

Marketing Facilities: The local market for the four least accessible communities of Anderson improved but little during this period. It is still of but little consequence to most farmers.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: In 1906 the type was general with a little wheat, corn, hogs, and beef cattle to sell. In 1926 general farming with tobacco and a little fruit, vegetables, and dairy products to sell.

Why Type of Farming Changed: The more specialized and intensive farming found to be more profitable, with the development of better local markets and good roads.

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1906 they needed lime and legumes, improvements of land, more intensive and scientific methods of farming. In Anderson they needed to improve their soil by use of lime and legumes. They also needed cooperative marketing and scientific methods of farming, and also better markets.

Table 8. . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX COUNTY - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Knox County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	81.25	72.50
Number Owners	250.0	64.0
Number Tenants	118.3	8.5
Number Hired Men	62.5	7.7
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	65.0	65.0
" " Wages	$ 1.75	$ 1.69
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	65.0	65.0
Non-resident Land Owners	0.25	2.25
Idle Land--%	5.25	34.25
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	1.75	2.25
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 87.50	$ 35.00
% Increase in Value	192.1	169.2
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	81.25	70.0
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	7755	73.3
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	37.5	8.3
" " " No. Tractors	11.5	1.0
No. Purebred Livestock	684.0	18.0
Alfalfa, Acres	5.0	0
Silos, Number	27.0	0.5
No. Acres Lime Used	13.25	1.00
Markets Available, Number	1	1
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	1.75	1.75
Type of Farming - New	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0.25	0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Knox - 1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: The crop yields for the least accessible communities of Knox were about the same in 1926 as they were in 1896. But the crop yields in the most accessible communities have increased more than 20%.

Kind of Tenants: In the four least accessible communities of Knox all the tenants were share tenants, while the four most accessible had about 15% of renters paying cash. In both cases they were native whites.

Who Owns Idle Land: The amount of idle land in the four most accessible communities is only about 6% and all of it is owned by farmers of the community. The worn out and thin places on these farms are idle. The four least accessible communities have about 30% idle land and five whole farms are idle, the owners having moved away from there. The rest is owned by farmers of the community.

Why Idle Land: In the four least accessible communities the reason for idle land is: too rough, too poor, owners working elsewhere, wage too high to farm poor land there at a profit. In the four most accessible communities the labor is too high to make farming profitable unless either a high grade of farming is done or a specialized type is followed.

Character of Empty Houses: In the four most accessible communities all but one of the vacant houses are small farme houses, in fair condition. There is one six-room frame where the owner has moved. In the four least accessible communities there are several fair to good houses, where the owners have gone North. The other empty houses are poor.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: The length of time for the houses to be vacant was just the same in both the sections. The average was six months, with a few as long as twelve months.

Why Houses Were Empty: In the most accessible communities the rent is too high or the houses are in bad condition. In the four least accessible the residents have moved to Knoxville and other places to work, or the houses are in poor condition, or there is no demand for the houses.

(next page)

AGRICULTURE.

(continued)

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Knox - 1926: (continued)

Marketing Facilities: Knoxville furnishes a market to the least accessible communities just as it does to the most accessible, but because they are further out, have poorer roads, and fewer trucks, they are not able to market with a profit some of their products that the accessible communities can profitably produce.

Type of Farming Now: In the four most accessible communities of Knox County the type of farming is general but more nearly special than it is in the least accessible. They have truck dairying and tobacco as their main cash income, but still grow a lot of corn, hay, and livestock other than dairy cows. In the four least accessible communities in Knox they have general farming with tobacco and dairying and only a little truck crops as cash income.

Type of Farming Formerly: In both communities the types formerly were the same: general farming with wheat, corn, hogs, and beef cattle as cash income.

Why Type of Farming Changed: The better market and better roads makes truck crops, tobacco, and dairying more profitable, especially in the accessible communities.

Some Farmers' Needs: The four most accessible communities' needs are more lime and legumes, cooperative marketing, and scientific methods. The four least accessible communities' needs are lime, legumes, rotation, and cooperative marketing, with better nearby markets especially needed.

AGRICULTURE

Table 9. . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	76.25	91.25
Number Owners	141.0	69.0
Number Tenants	7.0	12.5
Number Hired Men	133	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	68.7	71.25
" " Wages	$ 1.69	$ 1.44
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	68.7	71.25
Non-resident Land Owners	9.5	4.0
Idle Land--%	16.25	35.00
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	0	2.25
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 75.00	$ 31.25
% Increase in Value	185.7	108.3
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	73.75	67.5
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	72.5	67.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	2.8	3.0
" " " No. Tractors	1.75	1.0
No. Purebred Livestock	53.0	31.0
Alfalfa, Acres	4	0
Silos, Number	2.50	0
No. Acres Lime Used	5.25	3.0
Markets Available, Number	1.25	1.5
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	1.00	0.5
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0.75	0.75
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	0.5	1.25
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	1.0	0.75
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County with Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: There was an increase of about 5% in crop yields in the Anderson communities, while in the Knox communities the increase is more than 20%.

Kind of Tenants: About 5% of the tenants rent for cash and the remainder for shares in the four most accessible communities of Anderson. All share except one tenant in the four least accessible communities of Anderson. In both cases the renters are native whites.

Who Owns Idle Land: There is much less idle land (18%) in the four most accessible communities, than there is in the four least accessible (35%). All of it in both sections is owned by farmers of the community.

Why Land Was Idle: The reasons for the difference is that poor and rough lands cannot be farmed as easily at a profit far from market as they can with a good market close at hand.

Character of Vacant Houses: In the four most accessible communities there were no vacant houses. The few vacant in the four least accessible were frame buildings and from fair to good in condition.

How Long Houses Had Been Vacant: The average of the four least accessible was nine months for a house to be vacant. There was none vacant in the four most accessible.

Why Houses Were Vacant: The owners have gone away to find work, in the four least accessible communities. All houses are filled in the four most accessible.

Marketing Facilities: The fact that the Anderson communities are further away from a considerably consuming population causes them to have a less chance at the market, as compared with the close-in communities of Knox.

Type of Farming Now: The type of farming in the four most accessible communities is general, with tobacco the main cash crop. However, there is some (1) fruit, (2) vegetables, (3) poultry, with some hogs. The type in the four least accessible is general, with tobacco as the main cash crop. There are a few vegetables grown for market and just a little dairying.

(next page)

AGRICULTURE.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County with Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1926:

Why Type of Farming Changed: Farmers found tobacco, dairying, and truck crops more profitable, after the development of better roads and markets.

Some Farmers' Needs: The needs are the same in both sections: improved land by lime and legumes; should have more scientific instruction, organization, and cooperative markets. Better markets especially needed in the least accessible areas.

Table 10. . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	81.25	76.25
Number Owners	250.00	141.0
Number Tenants	118.3	7.0
Number Hired Men	62.5	1.3
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	65.0	68.7
" " Wages	$ 1.75	$ 1.62
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	65.0	68.7
Non-resident Land Owners	0.25	0.5
Idle Land--%	5.25	16.25
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	1.75	0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 87.50	$ 75.00
% Increase in Value	199.1	185.7
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	82.5	73.75
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	77.5	72.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	37.5	2.3
" " " No. Tractors	11.5	1.75
No. Purebred Livestock	684.0	53.0
Alfalfa, Acres	5.0	4.0
Silos, Number	27.0	2.5
No. Acres Lime Used	13.25	5.25
Markets Available, Number	1	1.25
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	1.00
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.75
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	1.75	0.5
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0.25	1.0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County - 1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: The four communities of Knox increased more than 20%, while the four of Anderson increased a little more than 10%.

Kind of Tenants: The four most accessible communities in Knox have about 15% of their tenants on cash basis and the remainder share rent; while in the four most accessible communities in Anderson about 5% of the tenants work for cash rent and 95% share rent. In both sections the renters are native whites.

Who Owns Idle Land: In both sections all the idle land is owned by farmers of the community.

Why Land Was Idle: The land of the Anderson communities was idle because of: being washed and rocky, high price of labor, and being submarginal and not profitable under present conditions. In Knox the land is idle because of high labor, low fertility, or too rough to cultivate.

Character of Empty Houses: The vacant houses in Knox are all small frame houses in fair to good condition, except one. This one is a six-room frame building, empty because the owner has gone away to work. In Anderson County the houses are all full.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: The average in Knox County was six months per house, with none for more than twelve months. In Anderson all were full.

Why Houses Were Empty: The houses in Knox were vacant either because the house was in bad shape, or because the rent wanted was too high.

Marketing Facilities: The four communities of Knox had a market at Knoxville for anything they had to sell, while those of Anderson had a nearby market at Clinton for only a very few things.

Type of Farming Now: The type of farming in Knox was still general, but was more toward special. The main sources of cash are tobacco, dairying, and truck crops. In Anderson County they had as cash income tobacco, with a little dairying, poultry, and truck crops.

Type of Farming Formerly: The type of farming formerly was alike in the two counties. General farming with wheat, hogs, and beef cattle as cash income.

Why Type of Farming Changed: With better markets and better roads the farmers found tobacco, dairying, and truck crops more profitable.

Some Farmers' Needs: They need, in both counties, cooperative marketing, scientific methods of farming, and lime and legumes.

Table 11 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	72.50	91.25
Number Owners	64.0	69.0
Number Tenants	8.5	12.5
Number Hired Men	7.7	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	65.0	71.25
" " Wages	$ 1.69	$ 1.44
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	65.0	71.25
Non-resident Land Owners	2.25	4.0
Idle Land--%	34.25	35.0
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	2.25	2.25
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 35.00	$ 31.25
% Increase in Value	169.2	108.3
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	70.0	67.5
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	73.5	67.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	8.5	3.0
" " " No. Tractors	1.0	1.0
No. Purebred Livestock	18.0	31.0
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0.5	0
No. Acres Lime Used	1.00	3.0
Markets Available, Number	1	1.5
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0.5
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.75
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	1.75	0.5
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0.75
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Anderson County - 1926:

Percentage Increase of Crop Yield: The crop yield for the four least accessible communities of Knox had remained the same, while those in Anderson had increased about 5%.

Kind of Tenants: In both of these areas all the tenants paid share rent, and they were white natives.

Who Owns Idle Land: The idle land in Knox was all owned by farmers of the community except a few farms, and their owners moved away for a short time to work in town. In Anderson, all the idle land was owned by farmers of the community.

Why Land Was Idle: The land is reported as idle in Anderson because of labor being high, fertility being poor, and submarginal land. It is reported as idle in Knox because: labor was high, men worked somewhere else, land poor.

Character of Empty Houses: The character of the vacant houses was the same in both counties. They ranged from good to poor. The owners of the good ones had gone to cities to work.

How Long Houses Were Empty: The vacant houses were empty on an average of six months in Knox, while those in Anderson averaged nine months.

Why Houses Were Empty: Most of the houses were vacant because the owners had gone North or somewhere else to work. A few were vacant because there was no demand for them and because they were in poor condition.

Marketing Facilities: The four communities of Knox had a market for anything that they cared to ahul to Knoxville, while those of Anderson had very poor market.

Type of Farming Now: In Knox the type of farming is general, with tobacco, dairying, and truck growing as the sources of cash. In Anderson they have general farming, with tobacco as the main cash crop. There are a few vegetables grown for market and just a little dairying.

Type of Farming Formerly: In both counties it was general, with wheat, corn, and beef cattle as cash revenues.

Why Type of Farming Changed: With better roads and better markets they found more profit in tobacco, dairying, and truck crops.

Some Farmers' Needs: In Anderson they needed to improve their soil by use of lime and legumes. They also needed cooperative marketing and scientific methods of farming. Better markets near at hand are an especially acute need in this section. In Knox they needed lime, legumes, crop-rotation, more use of green manure, and cooperative marketing.

Table 12. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	81.25	91.25
Number Owners	250.00	69.0
Number Tenants	118.3	12.5
Number Hired Men	62.5	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	65.0	71.25
" " Wages	$ 1.75	$ 1.44
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	65.0	71.25
Non-resident Land Owners	0.25	4.0
Idle Land--%	5.25	35.00
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	1.75	2.25
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 87.50	$ 31.25
% Increase in Value	199.1	108.3
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	81.25	67.5
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	77.5	67.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	37.5	3.0
" " " No. Tractors	11.5	1.0
No. Purebred Livestock	684.0	31.0
Alfalfa, Acres	5.0	0
Silos, Number	27.0	0
No. Acres Lime Used	13.25	3.0
Markets Available, Number	1	1.5
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0.5
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.75
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	1.75	0.5
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0.25	0.75
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Average of the four least accessible of Anderson County in 1926:

Percentage Increase of Crop Yields: In the four most accessible communities of Knox the crop yield increased more than 20%, while in the four least accessible in Anderson it increased only about 5%.

Kind of Tenants: In the four most accessible communities of Anderson there was but one tenant paying cash rent. In the four most accessible of Knox over 15% of tenants paid cash rent. All the tenants in both sections are native whites.

Who Owns Idle Land: In every case in both counties the idle land is owned by farmers of the community.

Why Land Was Idle: In Knox County the land was reported as idle because of plant food being low, high labor, and part of land being too rough. In Anderson County land was idle because rough, fertility low, high labor.

Character of Vacant Houses: In Knox County the vacant houses were all frame, and ranged from fair to good in condition. The vacant houses in Anderson were also frame, and also ranged from fair to good in condition.

How Long Houses Were Vacant: The average time a house has been vacant in Knox County is six months. The average time for one in Anderson County was nine months.

Why Houses Were Vacant: In Knox the houses were vacant because of poor condition, or rent too high. In Anderson County the houses were vacant because the owners had moved to town for work.

Marketing Facilities: The market was already fairly good for the four most accessible in Knox, and it has been improved a great deal. The market for the four least accessible of Anderson has improved but little and is still very poor.

Type of Farming Now: In Knox County in 1926 the type was general, but much more toward special than in Anderson. Tobacco, dairy products, and truck crops are the products they had to sell. In Anderson they had tobacco with very little dairying and trucking.

Why Type of Farming Changed: Tobacco, dairying, and trucking are found to be more profitable, with the coming of better roads and markets.

Some Farmers' Needs: In Knox County, cooperative buying and selling, more emphasis on dairying, lime and legumes. In Anderson County, improvement of land, by lime and legumes, more instruction, cooperative marketing, scientific farming.

Table 13 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF ANDERSON 1926

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	72.50	76.25
Number Owners	64.0	141.0
Number Tenants	8.5	7.0
Number Hired Men	7.7	1.3
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	65.0	68.7
" " Wages	$ 1.69	$ 1.62
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	65.0	68.7
Non-resident Land Owners	2.25	0.5
Idle Land--%	34.25	16.25
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	2.25	0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 35.00	$ 75.00
% Increase in Value	169.2	185.7
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	70.0	73.75
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	73.3	72.5
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	8.3	2.8
" " " No. Tractors	1.0	1.75
No. Purebred Livestock	18.0	53.0
Alfalfa, Acres	0	4
Silos, Number	0.5	2.5
No. Acres Lime Used	1.00	5.25
Markets Available, Number	1	1.25
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	1.0
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.75
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	1.75	0.5
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	1.0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County, 1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: The crop yield in four least accessible of Knox had remained the same, while in the four most accessible of Anderson it had increased more than 10%.

Kind of Tenants: In Knox all the tenants paid share rent. In Anderson all except about 5% paid share, and these paid cash rent. All the tenants of both counties were native whites.

Who Owns Idle Land: In Knox County all the idle land, except five farms, was owned by farmers of the community, these five being owned by farmers who have moved to town to work. In Anderson all idle land was owned by the farmers of the community.

Why Land Was Idle: In Knox land was idle because: (1) of high labor, (2) fertility low, and (3) owners elsewhere working. In Anderson County land was idle because of: washed and rocky land, low fertility, and high price of labor.

Character of Empty Houses: In Anderson County all houses were full. In Knox the vacant houses were all frame, and they ranged from fair to poor in condition.

How Long Houses Were Empty: None vacant in Anderson. Were vacant an average of six months in Knox.

Why Houses Were Vacant: In Knox they were not needed, or owners had moved to town to work. In Anderson, none were vacant.

Marketing Facilities: The market has improved very much for the four least accessible communities of Knox; they had a good market for the things which they could afford to haul to Knoxville. The market was still relatively poor for the four most accessible of Anderson, but it has improved somewhat.

Type of Farming Now: The type of farming was the same in these two sections --- general with tobacco and a little fruit, vegetables, and dairy products to sell.

Type of Farming Formerly: The type of farming formerly in these two sections was the same - general with wheat, corn, hogs, and beef cattle to sell.

Why Type of Farming Changed: With better roads and better markets it was found more profitable to do more intensive farming.

Some Farmers' Needs: In Anderson they needed cooperative marketing, rotation of crop, organization. In Knox they needed lime, legumes, crop rotation, cooperative marketing, use of more green manure.

Table 14. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX. 1896-1926

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County.
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	- 59.3	- 38.9
Number Owners	114.3	10.9
Number Tenants	- 15.6	- 32.0
Number Hired Men	- 55.4	- 72.9
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	0	0
" " % Best Quality	- 17.5	- 14.7
" " Wages	259.0	187.2
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	- 17.5	- 14.7
Non-resident Land Owners	- 80.0	?
Idle Land--%	- 16.0	57.4
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	- 53.3	?
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	199.0	169.2
% Increase in Value	199.1	169.2
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	25.0	7.7
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	24.0	10.0
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	150.0	32.0
" " " No. Tractors	?	?
No. Purebred Livestock	1163.8	7000.0
Alfalfa, Acres	?	0
Silos, Number	?	?
No. Acres Lime Used	960.0	?
Markets Available, Number	0	0
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	?	?
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	?	0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox 1896-1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: The four most accessible communities of Knox increased in crop yield more than 20%, while the four least accessible remained the same.

Kind of Tenants: No data.

Who Owns Idle Land: No data.

Why Land Is Idle: No data.

Character of Vacant Houses: No data.

How Long Houses Were Vacant: No data.

Why Houses Were Vacant: No data.

Marketing Facilities: The percentage increase in the local market has been about the same for each of these sections.

Type of Farming Now: No data.

Type of Farming Formerly: No data.

Why Type of Farming Changed: No data.

Some Farmers' Needs: No data.

Table 15. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	- 41.9	-14.1
Number Owners	61.5	51.1
Number Tenants	- 76.7	- 5.6
Number Hired Men	- 96.3	-100.0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	0	0
" " % Best Quality	- 14.1	18.8
" " Wages	200.0	155.5
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	- 14.1	18.8
Non-resident Land Owners	?	?
Idle Land--%	0	70.7
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	-100.00	- 10.0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	185.7	108.3
% Increase in Value	185.7	108.3
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	5.4	8.0
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	0	- 3.6
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	450.0	500.0
" " " No. Tractors	?	?
No. Purebred Livestock	7000.0	?
Alfalfa, Acres	?	0
Silos, Number	?	?
No. Acres Lime Used	?	?
Markets Available, Number	25.0	20.0
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	?	?
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	?	?
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	100.0	66.7
Type of Farming - New	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	300.0	?
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson 1906-1926:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: The four most accessible communities of Anderson had more than 10% increase in crop yield, while the four least accessible had only about 5% increase.

Kind of Tenants: No data

Who Owns Idle Land: No data.

Why Land Is Idle: No data.

Character of Empty Houses: No data.

How Long Houses Were Empty: No data.

Why Houses Were Empty: No data.

Marketing Facilities: The percentage increase in market has been greater for the accessible communities due to some small industrial development at Clinton which affords a market for a few nearby farmers.

Type of Farming Now: No data.

Why Type of Farming Changed: No data.

Some Farmers' Needs: No data.

Table 16. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	- 59.3	- 41.9
Number Owners	114.3	61.5
Number Tenants	- 15.6	- 76.7
Number Hired Men	- 55.4	- 96.3
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	0	0
" " % Best Quality	- 17.5	- 14.1
" " Wages	259.0	200.0
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	- 17.5	- 14.1
Non-resident Land Owners	- 30.0	?
Idle Land--%	- 16.0	0
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	- 53.3	- 100.0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	199.0	185.7
% Increase in Value	199.1	185.7
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	25.0	5.4
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	24.0	0
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	150.0	550.0
" " " No. Tractors	?	?
No. Purebred Livestock	1163.8	7000.0
Alfalfa, Acres	?	?
Silos, Number	?	?
No. Acres Lime Used	960.0	?
Markets Available, Number	0	25.0
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	?
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	?
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	?	100.0
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	?	300.0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Percentage Increase in Crop Production: The four most accessible communities of Knox have increased crop yield 20% wyile the four of Anderson have had but a 10% increase in yield.

Kind of Tenants: No data.

Who Owns Idle Land: No data.

Why Land Is Idle: No data.

Character of Vacant Houses: No data.

How Long Houses Were Vacant: No data.

Why Houses Were Vacant: No data.

Marketing Facilities: The four communities of Anderson have had but a small improvement in the market, while the four of Knox have increased a great deal.

Type of Farming Now: No data.

Type of Farming Formerly: No data.

Why Type of Farming Changed: No data.

Some Farmers' Needs: No data.

Table 17 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON COUNTY

Items.	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	- 38.9	- 14.1
Number Owners	10.9	51.1
Number Tenants	- 32.0	- 5.6
Number Hired Men	- 72.9	- 100.0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	0	0
" " % Best Quality	- 14.7	18.8
" " Wages	187.2	155.5
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	- 14.7	18.8
Non-resident Land Owners	?	?
Idle Land--%	57.4	70.7
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	?	- 10.0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	169.2	198.3
% Increase in Value	169.2	198.3
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	7.7	8.0
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	10.0	- 3.6
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	32.0	500.0
" " " No. Tractors	?	?
No. Purebred Livestock	7000.0	?
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	?	?
No. Acres Lime Used	?	?
Markets Available, Number	0	20.0
Marketing Facilities		
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	?
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	?
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	?	66.7
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	?
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Percentage Increase in Crop Yields: The four least accessible communities of Knox just held their own in crop yields, while the four least accessible in Anderson increased about 5%.

Kind of Tenants: No data.

Who Owns Idle Land: No data.

Why Land Was Idle: No data.

Character of Empty Houses: No data.

How Long Houses Were Empty: No data.

Why Houses Were Empty: No data.

Marketing Facilities: The market has not improved for the four least accessible communities of Anderson but it has improved a great deal for the four least accessible communities of Knox.

Type of Farming Now: No data.

Type of Farming Formerly: No data.

Why Type of Farming Changed: No data.

Some Farmers' Needs: No data.

Table 18 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	- 59.3	- 14.1
Number Owners	114.3	51.1
Number Tenants	- 15.6	- 5.6
Number Hired Men	- 55.4	-100.0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	0	0
" " % Best Quality	- 17.5	18.8
" " Wages	259.0	155.5
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	- 17.5	18.8
Non-resident Land Owners	- 80.0	?
Idle Land--%	- 16.0	70.7
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	- 53.3	- 10.0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	199.0	108.3
% Increase in Value	199.1	108.3
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	25.0	8.0
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	24.0	- 3.6
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	150.0	500.0
" " " No. Tractors	?	?
No. Purebred Livestock	1163.8	?
Alfalfa, Acres	?	0
Silos, Number	?	?
No. Acres Lime Used	960.0	?
Markets Available, Number	0	20.0
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	?
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	?
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	?	66.7
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	?	?
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Percentage Increase of Crop Yields: The most accessible of Knox increased 30% in crop yield. The least accessible of Anderson increased 5% in crop yield.

Kind of Tenants: No data.

Who Owns Idle Land: No data.

Why Land Is Idle: No data.

Character of Vacant Houses: No data.

How Long Houses Were Vacant: No data.

Why Houses Were Vacant: No data.

Marketing Facilities: The four most accessible of Knox improved a great deal. The four least accessible of Anderson improved very little.

Type of Farming Now: No data.

Type of Farming Formerly: No data.

Why Type of Farming Changed: No data.

Some Farmers' Needs: No data.

Table 19. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	- 38.9	- 41.9
Number Owners	10.9	61.5
Number Tenants	- 32.0	- 76.7
Number Hired Men	- 72.9	- 96.3
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	0	0
" " % Best Quality	- 14.7	- 14.1
" " Wages	187.2	200.0
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	- 14.7	- 14.1
Non-resident Land Owners	?	?
Idle Land--%	57.4	0
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	?	- 1.00
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	169.2	185.7
% Increase in Value	169.2	185.7
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	7.7	5.4
% Buildings Painted	No data	No data
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	10.0	0
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	32.0	450.0
" " " No. Tractors	?	?
No. Purebred Livestock	7000.0	7000.0
Alfalfa, Acres	0	?
Silos, Number	?	?
No. Acres Lime Used	?	?
Markets Available, Number	0	25.0
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	?
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	?
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	?	100.0
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	300.0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Percentage Increase of Crop Yields: The four least accessible of Knox increased yields none. The four most accessible of Anderson increased yields 10%.

Kind of Tenants: No data.

Who Owns Idle Land: No data.

Why Land Was Idle: No data.

Character of Vacant Houses: No data.

How Long Houses Were Vacant: No data.

Why Houses Were Vacant: No data.

Marketing Facilities: The local market for the four least accessible of Knox improved much. The local market for the four most accessible of Anderson improved some but still is not as good as the market of the four least accessible of Knox.

Type of Farming Now: No data.

Type of Farming Formerly: No data.

Why Type of Farming Changed: No data.

Some Farmers' Needs: No data.

Table 20. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Total number farms in the county (1925)	1,677	4,106	68	12
Value of all farm property (1920)	$ 5,561,000	$ 27,415,000	75	14
Assessed value of all property (1922)	$ 8,871,644	$126,482,034	50	4
Assessed value of all property per capita (1922)	$ 481	$ 1,074	57	4
Assessed value of all property per capita (1924)	$ 464	$ 1,120	49	5
Per cent increase or decrease in valuation of all property per capita (1912-1922)	122.2	176.2	80	44
Assessed valuation per sq. mi. (1922)	$ 25,940	$ 250,956	41	3
Value of farm land alone by census, per acre (1920)	$ 23.02	$ 63.06	70	14
Increase in value of farm land alone per acre (1910-1920)...	$ 12.16	$ 31.16	69	25
Per cent decrease in assessed value of farm lands (1920-1924).	6.3	5.6	85	88
Value of land and buildings per acre (1924)	$ 31.77	$ 89.90	53	6
Value of land alone per acre (1924)	$ 23.39	$ 66.10	52	4
Assessed value of land outside cities, per acre (1924).....	$ 16.42	$ 84.63	54	2
Number of farm tenants (1920)	296	874	85	41
Per cent of farm tenants (1920) ..	17.7	22.0	89	85
Per cent increase in number of farm tenants (1920-1925)	13	- 190	53	10

Table 20. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.
(continued) (continued)

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Number white farm tenants (1920).	290	845	83	38
Number acres in alfalfa (1920)...	762	47	3	64
Number acres in silage crops(1920)	15	1,599	76	3
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1920)	21.1	19.9	52	64
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1910)	15.7	20.0		
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1900)	18.1	18.7		
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1890)	18.2	21.2	76	49
Average yield of wheat per acre (bushels) (1920)	6.6	8.9		
Average yield of wheat per acre (bushels) (1910)	6.8	9.9		
Average yield of wheat per acre (bushels) (1900)	4.9	7.6		
Average yield of wheat per acre (bushels) (1890)	6.3	8.6		
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1920)	0.99	1.25	54	16
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1910)	1.0	1.1		
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1900)	1.06	1.1		
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1890)	0.95	0.97	74	71
Acres of crops harvested (1924)..	32,040	81,309	75	31

Table 20. (continued) COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES (continued)

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Value of crops harvested (1924) .	$ 758,915	$2,179,344	77	29
Crop index (corn, hay and forage used) (1920)	94.3	102.7	49	31
Land other than improved land (acres) (1920)	147,884	136,288	50	56
Per cent of land not improved (1920)	67.6	42.3	66	22
Relation between soil fertility and increase in rural population:				
1. No. bu. corn per A.(1890)	18.2	21.2	76	49
2. % inc. in rural pop. (1910-1920)....	3.3	— 33.4	25	95
Number crop acres per work horse or work mule (1920)	13.2	14.9	40	27
Value of machinery per crop acre (1919)	$ 7.03	$ 9.53	40	4
Value of farm products sold co-operatively (1924)	$ 1,862	$ 9,605	73	59
Value of supplies purchased co-operatively (1924)	$ 545	870	57	49
Per cent of farmers selling co-operatively (1924)	0.83	0.61	67	72
Number tractors on farms (1925)....	34	127	48	7
Number radios on farms (1925)	13	95	50	3
Number silos on farms (1925)	7	165	45	2
Ratio of farm mortgage debt to actual value (1925)	30.9	30.4	6	5

Table 20. (continued) COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES. (continued)

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Number of county agents (1925) ..	1	2	6	2
Number of home demonstration agents (1925)	1	1	2	13
Number of Smith-Hughes teachers (1925)	0	3	One of last	2
Per cent that the farm labor supply was of normal, April 1, (1925)	110.0	97.0	1	11
Per cent that the farm labor supply was of normal, April 1, (1924)	76.0	67.0	65	90
Wages of farm labor by day, without board, Oct. 1, 1924	$ 2.00	$ 1.80	10	23
Wages of farm labor by month, without board, Oct. 1, 1924 ...	$ 30.00	$ 38.00	71	25
Wages of farm labor by the day, without board, Oct. 1, 1925 ...	$ 1.60	$ 2.00	28	6
Wages of farm labor by the month, without board, Oct. 1, 1925 ...	$ 30.00	$ 39.00	66	12
Area in square miles	342	504	65	36
No. acres not in farms ...1920....	76,153	45,807	58	42

Table 21. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	115	124
Number Owners	35.25	45.38
Number Tenants	17.5	20.38
Number Hired Men	1.8	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	75.0	87.5
" " Wages	$ 1.06	$ 1.63
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	76.2	70.0
Non-resident Land Owners	1.4	1.1
Idle Land--%	23.8	11.9
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	1.2	1.0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 72.50	$ 131.25
% Increase in Value	96.61	262.1
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	70.0	77.5
% Buildings Painted	47.5	76.3
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	71.25	78.7
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	No data	No data
" " " No. Tractors	1.13	2.25
No. Purebred Livestock	3	18
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0.5	0.75
No. Acres Lime Used	2.6	0.25
Markets Available, Number	1.88	1.25
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0.25	0.25
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0.25	0.25
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0.13	1.00
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	**	**
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0.63
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties

Comparison of Averaages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan - 1925:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: In the eight communities of Hawkins the crop yield had increased slightly since 1914. The increase in crop yield in the eight communities of Sullivan is about 10%.

Kind of Tenants: In every case in each of the 16 communities the tenants were white natives. Most all were share tenants. Only about 5% paid cash rent in either community.

Who Owns Idle Land: In Hawkins County, in every case except one, the nearby farmers owned the idle land. That is, a part of some of the farms was idle. In one community of Hawkins a company owned 800 acres. In every case in Sullivan County the idle land was owned by the farmers of the community.

Why Land Is Idle: The reason for the land being idle was about the same in both counties: lack of labor, poor land, rough land, and lack of live stock to graze all the uncultivated land.

Character of Empty Houses: Twelve houses were empty in the eight communities in Hawkins, while only eight were empty in the eight communities in Sullivan. In every case the empty houses were in poor condition.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: The empty houses were vacant for just a short time. None reported longer than one year.

Why Houses Were Empty: In Sullivan County each of the empty houses was unfit to live in; that is why they were empty. There were five houses in Hawkins reported as not being needed, the others were poor for living conditions.

Marketing Facilities: The people in the eight communities of Hawkins have to haul their products to Rogersville or go a considerable distance outside the county with them. Rogersville offers a market for cream but not much else. The people in the eight communities of Sullivan have Kingsport as their market and it offers a market for: cream, whole milk, all kinds of truck crops, and tobacco.

Type of Farming Now: General farming with tobacco as the main cash crop, in most every community. Dairying is also used to bring in cash and to use feed and labor.

(next page)

AGRICULTURE.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Averages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan - 1925: (continued)

Type of Farming Formerly: The type of farming formerly in each of these communities was general farming with wheat and beef cattle as the main cash sources.

Why Type of Farming Changed: The farmers found more profit in tobacco and dairying, especially since better markets have been available.

Some Farmers' Needs: In Hawkins County they need outside work, while in Sullivan County they have plenty of places to work at odd times. In Hawkins there is a greater need for a market, as they have a fair market in Sullivan. Both counties need cooperative marketing. Both counties need labor-saving machinery and they need to take better care of what machinery they already have.

Home Supplies: In the eight rural communities of Hawkins there is still a scarcety of home grown fruit and vegetables, while the eight communities of Sullivan have enough for home use and some to sell. In both Hawkins and Sullivan dairy and poultry products are plentiful. But in both counties alike there is a scarcity of meat.

Table 22. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN COUNTY - 1914.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	123	154
Number Owners	33	41.57
Number Tenants	16.0	22.71
Number Hired Men	1.3	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	78.7	81.25
" " Wages	$ 0.51	$ 0.84
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	76.4	73.1
Non-resident Land Owners	0.3	0.1
Idle Land--%	27.5	34.3
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	0	1.0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 36.37	$ 36.25
% Increase in Value	-	-
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	62.50	69.0
% Buildings Painted	39.7	50.2
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	65.0	65.0
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	No data	No data
" " " No. Tractors	0	0
No. Purebred Livestock	0	0
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0	0
No. Acres Lime Used	0	0
Markets Available, Number	1.25	1.28
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0.13
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0.13
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0.13	0
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	**	**
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0.25
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Averages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan in 1914:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: No data.

Kind of Tenants: The tenants in both of these counties in 1914 were native white. In every case they paid share rent; that is, a part of the crop for the use of the land.

Who Owns Idle Land: In every case, in both counties, the idle land was owned by the farmers of the community. That is, several farmers in each community had some idle land on their farms.

Why Land Is Idle: In Hawkins many farmers reported that the idle land was not needed; a few said the idle land was too rough; and some said theirs was too poor. In Sullivan several said the idle land was not suited for pasture. Some said they did not have enough machinery to operate it. Others said their idle land was too poor or too rough.

Character of Empty Houses: There were but few empty houses in either of these sections in 1914 (though we could not find the exact number) and in every case those that were empty were reported to have been in poor condition for any one to live in.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: The houses had been empty but a short time in both areas; in no case for more than one year.

Why Houses Were Empty: One house in Hawkins reported as vacant because of shifting of tenants; all others in each area were reported as empty because the houses were not suitable to live in.

Marketing Facilities: In 1914 the people in Hawkins had a better market than did the people in the South end of Sullivan. Rogersville was larger than Kingsport at that time. The people in Sullivan had to go a long distance to Johnston City or to Bristol to do their trading, and to sell their products.

Type of Farming Now (1914): General farming, with wheat and beef cattle as the main cash crops in both areas. A large amount of corn was also grown.

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1914 every community in each of the two counties needed a better market; some communities also reported a need for outside work; some reported as needing scientific methods in farming; some needed more and better farm machinery.

AGRICULTURE

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Averages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan in 1914: (continued)

Home Supplies: In 1914 the eight communities of Hawkins had a more liberal supply of home grown food products than did the eight communities of Sullivan.

Table 23. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914 WITH THOSE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1914	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1925
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	154	124
Number Owners	41.57	45.38
Number Tenants	22.71	20.38
Number Hired Men	0	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	81.25	67.5
" " Wages	$ 0.84	$ 1.63
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	73.1	70.0
Non-resident Land Owners	1.0	1.1
Idle Land--%	34.3	11.9
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	1.0	1.0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	36.25	131.25
% Increase in Value	-	262.1
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	69.0	77.5
% Buildings Painted	50.2	76.3
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	65.0	78.7
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	No data	No data
" " " No. Tractors	0	2.25
No. Purebred Livestock	0	18
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0	0.75
No. Acres Lime Used	0	0.25
Markets Available, Number	1.28	1.25
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0.13	0.25
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0.13	0.25
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	1.00
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	**	**
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0.25	0.63
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Sullivan in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: Between 1914 and 1925 the crop yield has increased about 10%.

Kind of Tenants: The tenants in the eight communities in Sullivan County were just as good in 1925 as they were in 1914. In both cases they were native whites. There was no cash renting reported in 1914, but in 1925 about 5% of all tenants paid cash.

Who Owns Idle Land: In 1925, as well as in 1914, all the idle land was owned by farmers of the community. There was no large company owning the land and holding it for advancement in prices. Part of some of the farms was idle because of not being profitable to cultivate; this was especially true in 1914.

Why Land Is Idle: The reasons given for the land being idle in 1925 were about the same as in 1914: too rough, too poor, lack of livestock. In 1914 also not enough machinery to cultivate all of the land.

Character of Empty Houses: In 1914 there were 11 houses vacant while in 1925 only 8 were reported as vacant. In every case they were very small and in poor state of repair; that is, not fit to live in.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: Although these are poor houses, they are vacant but a short time; in no case more than one year.

Why Houses Were Empty: The only reason given for the houses being vacant was the poor condition of them; many of them should not really be called houses.

Marketing Facilities: Between 1914 and 1925 the market for farm products in the South end of Sullivan County has grown from nothing to a fair market for most anything the farmer cares to grow.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: In 1914 the type of farming was general farming, with wheat and beef cattle as the main cash crops. In 1925 the type was general farming also, with tobacco and dairying as the principal cash sources, and also some truck being sold.

Why Type of Farming Changed: Tobacco and dairying and truck are more profitable than wheat and beef cattle in this area now. As land goes up in price, and becomes cut up into smaller farms, the farmers have to change and raise a large amount, in value, on a smaller amount of land.

(next page)

AGRICULTURE.
(continued)
** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Sullivan County in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925: (continued)

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1914 there was a greater need for an improved market than in 1925, because Kingsport is furnishing a fair market for most all the farm products now. The farmers still needed cooperative marketing in the eight communities in 1925. They also still needed more farm machinery, and they needed to take better care of the machinery they already had.

Home Supplies: In the eight communities of Sullivan between 1914 and 1925 there was a very great increase in the production of all these products except meat. Hogs and beef cattle both fell off in number. Vegetables, dairy products, and poultry products have each increased more than has fruit production.

Table 24. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1914	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1925
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	123	115
Number Owners	33	35.25
Number Tenants	16.0	17.5
Number Hired Men	1.3	1.8
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	78.7	75.0
" " Wages	$ 0.51	1.06
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	76.4	76.2
Non-resident Land Owners	0.3	1.4
Idle Land--%	27.5	23.8
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	0	
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 36.87	$ 72.50
% Increase in Value	-	96.61
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	62.50	70.0
% Buildings Painted	39.7	47.5
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	65.0	71.25
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	No data	No data
" " " No. Tractors	0	1.13
No. Purebred Livestock	0	3
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0	0.5
No. Acres Lime Used	0	2.6
Markets Available, Number	1.25	1.88
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0.25
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0.25
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.13
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	**	**
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins County in 1914 with the Same Communities in 1925:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: Between 1914 and 1925 the crop yield has increased very slightly, but could not get the exact percentage; but somewhat less than 5%.

Kind of Tenants: The tenants in 1925 were as high type as they were in 1914. In both cases the tenants were native whites.

Who Owns Idle Land: In 1914 all the idle land was owned by farmers of the community; that is, several of the farms have some idle land on them. In 1925 one company owned 800 acres of the idle land in one community. The other idle land is owned by farmers of the communities.

Why Land Is Idle: The reasons given for the land being idle are: poor; not suited for pasture; not needed; not profitable to farm. The same reasons were given for both 1914 and 1925.

Character of Empty Houses: The empty houses, in both 1914 and in 1925, were all in poor condition. They were not only small but also in bad state of repair.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: Both in 1914 and in 1925 the vacant houses were empty but a short time. In no case was one vacant longer than one year.

Why Houses Were Empty: The houses were vacant because they were not suited to live in.

Marketing Facilities: The market for the eight communities of Hawkins had not improved much, except the market for cream.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: In 1914 the type of farming was general, with wheat and beef cattle as the main cash. In 1925 the type of farming was general farming with tobacco and dairying and a little truck crops as the main cash crops.

Why Type of Farming Changed: The type of farming changed between 1914 and 1925 because the farmers found tobacco and dairying more profitable.

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1925 as well as in 1914 the people needed a closer and a better market. In both years they needed cooperative markets. In both years they needed outside work, so the farmers could earn money at times they were not needed on their farms; or so that other members of the family might work most of the time at outside work.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins County in 1914 with the Same Communities in 1925: (continued)

Home Supplies: In the eight communities of Hawkins between 1914 and 1925 there was no increase in the home grown fruit and vegetable supply; there was a decrease in the meat supply; and some increase in the supply of poultry and dairy products.

HAMMERMILL BOND MADE IN U.S.A.

Table 25. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES WITH LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS - 1925

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County	Least Accessible Hawkins County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	122.4	103.3
Number Owners	42.2	23.3
Number Tenants	22.6	9.0
Number Hired Men	2.8	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	74.0	75.0
" " Wages	$ 1.10	$ 1.00
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	77.0	75.0
Non-resident Land Owners	2.0	0.33
Idle Land--%	24.0	23.33
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	2.0	0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 80.00	$ 60.00
% Increase in Value	166.1	80.0
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	72.0	66.7
% Buildings Painted	60.0	27.0
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	74.0	66.7
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	No data	No data
" " " No. Tractors	1.4	0.66
No. Purebred Livestock	3.8	1.66
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0.8	0
No. Acres Lime Used	4.2	0
Markets Available, Number	2.4	1.0
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0.4	0
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0.4	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0.2	0
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	**	**
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Five Most Accessible with Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins, 1925:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: There has been but a very slight increase in crop yield in the three least accessible. The increase yield was over 5% in the most accessible.

Kind of Tenants: There is no difference in the kind of tenants in the most and least accessible communities, as they are native whites in both cases.

Who Owns Idle Land: In the inaccessible communities the idle land is owned by the farmers of the community, while 800 acres of the idle land in one of the most accessible communities are owned by a company; the rest of the idle land is owned by the farmers of the community.

Why Land Is Idle: The least accessible communities had a larger percentage of poor and rough land than did the most accessible, though there is some poor and rough in all these communities. Other reasons given are: not needed, and not suitable for pasture.

Character of Empty Houses: The answer for the most accessible is the same as the least accessible: that is, the houses were in poor condition.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: In both the most accessible and least accessible communities, the houses were empty but a short time. In no case were they vacant for a longer period than one year.

Why Houses Were Empty: The same report was received for both the most accessible and the least accessible: the houses were vacant because they were not suited to live in.

Marketing Facilities: The market is the same for both these areas, but the roads to the market are better in the most accessible.

Type of Farming Now: The type of farming does not differ in the most and the least accessible communities. In both it is general, with tobacco and dairying as the main sources of cash.

Type of Farming Formerly: The type formerly used was general farming, with wheat and beef cattle as main cash income.

Why Type of Farming Changed: The farmers found tobacco and dairying more profitable with the coming of better markets and good roads.

Some Farmers' Needs: The most accessible communities had a need for good market, and outside work, but these needs are much greater in the least accessible. Both groups of communities need cooperative marketing, better farm machinery, and to take better care of the machinery they already have.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Five Most Accessible with Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins, 1925: (continued)

Home Supplies: Both the most and the least accessible communities have plenty of homegrown dairy and poultry products. The most accessible communities have a more liberal supply of home grown fruits and vegetables.

Table 26. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH % INCREASE IN THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN HAWKINS 1914-1925.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Hawkins County	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Hawkins County
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	- 10.3	1.6
Number Owners	5.5	- 1.7
Number Tenants	6.1	0
Number Hired Men	?	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	0	0
" " % Best Quality	- 5.1	- 6.3
" " Wages	111.5	100.0
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	2.7	- 0.4
Non-resident Land Owners	4900.0	?
Idle Land--%	- 20.0	0
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	?	0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	105.1	80.0
% Increase in Value	105.1	80.0
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	16.1	5.4
% Buildings Painted	25.0	0
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	8.8	11.2
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	No data	No data
" " " No. Tractors	?	?
No. Purebred Livestock	?	?
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	?	0
No. Acres Lime Used	?	?
Markets Available, Number	50.0	0
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	?	0
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	?	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	?	0
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	**	**
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins with Perdentage Increase in Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins, 1914-1925:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yields: The increase of crop yields in the least accessible communities is about 2%, while in the most accessible it is some over 5%.

Kind of Tenants: No data.

Who Owns Idle Land: No data.

Why Land Is Idle: No data.

Character of Empty Houses: No data.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: No data.

Why Houses Were Empty: No data.

Marketing Facilities: No data.

Type of Farming Now: No data.

Type of Farming Formerly: No data.

Why Type of Farming Changed: No data.

Some Farmers' Needs: No data.

Home Supplies: No data.

Table 27. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	156.4	122.4
Number Owners	40.0	42.2
Number Tenants	21.3	22.6
Number Hired Men	0	2.8
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	78.0	74.0
" " Wages	$ 0.52	$ 1.10
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	75.0	77.0
Non-resident Land Owners	0.4	2.0
Idle Land--%	30.0	24.0
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	0	2.0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 33.00	$ 80.0
% Increase in Value	-	105.1
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	62.0	72.0
% Buildings Painted	48.0	60.0
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	68.0	74.0
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	No data	No data
" " " No. Tractors	0	1.4
No. Purebred Livestock	0	3.8
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0	0.8
No. Acres Lime Used	0	4.2
Markets Available, Number	1.6	2.4
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0.4
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0.4
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0.2
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	**	**
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Average of Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average for Same Communities in 1925:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: Between 1914 and 1925 the crop yield of the five most accessible communities in Hawkins increased a little over 5%.

Kind of Tenants: The tenants in the five most accessible communities of Hawkins in 1925 were as good as those of the same communities in 1914. In both cases they were native whites.

Who Owns Idle Land: In 1914 all the idle land of the five most accessible communities in Hawkins was owned by farmers in the community. In 1925, there is one company owning 800 acres of the idle land in one community. The remainder is owned by farmers of the community.

Why Land Is Idle: In 1914 some of the idle land was idle because it was not needed. In both years some of it was idle because it was too poor, or too rough to farm profitably.

Character of Empty Houses: Both in 1914 and 1925, the vacant houses were small and in a poor state of repair.

How Long Houses Had Been Empty: In both 1914 and in 1925 the vacant houses were empty but a short time, not more than one year, and in most cases for only a few months.

Why Houses Were Empty: In every case, both in 1914 and 1925, the houses were vacant because they were not fit to live in.

Marketing Facilities: The market of the five most accessible communities of Hawkins has changed but little between 1914 and 1925. The cream market is all that has been added locally, but roads have been greatly improved.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: The type now (1925) is general farming with tobacco and dairying as the main cash income, with a few vegetables sold. In 1914 the main type was general, with wheat and beef as the main cash income.

Why Type of Farming Changed: Tobacco and dairying found to be more profitable with the development of better markets and roads.

Some Farmers' Needs: In 1914 there was some greater need for a market, as the roads have improved until the markets are easier reached (1925), yet they still need better markets. In both years they needed cooperative marketing and they needed outside work. They needed better farm machinery, and needed to take better care of what they already had.

AGRICULTURE.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties

Comparison of Average of Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average for Same Communities in 1925: (continued)

Home Supplies: The supply of fruit and vegetables is about the same now that it was in 1914. The supply of dairy and poultry products has increased, while the supply of meat has decreased.

MICROFILMED 1980 FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Table 28. COMPARISON OF THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Crop Yields - % Increase	**	**
Size of Farms (acres per farm)	101.7	103.3
Number Owners	23.7	23.3
Number Tenants	9.0	9.0
Number Hired Men	0	0
Farm Labor - Coms. Having Plenty	1	1
" " % Best Quality	80.0	75.0
" " Wages	$ 0.50	$ 1.00
Tenants--Kinds	**	**
" % Best Quality	78.3	75.0
Non-resident Land Owners	0	0.33
Idle Land--%	23.3	23.3
" " Who Owns Its	**	**
" " Why Idle	**	**
Empty Houses - Number	0	0
" " Character	**	**
" " How Long Empty	**	**
" " Why Vacant	**	**
Mortgages--% of Value	No data	No data
Average Value of Land per Acre	$ 33.33	$ 60.00
% Increase in Value	-	80.0
% Condition of Buildings is Adequate	63.3	66.7
% Buildings Painted	27.0	27.0
% Appearance of Farms is Adequate	60.0	66.7
Modern Farm Machinery - No. Binders	No data	No data
" " " No. Tractors	0	0.66
No. Purebred Livestock	0	1.66
Alfalfa, Acres	0	0
Silos, Number	0	0
No. Acres Lime Used	0	0
Markets Available, Number	1.0	1.0
Marketing Facilities	**	**
No. Cooperative Organizations	0	0
Cooperative Buying, No. Products	0	0
Cooperative Selling, No. Products	0	0
Home Supplies (garden, milk, fruit, meat, butter, eggs, etc.)	**	**
Type of Farming - Now	**	**
" " " Formerly	**	**
" " " Why Changed	**	**
Movements to Improve Farming	0	0
Greatest Needs of Farmers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

AGRICULTURE.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average of the Same in 1925:

Percentage Increase in Crop Yield: The crop yield for the three least accessible communities of Hawkins increased but little, only about 2%, between 1914 and 1925.

Kind of Tenant: In 1925 the tenants of the three least accessible communities were just as high type as the tenants of these communities were in 1914. In both years they were native whites.

Who Owns Idle Land: In every community in both periods, the idle land was owned by the farmers of the community.

Why Land Is Idle: In both years: not suited for pasture, too poor, and too rough, were given as reasons for land being idle. In addition, in 1914 the idle land was not needed as badly as in 1925.

Character of Empty Houses: In every case the empty houses were in very poor condition.

How Long Houses Were Empty: For only a very short time; not more than one year.

Why Houses Were Empty: Not suitable to live in.

Marketing Facilities: The market for the three least accessible communities of Hawkins improve but little between 1914 and 1925. A market at Rogersville for cream is all that was added locally.

Type of Farming Now and Formerly: General farming with tobacco and dairying as cash income. In 1914, general farming with wheat and beef cattle as cash income.

Why Type of Farming Changed: Tobacco and dairying found to be more profitable with better roads and markets.

Some Farmers' Needs: Outside work, local market. Farmers need to work more regularly throughout the year.

Home Supplies: The home grown supply of meat has decreased. The supply of fruits and vegetables is the same; while the supply of dairy and poultry products has increased slightly.

Table 29 COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Total number farms in the county (1925) ..	3,378	3,651	27	24
Value of all farm property (1920).	$ 20,896,000	$17,378,000	20	26
Assessed value of all property (1922)	$ 25,562,749	$12,615,369	10	54
Assessed value of all property per capita (1922)	$ 666	$ 550	28	43
Assessed value of all property per capita (1924)	$ 592	$ 465	27	48
Per cent increase or decrease in valuation of all property per capita (1912-1922)	228.3	344.2	19	2
Assessed valuation per sq.mi. (1922)	$ 58,630	$ 26,173	8	39
Value of farm land alone by census, per acre (1920)	$ 63.96	$ 41.55	13	34
Increase in value of farm land alone per acre (1910-1920) ...	$ 37.20	$ 22.64	14	37
Per cent decrease in assessed value of farm lands (1920-'24)	33.3	16.9	20	64
Value of land and buildings per acre (1924)	$ 66.74	$ 44.30	9	33
Value of land alone per acre (1924)	$ 51.47	$ 35.72	8	29
Assessed value of land outside cities, per acre (1924)	$ 30.30	$ 23.41	21	37
Number of farm tenants (1920)	691	792	38	50
Per cent of farm tenants (1920)...	20.9	23.9	9	14
Per cent increase in number of farm tenants (1920-1925)	45	78	60	70

Table 29. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.
(continued)

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Number white farm tenants (1920).	683	770	53	43
Number acres in alfalfa (1920)...	52	135	58	51
Number acres in silage crops (1920)	389	319	23	29
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1920)	27.7	24.4	4	20
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1910)	27.1	21.6		
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1900)	18.9	19.1		
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1890)	21.8	21.5	42	47
Average yield of wheat per acre (bushels) (1920) ...	11.1	9.2		
Average yield of wheat per acre (bushels) (1910) ...	9.1	8.5		
Average yield of wheat per acre (bushels) (1900) ...	7.9	6.3		
Average yield of wheat per acre (bushels) (1890) ...	6.9	7.1		
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1920)	1.05	1.07	40	36
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1910)	1.06	1.04		
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1900)	0.99	1.03		
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1890)	0.90	0.91	82	80
Acres of crops harvested (1924) ..	64,497	67,371	43	40

Table 29. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.
(continued)

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Value of crops harvested (1924) .	$ 1,862,753	$ 1,765,146	37	39
Crop index (corn, hay and forage used) (1920)	110	107.4	22	24
Land other than improved land (acres) (1920)	122,536	127,020	67	65
Per cent of land not improved (1920)	43.9	41.2	26	21
Relation between soil fertility and increase in rural population:				
1. No. bu. corn per A. (1890)	21.8	21.5	42	47
2. % inc. in rural pop. (1910-1920)...	c 7.4	2.8	14	25
Number crop acres per work horse or work mule (1920)	15.2	16.7	21	8
Value of machinery per crop acre (1919)	$ 7.84	$ 5.60	23	70
Value of farm products sold co-operatively (1924)	$ 229,138	$ 53,377	8	32
Value of supplies purchased co-operatively (1924)	$ 935	$ 1,220	47	41
Per cent of farmers selling co-operatively (1924)	11.34	5.51	13	44
Number tractors on farms (1925)..	69	50	23	35
Number radios on farms (1925) ...	24	20	24	11
Number silos on farms (1925)	47	8	7	41
Ratio of farm mortgage debt to actual value (1925)	31.4	35.6	7	18

Table 29. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES (continued)

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Number of county agents (1925) ...	1	0	-	-
Number of home demonstration agents (1925)	1	0	-	-
Number of Smith-Hughes teachers (1925)	1	0	46	One of last.
Per cent that the farm labor supply was of normal, April 1, (1925)	83.0	89.0	69	52
Per cent that the farm labor supply was of normal, April 1, (1924)	80.0	84.0	52	39
Wages of farm labor by day, without board, Oct. 1, 1924	$ 1.46	$ 1.40	60	66
Wages of farm labor by month, without board, Oct. 1, 1924	$ 25.00	$ 32.00	91	59
Wages of farm labor by the day, without board, Oct. 1, 1925	$ 1.66	$ 1.50	22	46
Wages of farm labor by the month, without board, Oct. 1, 1925	$ 40.00	$ 36.00	7	24
Area in square miles	436	482	53	42
No. acres not in farms 1920	51,264	22,152	41	20

Table 30 . COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Avorage per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Value per acre of farm land alone (1920) ...	$ 44.10	$ 39.02	$ 33.31	$ 38.69
Increase in value farm land alone (1910 - 1920) ..	$ 23.21	$ 22.86	$ 19.52	$ 21.73
Per cent increase or decrease in value of farm land (1920-'24).	— 15.3	— 25.3	—25.9	— 22.4
Per cent of farms operated by tenants (1920)	34.1	34.7	40.6	36.6
Number white farm tenants (1920)	842	839	710	795
Per cent increase or decrease in number farm tenants (1920-1925)..	2.1	18.8	—29.5	— 3.4
Number county agents (1925)	0.84	0.55	0.42	0.60
Number home demonstration agents (1925) ...	0.48	0.25	0.12	0.29
Number Smith-Hughes teachers (1925)	1.20	0.77	0.48	0.80
Average yield of corn per acre (1920)	20.98	21.77	20.8	21.2
Average yield of corn per acre (1890)	20.9	22.2	22.0	21.7
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1920)	1.09	1.05	1.02	1.06
Average yield of hay and forage per acre (1890)	1.04	1.13	1.17	1.11

Table 30. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING (continued)

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Avorage per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Number acres in alfalfa (1920)...	247	126	160	178
Per cent of counties having 50 acres or more in alfalfa (1920)	90.5	64.5	42.4	65.5
Number acres in silage crops (1920) ...	543	339	105	322
Crop index (corn, hay and forage used(1920).	98.2	97.6	93.9	46.2
Number crop acres per work horse or work mule (1920)	14.2	13.1	12.7	13.3
Crop acres and pasture (1925)	143,965.	145,515.	100,689.	129,326.
Acres woodland burned over (1924)	2,812	2,837	1,918	2,508
Per cent farms reporting woodland cleared and made suitable for crops (1920-1924) is of total farms (1925)	10.6	13.2	13.6	10.6
Acres woodland cleared and made suitable for crops (1920-1924) ...	1,711	2,295	1,731	1,908
Net agricultural income per county (1920)	$ 2,889,139	$ 2,755,491	$2,066,347	$2,559,716
Net agricultural income per farm (1920).	$ 925	$ 937	$ 967	$ 943
Net agricultural income per improved acre (1920)	$ 20.80	$ 21.47	$ 21.95	$ 21.42
Value of machinery per crop acre (1919)	$ 7.12	$ 6.80	$ 6.10	$ 6.88

Table 30. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING (continued).

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Per cent improved land (1920) that was in crops (1925)	67.0	71.9	68.6	67.8
Per cent crop and pasture acreage (1925) is of improved acreage (1920) ..	107.4	112.6	109.2	109.8
Land not improved (1920).	178,271	179,329	129,861	161,799.9
Per cent of land not improved (1920)	56.1	58.7	57.5	57.4
Per cent that the farm labor supply was of normal, April 1, 1924.	77.0	79.7	82.0	79.8
Per cent that farm labor supply was of normal April 1, 1925	89.8	88.9	87.6	88.7
Wages of farm labor by the day, without board, Oct. 1, 1924...	$ 1.73	$ 1.60	$ 1.41	$ 1.58
Wages of farm labor by the month, without board, Oct. 1, 1924..	$ 36.70	$ 33.77	$ 32.81	$ 34.40
Wages of farm labor by the day, without board, Oct. 1, 1925..	$ 1.60	$ 1.60	$ 1.41	$ 1.50
Wages of farm labor by the month, without board, Oct. 1, 1925..	$ 34.64	$ 31.58	$ 31.87	$ 32.68
Approximate total land area 1920	643,987	644,096	491,051	280,838.7
No. acres not in farms 1920	90,794	84,783	50,144	74,712
% farms having telephones 1920.....	17.7	22.8	23.9	22.5

Table 31.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Value per acre of farm land (1925)..	$ 79.01	$ 35.31	$ 57.16
Amount increase or decrease in farm values (1920-1925)	$-388,036,586	$-265,106,606	$-325,842,107
Value per acre of farm land alone (1920)	$ 66.15	$ 65.01	$ 57.36
Increase in value farm land alone per acre (1910-1920)	$ 30.87	$ -4.33	$ 24.96
Per cent increase in value farm land (1910-1920)	70.0	104.4	92.5
Value of land and buildings per farm (1925)	$ 8,743	$ 8,423	$ 8,583
Per cent increase or decrease in value of farm lands and buildings (1920-1925)	- 14.3	- 21.7	- 18.0
Gross value of all farm products per farm dweller (1919)	$ 787	$ 806	$ 797
Value of machinery per crop acre (1920)	$ 14.13	$ 9.67	$ 9.57
Per cent farms operated by tenants (1925)	25.5	33.8	38.6
Per cent farms operated by tenants (1920)	26.5	31.7	38.1
Number of farm tenants (1920)	52,194	48,086	50,098
Per cent increase or decrease in number farm tenants (1910-1920)...	2.8	5.8	4.3
Number white farm tenants (1920)....	43,117	28,164	35,518
Number native white farm tenants (1920) ...	39,961	26,870	33,282
Increase or decrease in number of farm tenants (1910-1920)	1,433	2,630	2,043

Table 31.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING.
(continued)

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Increase or decrease in per cent farms operated by tenants (1920-1925)....	- 0.85	1.9	0.5
Per cent counties having agricultural agents (1924)	78.5	64.5	72.8
Number county agents (1925)	53	33	43
Number home demonstration agents (1924) ...	20	18	19
Per cent counties having home demonstration agents (1924) .	36.1	35.8	35.9
Number Smith-Hughes teachers (1925).	73	41	58
Per cent of all owned farms mortgaged (1920)	37.1	39.5	38.3
Ratio of farm mortgage debt to value of land and buildings (1925)	40.4	40.8	41.9
Ratio of farm mortgage debt to value of land and buildings (1920) ...	30.8	30.3	29.1
Ratio of farm mortgage debt to value of land and buildings (1910)....	29.0	26.2	27.3
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1920)	34.26	21.4	27.7
Average yield of corn per acre (bushels) (1890)	28.8	20.76	24.7
Number acres in alfalfa (1919)	83,430	264,899	176,017
Number tons hay and forage per acre (1919)	1.6	1.36	1.48
Number tons hay and forage per acre (1890)	1.25	1.29	1.27

Table 31.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING.
(continued)

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Number acres in silage crops (1919)	137,778	27,862	81,698
Crop index (corn, hay and forage used) (1919)...	117.7	83.3	100.0
Current agricultural income per state (1921)	$2,083,093,250	$ 389,058,280	$ 1,218,789,694
Current agricultural income per capita farm population (1921).	$ 289	$ 244	$ 186
Gross current income per farm dweller (1919)	$ 420	$ 451	$ 436
Current agricultural income per farmer (1921)	$ 963	$ 843	$ 701
Per cent increase or decrease in current agricultural income per farmer (1919-1921)	— 39.8	— 51.9	— 55.0
Net agricultural income per state (1919)	$ 287,353,000	$164,776,000	$ 226,065,000
Net agricultural income per farm (1919)	$ 1,677	$ 1,743	$ 1,682
Net agricultural income per improved acre (1919)	$ 25.83	$ 22.11	$ 21.57
Number crop acres per work horse or work mule (1924)	17.8	17.7	17.7
Land not improved(acres) (1920) ...	22,450,858	34,452,870	28,574,334
Per cent land not improved (1920) ..	61.4	75.3	73.6
Number acres not in farms (1920) ...	13,303,298	25,122,099	19,333,299
Number farms with radios (1925)	9,236	2,598	5,918
Per cent farms with radio sets on April 1, 1927	30	20	25

Table 31.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING. (continued)

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Wages of farm labor by month, without board (1924)	$ 56.59	$ 52.17	$ 54.38
Per cent farm operators who were under 25 (1920)	3.9	5.6	6.0
Per cent farm operators who were under 35 (1920)	21.9	26.8	26.9
Relation between soil fertility and increase in rural population:			
1. Number bushels corn per acre (1920)	28.8	20.76	24.7
2. % increase in rural population (1910-1920)	1.4	10.1	5.9

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 32. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County	Eight Communities Anderson County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	31.9	18.9
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	15.56	4.25
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0.57	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	13.3	3.4
" Gravel (mileage).....	1.13	0.38
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	5.4	2.3
Automobiles: Number.....	89.75	20.4
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	22.5	3.88
" Number Fords.....	67.25	16.71
" Number Farm Trucks.....	12.88	1.88
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	3.4	5.0
" % Condition Road to It	77.5	68.75
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	76.25	78.8
Telephones: Number	38.13	31.0
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephones)	3.86	4.67
" % Efficiency	71.3	66.3
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	92.3	95.5

Table 33 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County 1896	Eight Communities Knox County 1926
Highways: Total Mileage.....	26.5	31.9
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	2.38	15.56
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0.57
" Macadam (mileage).....	4.3	13.3
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	1.13
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	2.1	5.4
Automobiles: Number.....	0	89.75
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	22.5
" Number Fords.....	0	67.25
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	12.88
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	4.0	3.4
" % Condition Road to It	55.0	77.5
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	68.75	76.25
Telephones: Number	0	38.13
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephone)	0	3.86
" % Efficiency	0	71.3
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	0	92.3

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 34. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Anderson County 1906	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926
Highways: Total Mileage.....	15.1	18.9
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	0.25	4.25
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	0.3	3.4
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0.38
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	1.8	2.3
Automobiles: Number.....	0	20.4
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	3.88
" Number Fords.....	0	16.71
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	1.88
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	4.3	5.0
" % Condition Road to It	52.5	68.75
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	75.0	78.8
Telephones: Number	1.9	31.0
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephones)	1.71	4.67
" % Efficiency	10.0	66.3
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	56.3	95.5

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 35. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1896	Most Accessible Knox County 1926.
Highways: Total Mileage.....	40.0	50.0
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	4.75	24.75
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	1.13
" Macadam (mileage).....	4.8	20.8
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	1.8
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	2.3	6.5
Automobiles: Number.....	0	168.75
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	43.75
" Number Fords.....	0	125.00
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	24.25
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	2.5	2.5
" % Condition Road to It	60.0	80.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	60.0	80.0
Telephones: Number	0	60.0
" Extent Available	0	3.66
" % Efficiency (% people having telephones)	0	70.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	0	97.0

Table 36. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County 1906	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Highways: Total Mileage.....	17.8	22.0
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	0	7.0
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	0	6.3
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0.75
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	1.8	2.3
Automobiles: Number.....	0	31.5
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	7.0
" Number Fords.....	0	28.0
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	3.0
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	2.8	4.1
" % Condition Road to It	50.0	77.7
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	71.7	80.0
Telephones: Number	0	51.25
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephones)	1.8	4.90
" % Efficiency	0	67.5
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	62.5	93.8

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 37 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1896	Least Accessible Knox County 1926
Highways: Total Mileage.....	13.0	13.8
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	0	6.38
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	3.8	5.9
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0.5
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	2.0	4.0
Automobiles: Number.....	0	10.75
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	1.25
" Number Fords.....	0	9.5
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	1.50
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	5.5	4.3
" % Condition Road to It	50.0	75.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	77.7	71.7
Telephones: Number	0	16.25
" Extent Available (% people having telephones)	0	4.81
" % Efficiency	0	72.5
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	0	87.5

Table 58 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Anderson County 1906	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Highways: Total Mileage.....	13.8	15.8
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	0.5	1.5
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	0.5	0.5
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	0.75	1.0
Automobiles: Number.....	0	9.25
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	0.75
" Number Fords.....	0	8.25
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	0.75
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	5.8	2.8
" % Condition Road to It	55.0	60.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	77.7	77.7
Telephones: Number	0	10.75
" Extent Available	1.50	4.15
" % Efficiency ..... (% people having telephones)	20.0	65.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	50.0	97.5

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 39 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Knox County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	50.0	13.8
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	24.75	6.38
" Asphalt (mileage).....	1.13	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	20.8	5.9
" Gravel (mileage).....	1.8	0.5
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	6.5	4.0
Automobiles: Number.....	168.75	10.75
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	43.75	1.25
" Number Fords.....	125.00	9.5
" Number Farm Trucks.....	24.25	1.50
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	2.5	4.3
" % Condition Road to It	80.0	75.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	80.0	71.7
Telephones: Number	60.00	16.25
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephones)	3.66	4.81
" % Efficiency	70.0	72.5
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	97.0	87.5

Table 40 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	22.0	15.8
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	7.0	1.5
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	6.3	0.5
" Gravel (mileage).....	0.75	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	2.3	1.0
Automobiles: Number.....	31.5	9.25
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	7.0	0.75
" Number Fords.....	28.0	8.25
" Number Farm Trucks.....	3.0	0.75
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	4.1	2.8
" % Condition Road to It	77.7	60.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	80.0	77.7
Telephones: Number	51.25	10.75
" Extent Available	4.90	4.15
" % Efficiency ..... (% people having telephones)	67.5	65.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	93.8	97.5

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 41. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	50.0	22.0
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	24.75	7.0
" Asphalt (mileage).....	1.13	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	20.8	5.5
" Gravel (mileage).....	1.8	0.75
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)...	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	6.5	2.3
Automobiles: Number.....	168.75	31.5
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	43.75	7.0
" Number Fords.....	125.00	28.0
" Number Farm Trucks.....	24.25	3.0
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	2.5	4.1
" % Condition Road to It	80.0	77.7
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	80.0	80.0
Telephones: Number	60.0	51.25
" Extent Available (% people having telephones)...	3.66	4.90
" % Efficiency	70.0	67.5
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	97.0	93.8

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 42. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	13.8	15.8
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	6.38	1.5
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	5.9	0.5
" Gravel (mileage).....	0.5	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	4.0	1.0
Automobiles: Number.....	10.75	9.25
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	1.25	0.75
" Number Fords.....	9.5	8.25
" Number Farm Trucks.....	1.50	0.75
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	4.3	2.8
" % Condition Road to It	75.0	60.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	71.7	77.7
Telephones: Number	16.25	10.75
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephones)	4.81	4.15
" % Efficiency	72.5	65.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	87.5	97.5

Table 43 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON COUNTY. 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	50.0	15.8
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	24.75	1.5
" Asphalt (mileage).....	1.15	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	20.8	0.5
" Gravel (mileage).....	1.8	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	6.5	1.0
Automobiles: Number.....	168.75	9.25
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	43.75	0.75
" Number Fords.....	125.00	8.25
" Number Farm Trucks.....	24.25	0.75
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	2.5	2.8
" % Condition Road to It	80.0	60.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	80.0	77.7
Telephones: Number	60.0	10.75
" Extent Available	3.66	4.15
" % Efficiency ..... (% people having telephones)	70.0	65.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	97.0	97.5

Table 44 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	13.8	22.0
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	6.38	7.0
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	5.9	6.3
" Gravel (mileage).....	0.5	0.75
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	4.0	2.3
Automobiles: Number.....	10.75	31.5
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	1.25	7.0
" Number Fords.....	9.5	28.0
" Number Farm Trucks.....	1.50	3.0
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	4.5	4.1
" % Condition Road to It	75.0	77.7
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	71.7	80.0
Telephones: Number	16.25	51.25
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephones)	4.81	4.90
" % Efficiency	72.5	67.5
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	87.5	93.3

Table 45 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX 1896-1926

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	25.0	5.7
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	421.0	?
" Asphalt (mileage).....	?	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	336.8	56.7
" Gravel (mileage).....	?	?
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	188.9	100.0
Automobiles: Number.....	?	?
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	?	?
" Number Fords.....	?	?
" Number Farm Trucks.....	?	?
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	0	- 22.7
" % Condition Road to It	33.3	0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	33.3	- 6.4
Telephones: Number	?	?
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephones)	?	?
" % Efficiency	?	?
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	?	?

Table 46. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE - 1906-1926

Items.	Per Cent Increase Anderson County Most Accessible	Per Cent Increase Anderson County Least Accessible
Highways: Total Mileage.....	23.9	16.7
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	?	200.0
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	?	0
" Gravel (mileage).....	?	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	28.6	33.3
Automobiles: Number.....	?	?
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	?	?
" Number Fords.....	?	?
" Number Farm Trucks.....	?	?
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	50.0	0
" % Condition Road to It	55.0	9.1
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	10.3	0
Telephones: Number	?	?
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephones)	172.22	176.67
" % Efficiency	?	225.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	50.00	160.00

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 47. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Highways: Total Mileage.....	25.0	23.9
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	421.0	?
" Asphalt (mileage).....	?	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	336.8	?
" Gravel (mileage).....	?	?
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	188.9	28.6
Automobiles: Number.....	?	?
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	?	?
" Number Fords.....	?	?
" Number Farm Trucks.....	?	?
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	0	50.0
" % Condition Road to It	33.3	55.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	33.3	10.3
Telephones: Number	?	?
" Extent Available (% people having telephones)...	?	172.22
" % Efficiency	?	?
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	?	50.00

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 48. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST IN ANDERSON

Items.	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Highways: Total Mileage.....	5.7	16.7
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	?	200.0
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	56.7	0
" Gravel (mileage).....	?	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	100.0	33.3
Automobiles: Number.....	?	?
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	?	?
" Number Fords.....	?	?
" Number Farm Trucks.....	?	?
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	- 22.7	0
" % Condition Road to It	0	9.1
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	- 6.4	0
Telephones: Number	?	?
" Extent Available ..... (% people having telephones)	?	176.67
" % Efficiency	?	225.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	?	160.0

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 49 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Highways: Total Mileage.....	25.0	16.7
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	421.0	200.0
" Asphalt (mileage).....	?	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	330.8	0
" Gravel (mileage).....	?	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	188.9	33.3
Automobiles: Number.....	?	?
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	?	?
" Number Fords.....	?	?
" Number Farm Trucks.....	?	?
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	0	0
" % Condition Road to It	33.3	9.1
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	33.3	0
Telephones: Number	?	?
" Extent Available (% people having telephones)..	?	176.67
" % Efficiency	?	225.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	?	160.0

Table 50 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Highways: Total Mileage.....	5.7	23.9
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	?	?
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	56.7	?
" Gravel (mileage).....	?	?
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	No data	No data
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	No data	No data
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	100.0	28.6
Automobiles: Number.....	?	?
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	?	?
" Number Fords.....	?	?
" Number Farm Trucks.....	?	?
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	- 22.7	50.0
" % Condition Road to It	0	55.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	- 6.4	10.3
Telephones: Number	?	?
" Extent Available (% people having telephones) ..	?	172.22
" % Efficiency	?	?
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	?	50.0

Table 51. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways (1924)	33.3	95.1	56	2
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways per 100 sq. miles (1924)	39.7	18.9	63	5
Number miles of Federal and State Aid highways per 1000 population (1924)	1.8	0.8	70	92
Number miles public roads per county (1922)	588	937	61	21
Number miles of public road per square mile (1922)	1.72	1.86	34	20
Number farms on concrete or brick roads (1925)	0	43	One of last	15
Number farms on macadam roads (1925)	267	1,771	16	3
Number farms on gravel roads (1925)	49	210	63	35
Number farms on improved dirt roads (1925)	277	669	72	39
Number farms on unimproved dirt roads (1925)	1,031	1,274	39	53
Number farms not reported as to roads (1925)	53	139	63	91
Number passenger automobiles (including Fords) (1924)	742	13,242	58	4
Number persons per passenger automobile (including Fords) (1923)	22.9	10.6	50	5
% of passenger automobiles that are not Fords (1925)	29.8	52.7	35	2

Table 51. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES. (continued)

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Number passenger cars per 100 families (1922)	21.6	45.5	44	4
Number miles of railroad (1922)..	78	120	11	4
Number miles of railroad per 100 square mile (1924)	22.8	23.8	7	4
Value of railroad (1922)	$2,879,523	$7,636,328	15	4
Number rural routes per county (1924)	11	41	69	1
% farms having telephones 1920..	21.1	31.1	39	26

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 52. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	13.0	12.0
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	2.63	4.5
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	3.3	3.7
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	4.75	5.1
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	5.63	2.0
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	5.62	11.75
Automobiles: Number.....	23.0	29.4
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	1.87	3.75
" Number Fords.....	21.0	25.6
" Number Farm Trucks.....	1.1	3.1
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	4.8	4.8
" % Condition Road to It	70.0	72.5
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	70.0	80.0
Telephones: Number	No data	No data
" Extent Available	**	**
" % Efficiency	66.0	78.7
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	95.0	97.5

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 53. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN - 1914

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	13.5	10.0
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	0	0.37
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	0.4	0.4
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	0	4.75
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	12.5	6.13
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	3.5	7.0
Automobiles: Number.....	0	0.87
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	0
" Number Fords.....	0	0.87
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	0
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	4.8	9.2
" % Condition Road to It	54.0	55.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	67.5	76.25
Telephones: Number	No data	No data
" Extent Available	**	**
" % Efficiency	70.0	77.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	82.5	53.8

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 54. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1914	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1925
Highways: Total Mileage.....	10.0	12.0
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	0.37	4.5
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	0.4	3.7
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	4.75	5.1
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	6.13	2.0
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	7.0	11.75
Automobiles: Number.....	0.87	29.4
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	3.75
" Number Fords.....	0.87	25.6
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	3.1
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	9.2	4.8
" % Condition Road to It	55.0	72.5
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	76.25	80.0
Telephones: Number	No data	No data
" Extent Available	**	**
" % Efficiency	77.0	78.7
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	53.8	97.5

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION.

Table 55. COMPARISON OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY WITH IN 1914 THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1914	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1925
Highways: Total Mileage.....	13.5	13.0
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	0	12.63
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	0.4	3.3
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	0	4.75
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	12.5	5.63
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	3.5	5.62
Automobiles: Number.....	0	23.0
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	1.37
" Number Fords.....	0	21.0
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	1.1
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	4.8	4.8
" % Condition Road to It	54.0	70.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	67.5	70.0
Telephones: Number	No data	No data
" Extent Available	**	**
" % Efficiency	70.0	66.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	82.5	95.0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 56. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE WITH LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County	Least Accessible Hawkins County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	16.4	7.33
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	2.8	3.66
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	3.5	3.0
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	6.6	1.6
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	7.6	2.33
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	6.6	4.0
Automobiles: Number.....	31.8	8.3
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	3.0	0.
" Number Fords.....	28.8	8.3
" Number Farm Trucks.....	1.6	0.33
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	3.6	6.66
" % Condition Road to It	64.0	76.7
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	70.0	70.0
Telephones: Number	No data	No data
" Extent Available	**	**
" % Efficiency	66.0	67.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	97.0	91.7

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 57 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH % INCREASE IN THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE 1914-1925.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Hawkins County	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Hawkins County
Highways: Total Mileage.....	- 3.5	- 4.3
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	366.7	?
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	600.0	?
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	?	?
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	- 50.6	- 69.6
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	37.5	200.8
Automobiles: Number.....	?	?
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	?	?
" Number Fords.....	?	?
" Number Farm Trucks.....	?	?
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	0	0
" % Condition Road to It	14.3	53.4
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	6.1	0
Telephones: Number	No data	No data
" Extent Available	**	**
" % Efficiency	- 5.7	- 4.3
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	26.0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 58. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Highways: Total Mileage.....	17.0	16.4
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	0.6	2.8
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	0.5	3.5
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)...	0	6.6
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	15.4	7.6
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	4.8	6.6
Automobiles: Number.....	0	31.8
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	3.0
" Number Fords.....	0	28.8
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	1.6
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	3.6	3.6
" % Condition Road to It	56.0	64.0
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	66.0	70.0
Telephones: Number	No data	No data
" Extent Available	**	**
" % Efficiency	70.0	66.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	77.0	97.0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 59 . COMPARISON OF THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Highways: Total Mileage.....	7.66	7.33
" Total Hard Surfaced (mileage)	0	3.66
" Asphalt (mileage).....	0	0
" Macadam (mileage).....	0	3.0
" Gravel (mileage).....	0	0
" Graded Dirt Roads (mileage)..	0	1.6
" Ungraded Dirt Roads (mileage)	7.66	2.33
" No. Bridges and Ferries.....	1.33	4.0
Automobiles: Number.....	0	8.3
" Cars Other Than Fords.....	0	0.3
" Number Fords.....	0	8.3
" Number Farm Trucks.....	0	0.33
Railroads: Distance to (miles).....	6.66	6.66
" % Condition Road to It	50.0	76.7
" % Efficiency of R.R. Service...	70.0	70.0
Telephones: Number	No data	No data
" Extent Available	**	**
" % Efficiency	70.0	67.0
Mail Service: % Served by Carriers...	91.7	91.7

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 60 COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways (1924)	79.8	89.5	11	6
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways per 100 sq. miles (1924)	18.3	18.6	8	6
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways per 1000 population (1924)	2.0	3.9	63	14
Number miles public roads per county (1922)	850	849	27	29
Number miles of public road per square mile (1922)	1.95	1.76	18	33
Number farms on concrete or brick roads (1925)	129	0	3	One of last
Number farms on macadam roads (1925)	467	298	11	18
Number farms on gravel roads (1925)	310	42	34	64
Number farms on improved dirt roads (1925)	792	1001	30	22
Number farms on unimproved dirt roads (1925)	1,673	2301	78	92
Number farms not reported as to roads (1925)	7	9	15	19
Number passenger automobiles (including Fords) (1924)	2,880	1,131	6	33
Number persons per passenger automobile (including Fords) (1923)	13.7	20.2	10	39
% of passenger automobiles that are not Fords (1925)	29.4	20.4		

C Table 60. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES. (continued)

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Number passenger cars per 100 families (1922)	37.0	23.8	8	37
Number miles of railroad (1922)...	51	51	35	36
Number miles of railroad per 100 square mile (1924)	11.7	10.5	30	38
Value of railroad (1922)	$3,205,000	$1,955,000	12	37
Number rural routes per county (1924)	22	29	31	8
% farms having telephones 1920...	26.5	10.1	33	76

Table 61. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways (1924) ...	60.3	51.3	35.7	48.9
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways per 100 square miles (1924) ...	12.8	10.7	10.7	11.4
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways per 1,000 population (1924) ...	2.10	2.98	2.95	2.67
Number passenger automobiles (including Fords) (1924)	4,064	1,136	565	1,893
Number people per passenger automobile (including Fords) (1923)	20.3	24.0	42.7	29.5
Number passenger cars per 100 families(1922)	27.7	22.2	16.1	21.9
Number miles railroad per county (1922)	78	39	21	45
Number miles railroad per 100 sq. mi. (1924)	15.4	8.8	5.5	9.8
Number rural delivery routes per county(1924)	19.7	18.1	12.4	16.8

Table 62.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways (1924) ...	5,701.6	4,782.1	5,241.9
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways per 100 square miles (1924)	17.3	8.7	13.0
Number miles Federal and State Aid highways per 1000 population (1923)	1.9	7.9	4.9
Per cent farms on public roads that are unimproved (1925)	40.6	43.4	43.1
State and local funds per dollar Federal funds used for road construction (1925)	$ 17.46	$ 8.30	$ 13.79
Number passenger automobiles (including Fords) (1923)	426,304	113,231	269,767
Number people per passenger automobile (including Fords) (1921)..	11.2	12.3	10.3
Number passenger cars per 100 families (1922).....	55	53	53
Number miles railroad per state (1923)..	6,380.61	3,892.57	5,111.20
Number miles railroad per 100 square miles (1923)	15.6	9.8	8.4
Railroads and their equipment (1922).	$579,580,708	$241,634,520	$407,159,184
Street railways, waterworks, shipping, etc. (1922)	$479,493,375	$ 83,989,160	$277,705,510
Number rural delivery routes per state (1925)	1,273	579	919
Number rural people per mile rural route (1925)	49.7	79.9	65.1

Table 63 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items *	Eight Communities Knox County	Eight Communities Anderson County.
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0.5	0.5
Community Fairs	0.5	0.25
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	1.50	1.50
Social Clubs	0.38	0.3
Fraternal Orders	2.25	0.25
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0.75	0.63
Recreational Clubs	0.38	0.13

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

Table 64. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items *	Eight Communities Knox County 1896	Eight Communities Knox County 1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0.5	0
Community Clubs	0.5	0.5
Community Fairs	0.13	0.5
Farmers' Institutes	0.13	0
Livestock Associations	0.5	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0	1.5
Social Clubs	0	0.38
Fraternal Orders	0.63	2.25
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0	0.75
Recreational Clubs	0.13	0.38

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 65. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT IN 1926.

Items *	Eight Communities Anderson County 1906	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926.
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0.5	0.5
Community Fairs	0	0.25
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0.13	1.5
Social Clubs	0	0.3
Fraternal Orders	0.25	0.25
Community Library (No. Vols.	0.13	0
Consolidated Schools	0.13	0.63
Recreational Clubs	0	0.13

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 66. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926

Items *	Most Accessible Knox County 1896	Most Accessible Knox County 1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0.75	0
Community Clubs	0	1
Community Fairs	0.25	1
Farmers' Institutes	0.25	0
Livestock Associations	0.5	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0	2
Social Clubs	0	0.75
Fraternal Orders	1	3
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0	1.0
Recreational Clubs	0.25	0.75

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

Table 67. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF THE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items *	Most Accessible Anderson County 1906	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0	0.1
Community Fairs	0	0.5
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0.25	1.50
Social Clubs	0	0.5
Fraternal Orders	0.25	0.25
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0.25	0.75
Recreational Clubs	0	0.25

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 63. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items *	Least Accessible Anderson County 1906	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0.5	0
Community Fairs	0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0	1.5
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	0.25	0.25
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0.25	0
Consolidated Schools	0	0.25
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

Table 69. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items *	Least Accessible Knox County 1896	Least Accessible Knox County 1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0.25	0
Community Clubs	0	0
Community Fairs	0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0	1.0
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	0.25	1.50
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0	0.5
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 70. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX - 1926.

Items *	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Knox County.
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	1.0	0
Community Fairs	1.0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	2.0	1.0
Social Clubs	0.75	0
Fraternal Orders	3.0	1.50
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	1.0	0.5
Recreational Clubs	0.75	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 71. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE - 1926.

Items *	Most Accessible Anderson County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0.5	0.5
Community Fairs	0.5	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	1.5	1.5
Social Clubs	0.5	0
Fraternal Orders	0.25	0.25
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0.75	0.25
Recreational Clubs	0.25	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 72. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items *	Most Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	1.0	0.5
Community Fairs	1.0	0.5
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	2	1.5
Social Clubs	0.75	0.5
Fraternal Orders	3	0.25
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	1.0	0.75
Recreational Clubs	0.75	0.25

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 73. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items *	Least Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0	0.5
Community Fairs	0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	1.0	1.5
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	1.5	0.25
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0.5	0.25
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 74. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON, 1926

Items *	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	1.0	0.5
Community Fairs	1.0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	2.0	1.5
Social Clubs	0.75	0
Fraternal Orders	3.0	0.25
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	1	0.25
Recreational Clubs	0.75	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 75. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON - 1926.

Items *	Least Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0	0.5
Community Fairs	0	0.5
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	1.0	1.5
Social Clubs	0	0.5
Fraternal Orders	1.50	0.25
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0.5	0.75
Recreational Clubs	0	0.25

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 76. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX.

Items *	Per Cent Increase Knox County Most Accessible 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Knox County Least Accessible 1896-1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	- 100.0	- 100.0
Community Clubs	0	?
Community Fairs	300.0	0
Farmers' Institutes	- 100.0	0
Livestock Associations	?	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	?	?
Social Clubs	?	0
Fraternal Orders	200.0	500.0
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	?	?
Recreational Clubs	200.0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 77. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items *	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	?	- 100.0
Community Fairs	?	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	500.0	?
Social Clubs	?	0
Fraternal Orders	0	0
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	- 100.0
Consolidated Schools	200.0	?
Recreational Clubs	?	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 73. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON.

Items *	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	- 100.0	0
Community Clubs	0	?
Community Fairs	300.0	?
Farmers' Institutes	- 100.0	0
Livestock Associations	?	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	?	500.0
Social Clubs	?	?
Fraternal Orders	200.0	0
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	?	200.0
Recreational Clubs	200.0	?

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 79. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON.

Items *	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County. 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	- 100.0	0
Community Clubs	0	- 100.0
Community Fairs	0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	?	?
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	500.0	0
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	- 100.0
Consolidated Schools	?	?
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 80. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items *	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	- 100.0	0
Community Clubs	0	- 100.0
Community Fairs	300.0	0
Farmers' Institutes	- 100.0	0
Livestock Associations	?	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	?	?
Social Clubs	?	0
Fraternal Orders	200.0	0
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	- 100.0
Consolidated Schools	?	?
Recreational Clubs	200.0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 81. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items *	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1898 - 1928	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906 - 1926
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	- 100.0	0
Community Clubs	?	?
Community Fairs	0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	?	500.0
Social Clubs	0	?
Fraternal Orders	500.0	0
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	?	200.0
Recreational Clubs	0	?

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

Table 82. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Value of farm products sold cooperatively 1925	$ 1,862	$ 9,605	73	59
Value of supplies purchased cooperatively 1925....	$ 545	$ 870	57	49

MADE IN U.S.A. HAMMERMILL BOND

Table 83 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN - 1925

Items *	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0	0.13
Community Fairs	0.4	0.3
Farmers' Institutes	0	0.38
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0.5	2.0
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	1	0.6
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	12.5
Consolidated Schools	0.13	0.4
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 84. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN - 1914

Items *	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0.5
Community Clubs	0	0
Community Fairs	0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0	0
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	0.5	0.14
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0	0
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 85. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items *	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1914	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1925
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0.5	0
Community Clubs	0	0.13
Community Fairs	0	0.5
Farmers' Institutes	0	0.38
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0	2
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	0.14	0.6
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	12.5
Consolidated Schools	0	0.4
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 86. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items *	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1914	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1925
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0	0
Community Fairs	0	0.4
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0	0.5
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	0.5	1
Community Library (No. Vols.)	8	0
Consolidated Schools	0	0.13
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 87. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE WITH LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS - 1925.

Items *	Most Accessible Hawkins County	Least Accessible Hawkins County
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0	0
Community Fairs	0.6	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0.8	0
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	1.6	0
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0.2	0
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

Table 88. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH % INCREASE IN THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS 1914 - 1923

Items *	Percent Increase Most Accessible Hawkins County	Per Cent Increase. Least Accessible Hawkins County
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0	0
Community Fairs	0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	?	0
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	100.0	0
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	?	0
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

Table 89. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items *	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1925.
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0	0
Community Fairs	0	0.6
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0	0.8
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	0.8	1.6
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0	0.2
Recreational Clubs	0	0.2

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

Table 90. COMPARISON OF THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items *	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Farm Bureaus	0	0
Farmers' Unions	0	0
Community Clubs	0	0
Community Fairs	0	0
Farmers' Institutes	0	0
Livestock Associations	0	0
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	0	0
Social Clubs	0	0
Fraternal Orders	0	0
Community Library (No. Vols.)	0	0
Consolidated Schools	0	0
Recreational Clubs	0	0

* See also "Cooperative Selling Organizations" and "Cooperative Buying Organizations" under "Agriculture".

FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

Table 91. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Value of farm products sold cooperatively 1925	$ 229,138	$ 53,377	8	32
Value of supplies purchased cooperatively 1925	$ 935	$ 1,220	47	41

Table 92. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Value of farm products sold cooperatively 1925	$ 80,632	$ 92,266	$ 51,826	$ 74,422
Value farm supplies purchased cooperatively 1925	$ 5,063	$ 3,872	$ 5,109	$ 4,690

Table 93.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Total number of cooperative agricultural associations 1925	327	118	220
Value supplies bought cooperatively 1925	$ 337,365.00	$ 890,209.00	$1,582,930
Value supplies sold cooperatively 1925	$25,155,536.00	$10,579,966.00	$17,867,751

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AMERICANA COLLECTION

Table 94. COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH THE AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY - 1926

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County	Eight Communities Anderson County
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	7.7	6.5
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	1.0	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.63%	8.25%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	1.0	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	2.5	0
b. Number real poor people.....	3.13	7.13
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.6	1.0
b. Extent used or sold, nc.....	0.57	0.86
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	10.28	7.84
b. % condition of work.....	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	$ 2.13	$ 1.88
d. Capital.....	$6713.00	$1363.00
e. Weekly payroll.....	$ 131.30	$ 93.50
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	82.5	76.25
b. People so working.....	39.2	14.9
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	10.5	12.0

Table 95. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County 1896	Eight Communities Knox County 1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	10.7	7.7
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0.125	1
c. Interest rate.....	7.75%	7.63%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	1
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0.13	0.25
b. Number real poor people.....	0.9	3.13
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.5	1.6
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0.50	0.57
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees	18.55	10.28
b. % condition of work	80.0	80.0
c. Wages paid (daily)	$ 0.84	$ 2.13
d. Capital	$ 800.00	$ 6713.00
e. Weekly payroll	$ 90.63	$ 131.30
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	50.0	82.5
b. People so working	3.2	39.2
c. Length of time each works ..... (months)	6.0	10.5

Table 96 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Anderson County 1906	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	6.5	6.5
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0	1
c. Interest rate.....	9.25%	8.25%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	1
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	4.5	7.13
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.0	1.0
b. Extent used or sold, no.	0.75	0.86
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees	3.43 1.88	7.84
b. % condition of work	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily)	$ 0.96	$ 1.88
d. Capital	$ 1250.00	$ 1363.00
e. Weekly payroll	$ 21.40	$ 93.50
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	45.00	76.25
b. People so working	4.9	14.9
c. Length of time each works ..... (months)	7.2	12.0

Table 97. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1896	Most Accessible Knox County 1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	10.3	7.5
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0.25	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	8.0%	7.5%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	No data	1
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0.25	0.5
b. Number real poor people.....	0	5.0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.5	1.5
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0.66	0.66
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	15.95	10.4
b. % condition of work.....	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	$ 0.75	$ 2.00
d. Capital.....	$ 675.00	$550.00
e. Weekly payroll.....	$ 75.00	$125.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	60.0	87.50
b. People so working.....	4.7	48.8
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	6.0	10.5

Table 98. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County 1906	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	6.1	6.1
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0	1
c. Interest rate.....	9.5%	8.0%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	1
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	5.5	4.25
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.0	1.0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	1.0	1.0
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	5.2	6.48
b. % condition of work.....	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	$ 0.92	$ 1.75
d. Capital.....	$2175.00	$1450.00
e. Weekly payroll.....	$ 31.25	$ 77.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	50.0	80.0
b. People so working.....	2.0	17.5
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	6.0	12.0

Table 99 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1896	Least Accessible Knox County 1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	11.0	7.8
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0	1
c. Interest rate.....	7.5%	7.8%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	1
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	1.75	1.25
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.5	1.7
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0.33	0.5
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	21.15	10.7
b. % condition of work.....	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	$ 0.92	$ 2.25
d. Capital.....	$925.00	$12, 875.00
e. Weekly payroll.....	$106.25	$137.50
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	40.0	77.5
b. People so working.....	2.8	29.5
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	no data	10.5

Table 100. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Anderson County 1906	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926.
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	6.9	6.9
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0	1
c. Interest rate.....	9.0%	8.5%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	1
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	5.5	10.0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.0	1.0
b. Extent used or sold, nc.	0.5	0.66
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees	1.66	9.2
b. % condition of work	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily)	$ 1.00	$ 2.00
d. Capital	$ 650.00	$1275.00
e. Weekly payroll	$ 11.50	$ 110.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	40.0	72.5
b. People so working	7.8	12.2
c. Length of time each works ..... (months)	9.0	12.0

Table 101. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1926	Least Accessible Knox County 1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	7.5	7.8
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	1.0	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.5%	7.8%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	1.0	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0.5	0
b. Number real poor people.....	5.0	1.25
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.5	1.7
b. Extent used or sold, no.	0.66	0.5
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees	10.4	10.17
b. % condition of work	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily)	2.0	2.25
d. Capital	$550.00	$12,875.00
e. Weekly payroll	$125.00	$ 137.50
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	87.5	77.5
b. People so working	48.8	29.5
c. Length of time each works ..... (months)	10.5	10.5

Table 102. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON COUNTY- 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	6.1	6.9
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	1.0	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	8.0	8.5
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	1.0	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	4.25	10.00
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.0	1.0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	1.0	0.66
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	6.48	9.25
b. % condition of work.....	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	1.75	2.00
d. Capital.....	$1,450.00	$1,275.00
e. Weekly payroll.....	$ 77.00	$ 110.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	80.0	72.5
b. People so working.....	17.5	12.2
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	12.0	12.0

Table 103. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	7.5	6.1
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	1.0	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.5%	8.0%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	1.0	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0.5	0
b. Number real poor people.....	5.0	4.25
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.3	1.0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0.66	1.0
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	10.4	6.48
b. % condition of work	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily)	2.0	1.75
d. Capital	$550.00	$1,450.00
e. Weekly payroll	$125.00	$ 77.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	87.5	80.0
b. People so working	48.8	17.5
c. Length of time each works ..... (months)	10.5	12.0

Table 104. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	7.8	6.9
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	1.0	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.8%	8.5%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	1.0	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	1.25	10.00
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.7	1.0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0.5	0.66
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	10.17	9.25
b. % condition of work.....	60.0	60.00
c. Wages paid (daily).....	2.25	2.00
d. Capital.....	$12,875.00	$1,275.00
e. Weekly payroll.....	$ 137.50	$ 110.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	77.5	72.5
b. People so working.....	29.5	12.2
c, Length of time each works..... (months)	10.5	12.0

Table 105 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County.
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	7.5	6.9
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	1.0	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.5%	8.5%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	1.0	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0.5	0
b. Number real poor people.....	5.0	10.0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.5	1.0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0.66	0.66
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees	10.4	9.2
b. % condition of work	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily)	2.0	2.0
d. Capital	$ 550.00	$ 1,275.00
e. Weekly payroll	$ 125.00	$ 110.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	87.5	72.5
b. People so working	48.3	12.2
c. Length of time each works ..... (months)	10.5	12.0

Table 106. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF ANDERSON-1926

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	7.8	6.1
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty)	1.0	1.0
c. Interest rate	7.8%	8.0
d. No. communities having farm loan associations	1.0	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people	0	0
b. Number real poor people	1.25	4.25
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no.	1.7	1.0
b. Extent used or sold, no.	0.5	1.0
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees	10.17	6.48
b. % condition of work	60.0	60.0
c. Wages paid (daily)	2.25	1.75
d. Capital	$12,875.00	$1,450.00
e. Weekly payroll	$ 137.50	$ 77.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	77.5	80.0
b, People so working	29.5	17.5
c. Length of time each works (months)	10.5	12.0

Table 107. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN THE FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX.

Items.	Percentage Inc. Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percentage Inc. Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	- 26.8	- 29.5
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	300.0	?
c. Interest rate.....	- 6.3	3.3
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	no data
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	100.0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	100.0	- 28.6
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	0	- 16.7
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0	100.0
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	-34.8	- 91.9
b. % condition of work.....	0	0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	77.8	63.6
d. Capital.....	-13.5	1291.9
e. Weekly payroll.....	66.7	29.4
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	45.8	93.8
b. People so working.....	1292.8	972.7
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	600.0	?

Table 108. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE

Items.	1906-1926 Percent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County	1906-1926 Percent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	0	0
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	?	?
c. Interest rate.....	- 15.8	- 5.6
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	no data
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	- 22.7	185.71
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	0	0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0	0
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	24.5	453.0
b. % condition of work.....	200.0	0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	90.9	100.0
d. Capital.....	-33.3	292.3
e. Weekly payroll.....	146.4	856.5
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	60.0	81.3
b. People so working.....	775.0	58.1
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	166.7	166.7

Table 109 : COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON

Items.	Percent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	- 26.8	0
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	300.0	?
c. Interest rate.....	- 6.3	- 15.8
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	no data
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	100.0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	100.0	- 22.7
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	0	0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0	0
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	-34.8	24.5
b. % condition of work	0	200.0
c. Wages paid (daily)	77.8	90.9
d. Capital	-18.5	- 33.3
e. Weekly payroll	66.7	146.4
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	45.8	60.0
b. People so working	1292.8	775.0
c. Length of time each works ..... (months)	600.0	166.7

Table 110. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Percent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	- 29.5	0
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	?	?
c. Interest rate.....	3.3	- 5.6
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	no data
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	- 28.6	185.71
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no...	- 16.7	0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	100.0	0
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	- 51.9	453.00
b. % condition of work.....	0	0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	63.6	100.0
d. Capital.....	1291.9	292.3
e. Weekly payroll.....	29.4	856.5
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	93.8	81.3
b. People so working.....	972.7	58.1
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	?	166.7

Table 111. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Percent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	- 26.8	0
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	300.0	?
c. Interest rate.....	- 6.3	- 5.6
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	no data
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	100.0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	100.0	185.71
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	0	0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	0	0
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	-34.8	453.0
b. % condition of work.....	0	0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	77.8	100.0
d. Capital.....	- 18.5	292.3
e. Weekly payroll.....	66.7	856.5
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	45.8	81.3
b. People so working.....	1292.8	58.1
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	600.0	166.7

Table 112 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items.	Percent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	- 29.5	0
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	?	?
c. Interest rate.....	3.3	- 15.8
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	no data
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	- 28.6	- 22.7
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no...	- 16.7	0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	100.0	0
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	- 51.9	24.5
b. % condition of work.....	0	200.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	63.6	90.9
d. Capital.....	1291.9	- 33.3
e. Weekly payroll.....	29.4	146.4
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	93.8	60.0
b. People so working.....	972.7	775.0
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	?	166.7

Table 113. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Total banking resources 1923..	$1,320,007	$36,238,210	55	4
Total banking resources per capita 1923	$ 71.32	$ 302.78	65	4
State banking resources (state only) 1923	$ 792, 424	$ 3,504,021	53	10
Number manufacturing establishments 1919	26	222	48	4
Wage earners: 1919				
Average number	467	11,750	29	4
Annual wages	$ 288,344	$10,183,344	32	4

Table 114. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN COUNTY 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	6.8	5.9
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	1.0	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.0%	6.5%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	1.0	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0.25
b. Number real poor people.....	1	0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	2.5	3.0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	1.33	1.5
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	10.63	2.25
b. % condition of work.....	80.0	80.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	$ 2.42	$ 2.56
d. Capital.....	$312,667.00	$687.50
e. Weekly payroll.....	$ 153.75	$ 34.50
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	67.0	100.0
b. People so working.....	41.0	36.4
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	12.0	10.5

Table 115. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	6.8	14.1
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0.8	0.5
c. Interest rate.....	7.0%	7.0%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	no data
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0.13
b. Number real poor people.....	1.5	0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	2.5	3.0
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	1.1	1.13
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	0	no data
b. % condition of work.....	no data	80.00
c. Wages paid (daily).....	0	$ 1.00
d. Capital.....	0	$571.00
e. Weekly payroll.....	0	no data
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	40.0	49.0
b. People so working.....	0	0
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	0	0

Table 116. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN COUNTY IN 1914 WITH THOSE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1914	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1925
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	14.1	5.9
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0.3	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.0%	6.5%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0.13	0.25
b. Number real poor people.....	0	0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	3	3
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	1.13	1.5
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	no data	2.25
b. % condition of work.....	80.0	80.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	$ 1.00	$ 2.56
d. Capital.....	$571.00	$687.50
e. Weekly payroll.....	no data	$34.50
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	49.00	100.0
b. People so working.....	0	36.4
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	0	10.5

Table 117. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH THOSE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1914	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1925
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	6.8	6.8
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0.8	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.0%	7.0%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	1.5	1.0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	2.5	2.5
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	1.1	1.38
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	0	10.63
b. % condition of work.....	no data	80.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	0	$ 2.42
d. Capital.....	0	$312,687.00
e. Weekly payroll.....	0	$153.75
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	40.0	67.0
b. People so working.....	0	41.0
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	0	12.0

Table 118. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE WITH LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County	Least Accessible Hawkins County
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	6.0	8.0
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	1.0	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.0%	7.0%
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	1.0	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	1.6	0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.6	2.3
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	1.4	1.3
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees	5.0	20 (Home)
b. % condition of work	80.0	80.0
c. Wages paid (daily)	$ 1.00	$ 3.00
d. Capital	$300.00	$833,333.00
e. Weekly payroll	$ 30.00	$ 360.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	65.0	70.0
b. People so working	7.6	28.3
c. Length of time each works ..... (months)	7.2	4.0

Table 119. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN HAWKINS.

Items.	Percent Increase Most Accessible Hawkins County 1914-1925	Percent Increase Least Accessible Hawkins County 1914-1925
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	0	0
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	25.0	42.8
c. Interest rate.....	0	0
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	no data
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	0	-100.0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	0	0
b. Extent used or sold, no.	40.0	- 11.33
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees	?	?
b. % condition of work	?	?
c. Wages paid (daily)	?	?
d. Capital	?	?
e. Weekly payroll	?	?
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %	73.3	75.0
b. People so working	?	?
c. Length of time each works ..... (months)	?	?

Table 120. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	6	6
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0.8	1
c. Interest rate.....	7	7
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	1
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	1.6	1.6
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	1.6	1.6
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	1.0	1.4
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	0	5
b. % condition of work.....	no data	80.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	0	$ 1.00
d. Capital.....	0	$ 300.00
e. Weekly payroll.....	0	$ 30.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	37.5	65.0
b. People so working.....	no data	7.6
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	0	7.2

Table 121. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1925.
Credit facilities available:		
a. Banks, distance to	8	8
b. Credit available (No. coms. having plenty).....	0.7	1.0
c. Interest rate.....	7.0	7.0
d. No. communities having farm loan associations.....	no data	1.0
Even distribution of wealth:		
a. Number rich people.....	0	0
b. Number real poor people.....	1.3	0
Market for bulky products, (ore, clay, stone, lumber, etc.)		
a. Extent these are available, no..	2.3	2.3
b. Extent used or sold, no.....	1.5	1.3
Extent local industries developed:		
a. Number of employees.....	0	20 (Home)
b. % condition of work.....	0	80.0
c. Wages paid (daily).....	0	$ 3.00
d. Capital.....	0	$ 833,333
e. Weekly payroll.....	0	$ 360.00
Outside work (other than agriculture):		
a. Extent available, %.....	40.0	70.0
b. People so working.....	0	28.3
c. Length of time each works..... (months)	0	4.0

Table 122. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Total banking resources 1923.	$7,569,000	$2,129,000	7	39
Total banking resources per capita 1923	$ 193.12	$ 92.89	7	47
State banking resources (state only) 1923	$3,574,255	$2,128,669	9	22
Number manufacturing establishments 1919	64	44	10	24
Wage earners: 1919				
Average number	1,765	89	9	54
Annual wages	$1,479,264	$ 62,883	9	54

Table 123. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Avorage per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Total Banking resources 1923....	$12,404,935	$2,007,258	$ 999,303	$5,102,684
Total banking resources per capita 1923	$ 156.75	$ 95.41	$ 59.94	$ 103.31
State banking resources (state only) 1923	$ 6,324,678	$1,263,128	$ 930,107	$2,799,110
Number manufacturing establishments 1919	93	36	18	48
Wage earners: 1919				
Average number	2,752	272	46	1,002
Annual wages	$ 2,412,161	$ 183,342	$ 27,111	$ 356,371

Table 124.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Total banking resources 1923	$1,964,863,583	$257,857,625	$ 1,111,360,604
Total banking resources per capita 1923	$ 479	$ 310	$ 395
Bank savings account per capita 1925	$ 221	$ 127	$ 204
% gain in per capita bank savings 1921 - 1925	139.3	181.4	132.0
Number state banks which failed 1921-1925	33.5	53.6	47.7
Number national banks which failed 1921-1925	3.8	10.3	7.0
Average number bank failures per 100 banks (1922, 1923, and 1924)	0.68	2.94	1.71
Value added by manufacturing 1921	$ 698,885,000	$ 61,736,000	$ 373,809,000
Average number wage earners in manufacturing 1919 ...	336,386	40,924	185,640
% total persons gainfully employed in manufacturing 1920	33.5	19.9	30.8

Table 125. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY - 1926.

Items.	Knox County.	Anderson County.
Number	987.5	445.0
Foreign	0.75	1.0
Negro	10.9	5.9
% Increase in Population	2.9	4.6
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Knox County with Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County - 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: There has been much greater increase in the population in the eight communities of Knox (11%) than of those in Anderson (4%). The cause of the increases in Knox are: come to be near good schools, near work, near railroad, or pike. The small increase in the Anderson communities is caused by natural growth of population.

Where Have Removals Gone: The very few that have left these eight communities of Knox County have not left the county but have moved to Knoxville. Those leaving the eight communities of Anderson have, in most cases, left the county. They have gone to Knoxville, to the North, and to the West.

Character and Sex of Removals: Not only was there more people leaving Anderson than Knox, but a larger percentage of those leaving are single persons than was the case in Knox County.

Number Moving into the Communities: No data.

Number Moving into Community from Outside the County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: A larger number of persons have moved into the Knox County communities than have moved into the Anderson communities. Also a very much larger percentage of the incomers have come into Knox County from other counties. They have moved in from Anderson, Union, Sevier, Claiborne, Campbell, Greene, Hancock, and Jefferson. Anderson had a few coming in from Union, Grainger, Greene, Hawkins, and Claiborne.

Why Came Incomers: In Knox - to get closer to market, educational advantages, to work on railroad, better roads, work in Knoxville. In Anderson the very few that have come in have come because of cheap land; better roads (came in from inaccessible communities); good farming land; schools; and to work.

Character and Sex of Incomers: Although more have moved into the Knox communities, there is not much difference in the character and sex, for in both cases they were mostly men of families.

Table 126. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities. Knox County 1896	Eight Communities Knox County 1926
Number	887.5	987.5
Foreign	7.25	0.75
Negro	28.5	10.9
% Increase in Population	no data	2.9
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Knox County in 1896 with The Average of Same Eight Communities in 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: The eight communities of Knox increased 11% between 1896 and 1926. The reason for this increase: to be near good school, near outside work, near railroad, on good road.

Where Have Removals Gone: 1896 - No data. 1926 - The very few leaving the eight communities of Knox have gone to Knoxville.

Character and Sex of Removals: 1896 - No data. 1926 - Most of the few leaving the eight communities of Knox are men and their families.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: 1896 - No data. 1926 - The incomers into the eight communities of Knox have come in from Anderson, Union, Sevier, Claiborne, Campbell, Greene, Hancock, and Jefferson.

Why Came Incomers: 1896 - No data. 1926 - The incomers into the eight communities of Knox in 1926, came in to be near market, to have educational advantages, to work on railroad, to get rich land, and to work in Knoxville.

Character and Sex of Incomers: 1896 - No data. 1926 - The incomers into the eight communities of Knox in 1926 were men and their families.

POPULATION

Table 127. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Anderson County 1906	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926
Number	426.8	445.0
Foreign	2.5	1.0
Negro	9.0	5.9
% Increase in Population	no data	4.8
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

POPULATION.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with the Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: The eight communities of Anderson increased 4% between 1906 and 1926. The reason for this growth is: the natural growth of population, better schools and roads in Anderson than in some other nearby counties, and to get more outside work.

Where Removals Have gone: 1906 - No data. Those leaving the eight communities of Anderson have, in most cases, left the county. They have gone to Knoxville, to the North, and to the West.

Character and Sex of Removals: 1906 - No data. Those leaving the eight communities of Anderson in 1926 were to a large extent single people, the girls going to Knoxville, and men to the North and to Florida.

Number Moving Into Community: No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: 1906 - No data. 1926 - The few coming into the eight communities of Anderson in 1926 have come there to get cheap land, good farm land, better roads, better schools, and more outside work.

Character and Sex of Incomers: 1906 - No data. 1926 - All the incomers into the eight communities of Anderson were men with families.

Table 128. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Four Most Accessible 1896	Four Most Accessible 1926
Number	1,425	1,637
Foreign	8.3	1.3
Negro	36.8	18.8
% Increase in Population	no data	14.4
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

POPULATION.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County in 1896 with Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: The increase that came between 1896 and 1926 (14.9%) was because people had moved in to educate their children; to be near town so they could work in town and go back home at night; better roads; and better markets.

Where Have Removals Gone: If any had moved out before 1896, we have no data on them. The very few that had moved out in 1926 had gone to the city.

Character and Sex of Removals: The very few leaving these four communities in 1926 were composed of some families, some young men, and some young women.

Number Moving into Community: No data.

Number Moving into Community Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: No data for 1896, but 1926 they came from other communities in Knox and from Sevier, Jefferson, Morgan, Hancock, Union, Claiborne, and Greene.

Why Came Incomers: 1896 - No data. 1926 - They moved in so some member of the family could work in Knoxvile; to be near good school; near good market; or on good roads.

Character and Sex of Incomers: 1896 - No data. 1926 - All the incomers in 1926 were men with families.

Table 129. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Four Most Accessible Anderson County. 1906	Four Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Number	585	631.25
Foreign	2.5	0
Negro	17.8	11.8
% Increase in Population	no data	8.8
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: From 1906 to 1926 the four most accessible communities increased 7.9%, and the increase was because the incomers wanted: fertile cheap land; the natural growth of population; Bull Run and Clinch Creek bottom; for some member of the family to work in Clinton; better roads.

Where Have Removals Gone: 1906 - No data. In 1926 the very few that had left the four most accessible communities were men and their families.

Number Moving Into Community: No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside the County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: 1906 - No data. In 1926 the incomers into the four most accessible communities had come from Union, Greene, Claiborne, Campbell, Blount, Grainger, and Hawkins.

Why Came Incomers: 1906 - No data. Those coming into the most accessible communities in 1926 came to be near better schools, to get outside work, to get away from town, to be on good roads.

Character and Sex of Incomers: 1906 - No data. 1926 - The incomers into the four most accessible communities were men with families.

Table 130. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Four Least Accessible Knox County 1896	Four Least Accessible Knox County. 1926.
Number	350	337.5
Foreign	6.3	0.25
Negro	20.3	5.0
% Increase in Population	no data	— 8.6
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County in 1896 with the Average of the Same in 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: Between 1896 and 1926 the four least accessible decreased 3.6% in population. The decrease was caused by people moving to better schools, and better roads, to get more out-side work, and to be nearer markets.

Where Have Removals Gone: 1896 - No data. In 1926 they had moved to more accessible communities, and to town.

Character and Sex of Removals: 1896 - No data. 1926 - Those leaving the four least accessible communities were men with families, and young men and young women.

Number Moving In to Community - No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside Counties - No data.

Whence Came Incomers: There has been but very few coming into the least accessible communities, and these have come from Sevier, Jefferson, Morgan, and Hancock Counties.

Why Came Incomers: 1896 - No data. In 1926 the very few that had come into these four communities came to work on railroad and to get cheap land.

Character and Sex of Incomers: 1896 - No data. 1926 - All the incomers into the four least accessible communities were men with families.

Table 131 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Four Least Accessible Anderson County 1906	Four Least Accessible Anderson County 1926.
Number	268.75	258.75
Foreign	2.5	2
Negro	0	0
% Increase in Population	no data	0.4
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: The four least accessible communities in Anderson decreased 3.7% between 1906 and 1926. The decrease was partly caused by low income, and the people left to work in town, to be nearer a good market, to be on good roads, near good schools, etc.

Where Have Removals Gone: 1906 - No data. Those leaving the four least accessible communities have nearly all gone outside the county. Some have gone North and some to Knoxville.

Character and Sex of Removals: 1906 - No data. 1926 - A large percentage of the removals are single folks, the men going North and the women going to Knoxville.

Number Moving Into the Community: No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County - No data.

Whence Came Incomers: 1906 - No data. 1926 - The few incomers into the four least accessible communities came from other and more remote communities of Anderson, and from remote areas of Union, Greene, Claiborne, Blount and Grainger.

Why Came Incomers: 1906 - No data. The few coming into the four least accessible communities have come to get cheap land, to have better roads (moving from other places of worse roads); better schools.

Character and Sex of Incomers: 1906 - No data. 1926 - The few incomers into the four least accessible communities of Anderson are men and their families.

Table 132. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible.	Least Accessible.
Number	1,637	337.5
Foreign	1.3	0.25
Negro	18.8	3.0
% Increase in Population	14.4	—8.6
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Knox County, 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: The four most accessible communities of Knox increased 14.9%, while the four least accessible decreased 3.6%. The increase was because the people wanted to be near good schools, or to be near enough so that some member of the family could work in town. The decrease was caused by people wanting to be near better schools, to get more outside work, or to be on better roads.

Where Have Removals Gone: Very few have left the county. Those from the most accessible have moved to town, and those from least accessible have gone both to more accessible and to town.

Character and Sex of Removals: No particular difference in the character or sex of the removals from these two sections was found, the same ratio of families, young men and young women, removed from each. There was, however, a much larger number of removals from the four least accessible.

Number Moving into the Community: No data.

Number Moving into Community Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: But few people have moved into the least accessible communities. Several people have moved into the four most accessible communities. They have mostly come from other communities in Knox and other nearby counties, such as Sevier, Jefferson, Morgan, Hancock, Union, Claiborne, Campbell, and Greene.

Why Came Incomers: There has been a much larger number moving into the four most accessible communities than there has been into the four least accessible. They have come so that some members of the family can work in Knoxville, or to be near a good school, or near a good market. The few that have moved to the four least accessible have come to work on railroad, or to get cheap land, and in one communities it was said that some had moved in from another county to make liquor.

Character and Sex of Incomers: All the incomers, in both sections, were men with families.

Table 133. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible.	Least Accessible.
Number	651.25	258.75
Foreign	0	2.00
Negro	11.8	0
% Increase in Population	8.8	0.4
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County with Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County, 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: The four most accessible communities in Anderson increased 7.9%, while the four least accessible decreased 3.7%. The four most accessible increased because of: better roads, better schools, better markets, Bull Run and Clinch River bottoms, and to enable some member of family to work in town. The four least accessible have decreased because of low incomes, no outside work, and poor roads.

Where Have Removals Gone: In the least accessible a larger number have left, and a larger percentage of those moving have moved out of the county. Several have gone North and several have gone to Knoxville. In the most accessible, most have gone to Clinton.

Character and Sex of Removals: A larger number of people have left the four least accessible communities, and a larger percentage of these are single. The men have gone North and the girls have gone to Knoxville. In the most accessible communities, the few that have left are men with families.

Number Moving into Community: No data.

Number Moving into Community from Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: Not only has a larger number of people moved into the four most accessible, but a larger percentage of them have moved in from outside the county. The incomers of these two sections have mostly come from Union, Greene, Claiborne, Campbell, Blount, Grainger, and Hawkins.

Why Came Incomers: In four most accessible: to be near better schools, to get outside work, good cheap land, to get away from town. The few moving into the four least accessible communities have come in to get cheap land, and better roads (moving from another county of worse roads).

Character and Sex of Incomers: No difference in character and sex of incomers, as they are men with families in both sections.

Table 134. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible. Knox County	Most Accessible. Anderson County.
Number	1,637	631.25
Foreign	1.3	0
Negro	18.8	11.8
% Increase in Population	14.4	8.8
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County, 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: The four most accessible of Knox increased 14.9%, while the four most accessible in Anderson increased only 7.9% or a little over one-half as much. The reason for Anderson increase was rich, low-price land, better schools and roads. In Knox, better schools, better roads, to work in town, and better markets.

Where Have Removals Gone: Not only have fewer people left the communities of Knox County than has left those of Anderson, but a much larger percentage of Knox people have remained in the county; only a very few have gone out of the county. In Anderson many more of them have left the county, some going to Knoxville, and some to the North.

C Character and Sex of Removals: The character and sex is the same for these two regions. The same percentage of men with families leaving both areas.

Number Moving Into Community: No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside the County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: There has been a much larger number of persons coming into the four communities of Knox, than has come into Anderson. They have come from a larger number of counties into Knox; and in both sections large numbers have also moved in from inaccessible communities of the same county.

Why Came Incomers: Those of Knox have come in to be (1) closer to a good market, (2) close to factory work, (3) on good roads, (4) to have educational advantages. Those in Anderson came in to (1) better schools, (2) work, (3) good farming land, (4) better roads.

Character and Sex of Incomers: There was a larger number of incomers into the four accessible communities of Knox than there was in Anderson, but the character and sex was the same. All, in each county, were men with families.

Table 135. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible. Knox County.	Least Accessible. Anderson County.
Number	337.5	258.75
Foreign	0.25	2.00
Negro	5.0	0
% Increase in Population	— 8.6	0.4
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	***
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

POPULATION.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Leaxt Accessible in Anderson County - 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: The least accessible communities of Knox decreased 3.6% and the four least accessible in Anderson decreased 3.7%. The reasons in both counties are: to get to better schools, roads, etc. More left four communities of Knox to get closer to public work. In Anderson several left to get to better markets.

Where Have Removals Gone: Although these two regions have decreased about the same, many more from Anderson have left the county and state, several going to Knoxville, some to Florida, and many to the North. Most of Knox people have remained somewhere in the county, most in Knoxville.

Character and Sex of Removals: The character and sex of the removals of these two counties differ but little, but a somewhat larger percentage of young men and women left from Anderson.

Number Moving Into Community: No data.

Number Moving in from Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: There has been but very few coming into these sections. Those of Knox have come from more remote places in the county, from Sevier and Jefferson Counties. Those of Anderson have come from Union, part of Greene, and Claiborne.

Why Came Incomers: In Knox, to be near better schools, to work on railroad, In Anderson they came to get cheap land and better roads. (They came from places of very poor roads).

Character and Sex of Incomers: There has been very few moving into either of these communities, as is indicated by both areas having a reduction in population. As to character and sex, there is no difference in the two sections as all of the incomers are men with families.

Table 136. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County. 1926	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Number	1,637	258.75
Foreign	1.3	2.0
Negro	18.8	0
% Increase in Population	14.4	0.4
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Date on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Average of the Four Least Accessible of Anderson County, 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: There has been a decrease in population in the four least accessible communities of Anderson, due to people going to industrial centers to work. The four most accessible of Knox had a large increase due to: people coming there to work in Knoxville; and coming in to better schools; and to better roads.

Where Have Removals Gone: There has been but few to move from the four most accessible communities of Knox, and almost all of them are still in the county, many of them going to Knoxville. A few have gone West and North. A much larger number have left the four inaccessible communities of Anderson, and most of these have gone out of the county, and many out of the state. A large number of them have gone to industrial centers of the North. Several have gone to Knoxville.

Character and Sex of Removals: There was not a very large number of removals from the four most accessible of Knox County, but those that have left have been both young men and men of families. These have gone to Knoxville, with the exception of a few young men gone North and West. Those leaving the four inaccessible communities of Anderson, were in much larger numbers, and also a larger percentage of them are young men and girls.

Number Moving Into Community: No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: There have been only a very few incomers to the four least accessible communities of Anderson, and these have come from Union, Greene, and Claiborne Counties. The incomers of the four most accessible communities of the same county and from Union, Sevier, Claiborne, Greene, and Hancock.

Why Came Incomers: The very few coming into the four least accessible communities in Anderson have come for cheap land and better roads. (Some coming from a county of worse roads). Those coming into the four most accessible communities in Knox have come in so some member of the family can work in Knoxville, or to be near a good school, and near a good market.

Character and Sex of Incomers: All the incomers into both of these sections were men with families.

Table 137. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1926	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Number	337.5	651.25
Foreign	0.25	0
Negro	3.0	11.8
% Increase in Population	- 8.6	8.8
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Un tabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County, 1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: The four least accessible communities of Knox have no increase, but a slight decrease in population, due to the people moving in closer to Knoxville. The four most accessible of Anderson have a small increase, due to natural increase in population and to other people moving in to get better roads, better schools, and to work at mills.

Where Have Removals Gone: There has not been a large number leaving either of these places, and not a large percentage of those left the county. Most of those leaving the four least accessible of Knox have gone to Knoxville. Most of those leaving the four most accessible of Anderson have gone to Clinton.

Character and Sex of Removals: Those leaving the four most accessible of Anderson were men with families. Those leaving the four least accessible of Knox are not only men with families, but also young men and young girls.

Number Moving Into Community: No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside the County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: There has not been a large number of incomers into either of these areas. The incomers to the four communities of Anderson have been from Claiborne, Union, Grainger, Greene, Blount, Campbell. Those into the four least accessible of Knox have been from Morgan, Jefferson, Sevier, and from eastern part of Knox County.

Why Came Incomers: Those coming into the least accessible communities of Knox have come in to work on railroad, to rent good land, to educate children, and to make liquor. The incomers to the four most accessible communities in Anderson have come to get better schools, outside work, cheap land, get away from town, to get good farm land.

Character and Sex of Incomers: In the four least accessible communities of Knox there were few incomers, but all were good citizens except a few in one section, who are rough. Most all of the incomers are families. The few incomers into the four most accessible communities of Anderson were good citizens and men with families.

Table 138. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX.

Items.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible. Knox County. 1896-1926	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Knox County. 1896-1926
Number	14.9	- 3.6
Foreign	-84.3	-96.0
Negro	-48.9	-85.1
% Increase in Population	14.4	- 8.6
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with the Persentage Increase in the Foure Least Accessible Communities in Knox 1896-1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: No data

Where Have Removals Gone: No data

Character and Sex of Removals: No data

Number Moving Into Community: No data

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County: No data

Whence Came Incomers: No data.

Character and Sex of Incomers: No data

Table 139 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON. 1906-1926

Items.	Percentage Increase Four Most Accessible Anderson County	Percentage Increase Four Least Accessible Anderson County.
Number	7.9	- 3.7
Foreign	-100.0	-20.0
Negro	- 33.8	0
% Increase in Population	8.8	0.4
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson 1906-1926:

Cause of Increase or Decrease: No data.

Where Have Removals Gone: No data.

Character and Sex of Removals: No data.

Number Moving Into Community: No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: No data.

Why Came Incomers: No data.

Character and Sex of Incomers: No data.

Table 140 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF ANDERSON.

Items.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Number	14.9	7.9
Foreign	-84.3	-100.0
Negro	-48.9	- 33.3
% Increase in Population	14.4	8.8
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Perdentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County 1896-1926 (Knox), 1906-1926 (And):

Cause of Increase or Decrease: No data

Where Have Removals Gone: No data

Character and Sex of Removals: No data

Number Moving Into Community: No data

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County: No data

Whence Came Incomers: No data

Why Came Incomers: No data

Character and Sex of Incomers: No data

Table 141. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON.

Items.	1896-1926 Percentage Increase Least Accessible Knox County.	1906-1926 Percentage Increase Least Accessible Anderson County.
Number	- 3.6	- 3.7
Foreign	-96.0	-20.0
Negro	-85.1	0
% Increase in Population	- 8.6	0.4
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County 1896-1926 (Knox), 1906-1926 (And):

Cause of Increase or Decrease: No data

Where Have Removals Gone: No data

Character and Sex of Removals: No data

Number Moving Into Community: No data

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County: No data

Whence Came Incomers: No data

Why Came Incomers: No data

Character and Sex of Incomers: No data

Table 142. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items.	1896-1926 Percentage Increase Most Accessible Knox County.	1906-1926 Percentage Increase Least Accessible Anderson County.
Number	14.9	- 3.7
Foreign	-34.3	-20.0
Negro	-48.9	0
% Increase in Population	14.4	0.4
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Anderson 1906-1926)-(Knox 1896-1926):

Cause of Increase or Decrease: No data

Where Removals Have Gone: No data

Character and Sex of Removals: No data.

Number Moving Into Community: No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: No data.

Character and Sex of Incomers: No data.

Table 143. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDER

Items.	1896-1926 Percentage Increase Least Accessible Knox County.	1906-1926 Percentage Increase Most Accessible Anderson County
Number	- 3.6	7.9
Foreign	-96.0	-100.0
Negro	-85.1	- 33.8
% Increase in Population	- 8.6	8.8
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	no data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	**	**
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	**	**
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Anderson 1906-1926)-(Knox 1896-1926):

Cause of Increase or Decrease: No data.

Where Removals Have Gone: No data.

Character and Sex of Removals: No data.

Number Moving Into Community: No data.

Number Moving Into Community from Outside County: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: No data.

Character and Sex of Incomers: No data.

Table 144. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Population per square mile (1920).	53.5	224.1	28	3
Rural population per square mile (1920)...	53.5	69.7	9	2
Per cent of increase or decrease in rural population(1910-1920)..	3.3	- 33.4	27	95
Actual increase or decrease in rural population (1910-1920) ...	581	- 17,607	32	95
Total white population (1920)	17,703	99,607	36	3
Increase or decrease in population (1910-1920)	581	18,739	41	3
Per cent increase in population (1910-1920)	3.3	19.9	41	7
Increase or decrease in population (1900-1920)	664	38,624		
Number negroes (1920)	595	13,310	27	89
Per cent of population negro (1920).	4.7	11.8	19	63
Number urban population (1920)	0	77,818	One of last	3
Per cent increase in urban population (1910-1920)	0	87.6	One of last	3
Actual increase or decrease in urban population (1910-1920)	0	36,346	65	1
Per cent of population urban (1920)..	0	68.9	One of last	3
Number of foreign-born whites (1920).	47	950	26	4
Number Indians, Chinese, Japanese, etc. (1920)	0	9	One of last	2
Population of all incorporated places (1920)	2,726	77,818	52	3

Table 144. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES (continued)

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Average size of families (1920)...	4.8	4.5	24	66
Per cent of population 21 years of age and over (1920)	46.83	56.05	63	4
Per cent of population females over 21 years of age (1920)	23.0	28.5	63	4
Per cent of population under 14 years of age (1920)	37.8	30.1	30	89
Number marriages per 1,000 population over 10 years of age (1920)	16.1	20.6	40	23
Per cent of population church members (1916)	38.6	42.8	38	20
Population of county seats of Tennessee's counties (1920)	1,409	77,818	41	3
Population of largest town in each county (1920)	1,409	77,818	53.	3

Table 145. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN - 1925

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Number	270	403
Foreign	0	0
Negro	5.85	1.83
% Increase in Population.....	1.2	14.0
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	6.2	1.8
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	4.5	27.0
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	1.13	20.5
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

POPULATION.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan, 1925:

Cause of Increase or Decrease in Population: The eight communities of Sullivan County had an average increase of 14%, while the eight communities of Hawkins County, including Pressmen's Home, had an average of only 12% increase (if the Pressmen's Home is not included, the other seven communities had a reduction of 1%.) The cause of the large increase in population of Sullivan is the large number moving in to work in the nearby city of Kingsport. Also the natural growth that comes where not many move out. The cause of the large increase in the one Hawkins County community, Pressmen's Home, is the large number of families moving there to work around the Home. The reason for the decrease of population in the other seven communities is the moving out to industrial centers, such as Ohio, Kingsport, etc.

Where Have Removals Gone: There has been a much larger number leaving Hawkins County, and they have gone to Kingsport, Florida, Bloomington, Ill., Detroit, and to the coal fields of Virginia. Those leaving the eight rural communities of Sullivan have moved to Kingsport and Bristol.

Character and Sex of Removals: A much larger percentage of the removals from Hawkins have been young men and girls, than was the case in Sullivan.

Whence Came Incomers: There has been almost no people moving into the eight communities of Hawkins; only two families, and they came from Hancock County. The people moving into Sullivan have been from nearby counties, from North Carolina, and a very large number from Scott County, Virginia.

Why Came Incomers: The two families moving into Hawkins bought farms. Those coming into Sullivan have come in for the following reasons: one married in the county; others to be closer to school; to be on good road; to work in Kingsport; one to become depot agent.

Character and Sex of Incomers: All the incomers into both of these sections are men with families, and are reported to be good citizens in each case.

Table 146. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN - 1914

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Number	267	354
Foreign	0	0
Negro	5.85	3.75
% Increase in Population	**	**
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	No data	No data
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	No data	No data
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	No data	No data
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan, 1914:

Cause of Increase or Decrease in Population: No data.

Where Have Removals Gone: No data.

Character and Sex of Removals: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: No data.

Why Came Incomers: No data.

Character and Sex of Incomers: No data.

Table 147. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1914	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1925
Number	354	403
Foreign	0	0
Negro	3.75	1.88
% Increase in Population	no data	14.0
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	1.8
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	no data	27.0
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	no data	20.5
Whence Came Inconers	**	**
Why Came Inconers	**	**
Character & Sex of Inconers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

POPULATION.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Sullivan in 1914 with the Same Communities in 1925:

Cause of Increase or Decrease in Population: The eight rural communities in Sullivan increased between 1914 and 1925. The increase was caused by a large number moving in to work in the nearby city of Kingsport. Also the natural growth that comes when but few move out.

Where Have Removals Gone: Those leaving the eight rural communities of Sullivan in 1925 went to Kingsport.

Character and Sex of Removals: Those leaving the eight communities of Sullivan in 1925 were men with families.

Whence Came Incomers: The incomers into the eight communities of Sullivan in 1925 were from nearby counties, from North Carolina, and a large number from Scott County, Virginia.

Why Came Incomers: One married into county; some came to be close to school; to be on good roads; to work in Kingsport; one to become depot agent.

Character and Sex of Incomers: The incomers into the eight rural communities of Sullivan were men with families, all reported to be good citizens.

Table 148 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1914	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1925
Number	267	270
Foreign	0	0
Negro	5.85	5.85
% Increase in Population	no data	1.2
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	6.2
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	no data	4.5
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	no data	1.13
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

POPULATION.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925:

Cause of Increase or Decrease in Population: There has been an increase of but 1.2% in the eight communities of Hawkins; and if Pressmen's Home be omitted there would be a decrease. The large increase in Pressmen's Home Community was due to men and their families moving in to work around the Home. The decrease in the other seven Hawkins communities was caused by people moving out to industrial centers, such as to Ohio, and Kingsport.

Where Have Removals Gone: Those leaving the eight communities of Hawkins have gone to Kingsport; Florida; Bloomington, Illinois; Detroit; and the coal fields of Virginia. (Those leaving the Sullivan communities went to Kingsport).

Character and Sex of Removals: A large percentage of those leaving the eight communities of Hawkins were young men and girls.

Whence Came Incomers: The two families coming into the eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 came from Hancock County, a backward county adjoining.

Why Came Incomers: They bought farms in Hawkins in 1925.

Character and Sex of Incomers: Those moving into the eight communities of Hawkins in 1925 were men with families.

Table 149. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE WITH LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County	Least Accessible Hawkins County
Number	332.0	133.3
Foreign	0	0
Negro	1	18
% Increase in Population	1.2	- 6.2
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County	10.4	0
Character & Sex of Removals	**	**
No. Moving Into Community	1.8	9
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	1.8	0
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

POPULATION

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Most Accessible with Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1925:

Cause of Increase or Decrease in Population: In the least accessible communities the population has not increased. The coming of several people from adjoining communities to Pressmen's Home has kept the population from decreasing on the average in the Hawkins communities. The reason for the decrease is that a large number of people have moved out to work in town. In the most accessible communities the population increased 1.5%. This was due to natural growth. The reason it was no greater is that several people from these communities also moved to industrial centers to work.

Where Have Removals Gone: All those leaving either of these sections have gone to industrial centers, except a few who have gone to Pressmen's Home to Pressmen's Home to work.

Character and Sex of Removals: There was no difference in the character and sex of removals from these two sections. A large percentage of them were young men and girls, in each case.

Whence Came Incomers: No people have moved into the least accessible (except a few to Pressmen's Home coming in from adjoining communities). Only two families came in to the most accessible communities and they came from Hancock.

Why Came Incomers: The two families coming into the most accessible came in because they had bought a farm; and the few into the least accessible to work at Pressmen's Home.

Character and Sex of Incomers: All the incomers in each section were men with families.

Table 150. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS. 1914-1925.

Items.	Percentage Increase Five Most Accessible.	Percentage Increase Three Least Accessible.
Number	1.5	-20.0
Foreign	0	0
Negro	0	0
% Increase in Population	1.5	-20.0
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	?	?
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	?*	?*
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	?	?
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins with Percentage Increase in Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins, 1914-1925:

Cause of Increase or Decrease in Population: No data.

Where Have Removals Gone: No data.

Character and Sex of Removals: No data.

Whence Came Incomers: No data.

Why Came Incomers: No data.

Character and Sex of Incomers: No data.

Table 151. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Five Most Accessible 1914	Five Most Accessible 1925
Number	327.0	332.0
Foreign	0	0
Negro	1	1
% Increase in Population.....	no data	1.2
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	10.4
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	no data	1.8
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	no data	1.8
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average of Same Communities in 1925:

Cause of Increase or Decrease in Population: Between 1914 and 1925 the population of the five most accessible communities of Hawkins increased only 1.5%. The reason the increase was no larger was that several people moved to industrial sections.

Where Have Removals Gone: Those leaving the five most accessible communities in 1925 have gone away to industrial centers.

Character and Sex of Removals: A large percentage of those leaving the five most accessible communities of Hawkins between 1914 and 1925 were young men and girls.

Whence Came Incomers: Only two families moved in and they came from Hancock County, a nearby inaccessible region.

Why Came Incomers: They bought farms.

Character and Sex of Incomers: They were two men and their families; good citizens.

Table 152. COMPARISON OF THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Least Accessible 1914	Least Accessible 1925
Number	166.7	133.3
Foreign	0	0
Negro	18	18
% Increase in Population	no data	- 6.2
Cause of Increase or Decrease	**	**
Where Have Removals Gone	**	**
% Removals Who Left County ..	no data	0
Character & Sex of Removals .	**	**
No. Moving Into Community ...	no data	9
No. Moving Into Community from Outside County	no data	0
Whence Came Incomers	**	**
Why Came Incomers	**	**
Character & Sex of Incomers .	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

POPULATION.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of the Three Least Accessible in Hawkins in 1914 with Average of the Same Communities in 1925:

Cause of Increase or Decrease in Population: The reason for no increase is that the people have gone to industrial centers to work.

Where Have Removals Gone: Those leaving the three least accessible communities of Hawkins have gone to industrial centers. Some to Detroit, etc.

Character and Sex of Removals: Most of those leaving the three least accessible communities of Hawkins were young men and girls.

Whence Came Incomers: The very few who came into one community, Pressmen's Home, came from the adjoining communities.

Why Came Incomers: Came to work around the Home in 1925.

Character and Sex of Incomers: The very few who came into the three least accessible communities of Hawkins were men with families.

Table 153. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Population per square mile (1920) .	83.2	47.5	7	44
Rural population per square mile (1920) ...	51.7	47.5	11	14
Per cent of increase or decrease in rural population (1910-1920)	7.4	- 2.8	5	28
Actual increase or decrease in rural population (1910-1920) ..	1,548	- 669	10	68
Total white population (1920)	34,565	21,717	5	23
Increase or decrease in population (1910-1920)	8,139	- 669	5	32
Per cent increase in population (1910-1920)	28.9	- 2.8	6	72
Increase or decrease in population (1900-1920)	11,324	-1,349		
Number negroes (1920)	1,691	1,201	55	43
Per cent of population negro (1920)	4.7	5.2	32	34
Number urban population (1920)	13,739	0	6	One of last
Per cent increase in urban population (1910-1920)	92.2	0		
Actual increase or decrease in urban population (1910-1920).	6,591	0	6	61
Per cent of population urban (1920).	37.9	0	7	One of last
Number foreigh-born whites (1920) ..	128	10		
Number Indians, Chinese, Japanese, etc. (1920)	0	3		
Population of all incorporated places (1920)	14,263	1,402	6	67

Table 153. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES. (continued)

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Average size of families (1920)	4.6	4.8	60	28
Per cent of population 21 years of age and over (1920)	50.73	46.35	26	69
Per cent of population females over 21 years of age (1920) ...	25.4	24.1	27	44
Per cent of population under 14 years of age (1920)	34.7	37.4	69	41
Number marriages per 1,000 population over 10 years of age (1920)	56.4	13.9	2	62
Per cent of population church members (1916)	34.3	36.4	57	49
Population of county seats of Tennessee's counties (1920)	250	1,402	89	42
Population of largest town in each county (1920)	8,047	1,402	8	54

Table 154 COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Avorage per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Average total population (1920).....	41,715	19,396	13,437	24,609
Actual increase or decrease in population for counties as a whole (1910-1920)	4,655	338	31	1,657
Per cent of population Negro (1920) ...	13.8	13.0	12.7	13.1
Number urban population (1920)....	18,188	1,439	84	6,434
Per cent of population urban (1920)	24.3	6.9	0.27	10.25
Actual increase or decrease in urban population (1910-1920) ...	4,690	833	- 4	1,801
Per cent increase in urban population (1910-1920) ...	20.9	1.4	- 0.15	7.15
Per cent increase in county population (1920- 1920) ..	11.66	3.14	0.29	0.47
Number rural population per sq. mi. (1920) ..	48.3	37.7	39.8	41.68
Actual increase or decrease in rural population (1910-1920) .	- 35	-445	36	-144
Per cent increase in rural pop. (1910-1920)	2.7	- 2.0	- 0.21	0.3
Per cent population foreign-born whites (1920) ...	1.09	0.18	0.08	0.7

Table 154.COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING (continued)

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Average number foreign-born whites (1920) ...	455	35	10	163
Per cent Indians, Chinese, Japanese, etc. (1920) ...	3.26	0.81	0.24	1.41
Per cent population 21 years of age and over (1920) ...	50.12	48.96	47.24	48.74
Per cent population females over 21 years (1920) ...	24.77	24.13	23.46	23.70
Per cent of population under 14 years (1920).	35.59	36.56	37.60	36.61
Per cent population church members (1916).	36.4	35.9	34.5	35.6
Average size of families (1920)	4.60	4.49	4.71	4.60
Population of county seats of counties in Tennessee (1920)	16,445	1,904	783	6,260
Population of largest town in each county (1920)	17,589	2,118	819	6,715
No. marriages per county 1923	665	233	182	356
No. marriages per 1,000 population over 10 years of age 1920..	20.9	15.8	18.0	18.2

Table 155.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Estimated total population (1925) ...	3,587,350	1,096,221	2,316,198
Total population (1920)	3,329,253	1,032,342	2,157,359
Density of population (1920)	134.8	26.1	80.4
Per Cent Population negro (1920)	7.9	12.5	9.9
Number urban population (1920)	1,956,105	294,323	1,108,257
Per Cent population urban (1920)	53.9	33.4	43.4
Per cent increase in urban population (1910-1920)	5.3	3.2	4.2
Actual Increase or Decrease in urban population (1910-1920)	22,237	42,647	32,650
Per cent increase in state population (1910-1920)	16.2	16.5	16.4
Actual increase or decrease in state population (1910-1920)...	455,582	112,176	280,374
Number rural population per square Mile (1920)	35.97	16.23	25.89
Per cent increase in rural population (1910-1920)	1.4	10.1	5.9
Average number foreign-born whites (1920)	513,464	55,585	285,682
Per cent population foreign-born whites (1920)	13.9	9.0	13.0
Per cent Indians, Chinese, Japanese, etc. (1920)	0.3	1.6	1.5
Per cent population over 24 years of age (1920)	51.2	49.0	50.4
Number females 21 years old and over (1920)	995,496	262,050	601,697

Table 155.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING. (continued)

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Per cent population females over 21 years (1920)	28.3	26.0	27.9
Per cent population under 15 years (1920)	31.1	33.3	31.7
Average size of families in each state (1920)	4.4	4.3	4.5
Population of state capitol in each state (1920)	123,267	45,935	84,601
Population of largest city in each state (1920)	729,294	108,338	427,363
Per cent of population in cities over 25,000 (1920)	37.7	18.7	29.2
Per cent females over 15 gainfully employed (aggregate) (1920)..	23.4	21.9	22.7
Per cent total population (male) gainfully employed (1920)	78.3	77.2	78.2
Per cent male population (native whites) gainfully employed (1920)	74.9	74.5	75.1
Per cent total persons gainfully employed engaged in manufacturing (1920) ...	33.5	19.9	30.8
Per cent population engaged in agriculture (1920)	26.7	41.2	29.9
Number marriages per 1,000 population (1923)	11.0	11.0	11.0
Number divorces per 1,000 families (1923)	6.7	8.9	7.8
Number marriages per state (1923) ..	37,874	12,616	24,987
Number persons in prisons per 100,000 population, Jan. 1 (1923)..	91.6	105.0	99.7
Per cent pop. church members (1916)	42.0	36.5	39.1

Table 156. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County	Eight Communities Anderson County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	5.0	4.4
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 10,687.50	$ 9,093.75
Value of School Equipment	$ 1,196.75	$ 808.75
No. Single Desks	98.88	24.15
No. Double Desks	22.0	99.5
Enrollment per Teacher	44.8	39.25
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	1.88	1.75
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	101.00	100.00
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0.75	0.15
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0.75	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 7,719.00	$ 1,900.00
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	17.5	13.75
No. in College	6.9	2.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average if Eight Communities in Knox County with Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County in 1926:

Kind of House: The eight communities of Knox had three buildings of brick containing eight rooms each. It had one six-room brick. It has one four-room frame and three two-room farme buildings -- all in good condition.

The eight communities of Anderson County had six buildings of brick -- one eight rooms, two six rooms, one five rooms, one four rooms, and one two rooms. That leaves only two frame buildings and they had two rooms each and were both in good condition.

Anderson County had gone to the extreme in building large brick buildings. They frequently had three and four rooms in buildings where they had but one teacher.

Water Supply: In the eight communities of Knox there are six wells and two springs. Two of the wells have sanitary drinking fountains and one of the wells is concreted with a pump in it.

The eight communities of Anderson had but one well on the ground. All the other sources were reported as being unsanitary. They were springs and three of them off the school ground.

Special School Needs: The eight communities of Knox needed: better buildings, better up-keep of buildings, room finished in basement, home for janitor, indoor water supply, library, more high school students, playground equipment, and good roads.

The special needs in eight schools of Anderson were: better roads, better attendance, teacher that is alive, water supply, gymnasium, parent-teacher association, well on grounds.

Table 157 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF THE SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County 1896	Eight Communities Knox County 1926
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	2.3	5.0
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 2,187.80	$ 10,687.50
Value of School Equipment	$ 793.75	$ 1,196.75
No. Single Desks	0	98.88
No. Double Desks	99.5	22.0
Enrollment per Teacher	44.4	44.9
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	1.0	1.88
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	12.5	101.0
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0.75
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0.75
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 250.00	$ 7,719.00
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	9.9	17.5
No. in College	3.3	6.9
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Knox County in 1896 with the Average of Same Eight Communities in 1926:

Kind of Building: In 1896 the eight communities of Knox County had twelve small school buildings, many of them in poor condition, and two churches were used for school. In 1926 there were four school buildings of brick and four of wood frame. Of the four brick buildings, three of them had eight rooms each, and one had four rooms. Three of the frame buildings had two rooms each, and one had four rooms.

Water Supply: In 1896 the eight communities of Knox had no schools with a satisfactory water supply. In 1926 six of the eight had good water supplied by wells. Two still used springs, one on the grounds, and one one-fourth mile away.

Special School Needs: In 1896 the eight communities of Knox needed all their buildings to be better, better up-keep of buildings, home for janitor (in some schools), indoor water supply, or a better outdoor supply, library, more high school students, playground equipment, good roads, consolidation, and longer term of school. In 1926 they needed only a few better buildings, a room finished in basement of one school, home for janitor at one school, indoor water supply, (already have a good outdoor system in most places). Still need books added to library, though it has improved a lot, and need more playground equipment.

Table 158. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Anderson County 1906	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	1.3	4.4
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 1,825.00	$ 9,093.75
Value of School Equipment	$ 228.13	$ 608.75
No. Single Desks	0	94.13
No. Double Desks	65.0	0
Enrollment per Teacher	41.5	39.25
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	0.25	1.75
Library (Number of Volumes).....	116.00	100.00
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0.13
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0.75
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 500.00	$ 1,900.00
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	9.4	13.75
No. in College	0.4	2.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with the Average of Same Eight Communities in 1926:

Kind of Buildings: In 1906 the eight communities of Anderson had eighteen small school buildings, many of them in poor condition. One was a church used for schools. In 1926 they had consolidated into eight larger buildings, six of which were of brick.

Water Supply: In 1906, all but one of the eight communities of Anderson County had unsatisfactory water supply. In 1926, there was still just one school with good water supply.

Special School Needs: In 1906 the eight communities needed larger and better buildings, good roads, consolidation, better water supply, auditorium, gymnasium, more equipment, better teachers, and longer school term. In 1926 they need: gymnasium, auditorium, parent-teacher association, and better water supply.

Table 159. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1896	Most Accessible Knox County 1926
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	3.3	7.5
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 3,500.00	$ 19,750.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 1,400.00	$ 1,991.00
No. Single Desks	0	144.00
No. Double Desks	144.00	44.00
Enrollment per Teacher	43.8	47.5
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	1.50	2.00
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	25.00	104.00
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	1.0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	1.0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 500.00	$ 15,250.00
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ..;	12.5	24.0
No. in College	4.8	13.5
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County in 1896 with Average for the Same Communities in 1926:

Kind of Buildings: In 1896 all the buildings were wood frame, and there were twelve or more small schools, most of which were one teacher schools. They used the church building in one community. In 1926 all had been consolidated into four larger buildings. The buildings were all of brick.

Water Supply: In 1896 in the four most accessible communities in Knox all the schools had unsatisfactory water supplies. In 1926 they all had good water supplies.

Special School Needs: In 1896 the schools of the four most accessible communities needed longer terms. All their buildings needed to be better, better water supply, consolidation, better up-keep of buildings. Homes for the janitors, better libraries, and playground equipment. In 1926 they needed better up-keep of buildings, indoor water supply. In one section they needed a home for the janitor.

Table 160. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Anderson County 1906	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926.
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	1.5	4.5
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 600.00	$6,625.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 118.75	$ 372.50
No. Single Desks	0	52.0
No. Double Desks	42.5	0
Enrollment per Teacher	45.0	42.5
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	0	1.5
Library (Number of Volumes).....l.	13.0	31.0
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	1.0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	0	0
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	6.25	8.0
No. in College	0	1.5
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Kind of Buildings: In 1906 the four least accessible communities of Anderson had small one- and two-room buildings, some in very poor condition. In 1926 three communities had brick, the other had a wood building in poor condition.

Water Supply: In every case, both in 1906 and 1926, the four least accessible communities of Anderson had unsanitary water supplies.

Special School Needs: In 1906 the four least accessible communities of Anderson County needed better buildings, good roads, consolidation, an adequate water supply, better equipment, better attendance, better prepared teachers.

In 1926 one community still needed a good building, and all needed a better water supply, roads needed improving, and it is stated that better teachers were needed in some schools.

Table 161 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1896	Least Accessible Knox County 1926
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	1.5	2.5
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 875.00	$ 1,625.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 187.50	$ 402.50
No. Single Desks	0	55.75
No. Double Desks	55.0	0
Enrollment per Teacher	45.0	42.25
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	0.5	1.75
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	0	98
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0.5
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0.5
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	0	$ 187.50
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	7.25	11.00
No. in College	1.8	2.0
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County in 1896 with the Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Kind of Buildings: In 1896 the four least accessible communities of Knox had six small schools, most of them being one-teacher schools. One was a church building, used for a school.

In 1926 they still had three two-room buildings, but the rooms were larger and the buildings in good condition. They also had one four-room building in good condition..

Water Supply: In 1896 the four least accessible communities of Knox had unsanitary water supplies, one 150 yards away, and one 600 yards away. In 1926 they had two wells and two springs, one of the springs being off the ground.

Special School Needs: In 1896 the four least accessible communities of Knox needed sanitary water supply, better buildings, better roads, consolidation, libraries, and playground equipment. In 1926 they needed more high school students, better libraries, buildings repaired, and more playground equipment.

Table 162. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County 1906	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	1.0	4.3
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 3,050.00	$ 11,563.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 337.50	$ 862.50
No. Single Desks	0	136.25
No. Double Desks	87.5	0
Enrollment per Teacher	38.00	35.75
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	0.5	2.00
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	219.00	168.00
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0.25
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data.
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 1,000.00	$ 3,800.00
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	12.5	19.5
No. in College	0.7	3.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Kind of Building: In 1906 the four most accessible communities of Anderson had twelve one-room school buildings, all of wood. In 1926, all those had been consolidated into four large buildings, three of which are brick.

Water Supply: In 1906, of the four most accessible communities of Anderson two got water off grounds, one had a well on the grounds, and one had a cistern on the grounds. In 1926, the water supply is about the same; still have just one well on the grounds, and still have two off the grounds, three of these being unsanitary.

Special School Needs: In 1906 the four most accessible communities of Anderson needed better buildings, more sanitary water supply, consolidation, gymnasium, auditorium, parent-teacher association. In 1926 they need: gymnasium, auditorium, parent-teacher association, and better water supply.

Table 163 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Knox County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	7.5	2.5
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 19,750/00	$ 1,625.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 1,991.00	$ 402.50
No. Single Desks	144.0	53.75
No. Double Desks	44.0	0
Enrollment per Teacher	47.50	42.25
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	2.0	1.75
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	104.00	98.00
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	1.0	0.5
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	1.0	0.5
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 15,250.00	$ 187.50
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	24.00	11.00
No. in College	13.3	2.0
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Knox County - 1926:

Kind of House: The four most accessible communities of Knox had four buildings of brick, three with eight rooms each, and one with six rooms. The four least accessible communities in Knox had four frame buildings, three with two rooms, and one with four rooms.

Water Supply: All the four most accessible communities had good water supplies. Two had sanitary fountains. In the four least accessible communities of Knox only two had wells, one had spring on the grounds, and the other had a spring one-fourth mile away.

Greatest School Needs: The greatest difference in the need of these two sections is that the four least accessible are in greater need of: adequate water supply, libraries, good buildings, better roads, and more equipment.

Table 164. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	4.3	4.5
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 11,563.00	$ 6,625.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 382.50	372.50
No. Single Desks	136.25	52.00
No. Double Desks	0	0
Enrollment per Teacher	35.75	42.5
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	2.0	1.5
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	168.00	31.00
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0.25	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 3,800.00	0
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	19.5	8
No. in College	3.3	1.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Anderson County - 1926:

Kind of House: There is but little difference between the two sections, each having three brick buildings. The most accessible have one eight-room, one five-room, and one two-room house; the least accessible have two six-room and one two-room building.

Water Supply: The four most accessible communities of Anderson have one well on ground, and three unsanitary springs, two of these being off the ground. In the four least accessible communities all the school have unsanitary water supplies, three on the ground and one off.

Special School Needs: The greatest difference between most accessible and least accessible of Anderson is: the least accessible are in greater need of: better water supply, one new building, consolidation, better attendance, and more school equipment. Both need gymnasium, auditorium and parent-teacher association.

Table 165 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	7.5	4.5
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 219,750.00	$ 11,563.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 1,991.00	$ 882.50
No. Single Desks	144.00	136.25
No. Double Desks	44.00	0
Enrollment per Teacher	47.5	35.75
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	2.0	2.0
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	104.0	168.0
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	1.0	0.25
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	1.0	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 15,250.00	$ 3,800.00
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	24.00	19.50
No. in College	13.3	3.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County - 1926:

Kind of Building: The four most accessible communities of Knox have all their school buildings of brick: three with eight rooms, one with five rooms, and one with two rooms. The other is a two-room frame.

Water Supply: All four of the most accessible communities of Knox have good water supply. Two have running water and sanitary fountains. The four of Anderson have one good water supply, and three very unsanitary.

Special School Needs: Many needs are in common for these two sections, such as equipment. In addition Anderson needs a parent-teacher association, and gymnasium, and Knox expresses as a need a home for the janitor.

Table 166. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON-1926

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	2.5	4.5
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 1,625.00	$ 6,625.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 402.50	$ 372.50
No. Single Desks	53.75	52.00
No. Double Desks	0	0
Enrollment per Teacher	42.25	42.50
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	1.75	1.5
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	98.00	31.00
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0.5	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	180.50	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 187.50	0
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	11.00	8.00
No. in College	2.0	1.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Anderson County - 1926:

Kind of House: The four least accessible communities of Knox have all frame buildings. One has four rooms, and three have two rooms. The four least accessible in Anderson have three brick buildings, two of six rooms and one of four rooms, the other being a two-room frame.

Water Supply: The four least accessible communities of Knox have two wells, one spring on grounds, and one spring one-fourth mile away.

The four least accessible of Anderson have unsanitary springs at all the schools; three on the ground and one off.

Special School Needs: Many of the needs are in common, such as roads, school supplies, and playground equipment, etc., but the Anderson section is in most need of a good water supply, while the Knox section needs improved buildings more than Anderson.

Table 167 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	7.5	4.5
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 19,750.00	$ 6,625.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 1,991.00	$ 372.50
No. Single Desks	144.0	52.0
No. Double Desks	44.0	0
Enrollment per Teacher	47.5	42.5
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	2.0	1.5
Library (Number of Volumes).....	104.0	31.0
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	1.0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	1.0	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 15,250.00	0
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	24.0	8.0
No. in College	13.3	1.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 168 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	2.6	4.3
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	$ 1,625.00	$ 11,563.00
Value of School Equipment	$ 402.50	$ 862.50
No. Single Desks	55.75	136.25
No. Double Desks	0	0
Enrollment per Teacher	42.25	35.75
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	1.75	2.00
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	98.00	168.00
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0.5	0.25
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0.5	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	$ 187.50	$ 3,800.00
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	11.0	19.5
No. in College	2.0	3.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Kind of Building: No data.

Water Supply: No data.

Special School Needs: No data.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Kind of Building: No data.

Water Supply: No data.

Special School Needs: No data.

Table 169. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX -1896-1926

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County.
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	200.0	66.7
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	464.0	86.0
Value of School Equipment	42.2	114.7
No. Single Desks	?	?
No. Double Desks	- 69.6	- 100.0
Enrollment per Teacher	8.5	- 0.6
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	33.3	250.0
Library (Number of Volumes).....	315.0	?
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	?	?
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	?	?
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	2950.0	?
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	92.0	52.0
No. in College	110.5	14.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 130. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	466.7	200.0
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	279.0	1,004.0
Value of School Equipment	155.6	198.9
No. Single Desks	?	?
No. Double Desks	- 100.0	- 100.0
Enrollment per Teacher	- 6.0	- 5.0
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	300.0	?
Library (Number of Volumes).....	- 323.2	148.0
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	?	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	280.0	0
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	56.0	28.0
No. in College	550.0	?
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 171 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF ANDERSON

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896 - 1926	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906 - 1926
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	200.0	466.7
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	484.0	279.0
Value of School Equipment	42.2	155.6
No. Single Desks	?	?
No. Double Desks	- 69.6	- 100.0
Enrollment per Teacher	8.5	- 6.0
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	33.3	500.0
Library (Number of Volumes).....	315.0	- 23.2
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	?	?
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	?	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	2950.0	280.0
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	92.0	56.0
No. in College	110.5	550.0
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox - 1896-1926:

Kind of Buildings: No data.

Water Supply: No data.

Special School Needs: No data.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson with the Percentage Increase in the Four Leaxt Accessible Communities in Anderson - 1906-1926:

Kind of Buildings: No data.

Water Supply: No data.

Special School Needs: No data.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Kind of Buildings: No data.

Water Supply: No data.

Special School Needs: No data.

Table 172. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	66.7	200.0
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	86.0	1,004.0
Value of School Equipment	114.7	198.8
No. Single Desks	?	?
No. Double Desks	- 100.0	- 100.0
Enrollment per Teacher	- 0.6	- 5.0
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	250.0	?
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	?	148.0
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	?	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	?	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	?	0
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	52.0	28.0
No. in College	14.3	?
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 173. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	200.0	200.0
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	464.0	1,004.0
Value of School Equipment	42.2	198.9
No. Single Desks	?	?
No. Double Desks	- 69.6	- 100.0
Enrollment per Teacher	8.6	- 5.0
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	33.3	?
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	315.0	148.0
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	?	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	?	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	2,950.0	0
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	92.0	28.0
No. in College	110.5	?
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Kind of Buildings: No data.

Water Supply: No data.

Special School Needs: No data.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Average of the Four Least Accessible of Anderson County - 1926:

Kind of Buildings: All the school buildings in the four most accessible communities of Knox were of brick. Three of the four buildings in the four least accessible communities of Anderson had brick, the other one was wood and in bad condition.

Water Supply: All the four schools in four most accessible communities of Knox had good water supply. None of the schools in the four least accessible communities of Anderson had good water supplies.

Special School Needs: In the four most accessible of Knox the need was for better up-keep of buildings, home for janitor, indoor water supply, and finished room in basement. In the four least accessible of Anderson one community needed new building; better roads, better attendance. A few schools need better prepared teachers and better water supply

Table 174 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	66.7	466.7
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	86.0	279.0
Value of School Equipment	114.7	155.6
No. Single Desks	?	?
No. Double Desks	- 100.0	- 100.0
Enrollment per Teacher	- 0.6	- 6.0
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	250.00	300.0
Library (Number of Velumes).....	?	- 23.2
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	?	?
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	?	0
High School, Distance to	No data	No data
" " Investment in Facilities	?	280.0
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	52.0	56.0
No. in College	14.3	550.0
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County - 1926:

Kind of Buildings: In the four least accessible communities all the school buildings were of wood frame, three had two-room building, and one had a four-room building. The four most accessible communities of Anderson had three buildings of brick and one frame in good condition.

Water Supply: The four least accessible communities of Knox had two schools with good water supply, and two not so good. One got water from a spring one-fourth mile away.

Special School Needs: The four least accessible communities of Knox needed good roads, school supplies, playground equipment, and one new building.

The four most accessible communities of Anderson needed a gymnasium, auditorium, water supply, parent-teacher association, better teachers, and better roads.

Table 175. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Per cent of illiteracy of native whites (1920)	12.6	5.8	17	74
Per cent of illiteracy of negroes (1920)	28.5	14.7	68	4
Number consolidated schools (1924)	16	21	6	4
Number of one-room schools (1923)	25	39	19	38
Per cent of all rural elementary schools that are one-room (1923)	55.5	41.9	25	7
Average salary of rural teachers (white, colored) (1924)	$ 421.00	$ 583.00	51	6
Average salary of rural teachers (white, colored) (1923)	$ 446.00	$ 496.00	37	25
Salary of County Superintendent (1924)	$ 1,850	$ 4,500	61	2
Length of rural elementary schools (1923)	111	136	73	28
Length of rural elementary schools (1924)	105	137	79	33
Per cent of enrollment in average daily attendance (1923) ...	66	64	43	60
Per cent of rural elementary enrollment in average daily attendance (1923)	66.5	65.0	33	44
Per cent of rural elementary teachers having attended normal school or college (1923)	19.0	27.4	50	38

Table 175. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES. (continued)

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Per cent of teachers having only elementary school training (1923)	6.2	0	54	One of last
Per cent of teachers without previous experience (1923)	28.4	9.7	84	11
Per cent of revenue of rural elementary schools paid by county itself (1923)	76.6	86.3	16	3
Expenditure per pupil enrolled in rural elementary schools (1923)	$ 29.33	$ 55.72	20	4
Expenditure per rural high school pupil (1923)	$ 52.21	$ 94.01		
Expenditure per rural person for rural elementary schools (white, colored) (1923)	$ 3.45	$ 5.40	51	10
Expenditure per capita of total population for rural elementary schools (white, colored) (1923)	$ 3.45	$ 1.61	36	91
Total receipts for rural elementary schools from state and county funds per pupil enrolled (1924)	$ 19.47	$ 52.71	39	3
Total receipts for rural elementary schools from county tax levy (1924)	$ 38,266.87	$ 305,219.15	47	4
Total receipts of county elementary schools from state and county funds (1924)	$ 172,236.40	$ 520,206.40	10	4
County tax levy for rural elementary schools per enrollment in schools (1924)	$ 10.33	$ 30.93	35	2

Table 175. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES (continued)

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Receipts per square mile from county tax levy for rural elementary schools (1924)	$ 111.89	$ 605.59	35	4
Average value of rural elementary school property per school (1923)	$ 4,344	$ 9,307	4	2
Value of rural elementary school property per rural person (1923)	$ 10.68	$ 24.71	14	1
Value rural elementary school buildings and heating plants per school (1923)	$ 3,709	$ 7,936	4	2
Per cent of rural elementary school enrollment finishing elementary school (1923)	1.4	3.7	77	23
Per cent of scholastic population finishing high school (1923)	0.8	1.5	51	10
Per cent of total enrollment enrolled in high school(1923).	5.6	14.2	49	2
Per cent high school enrollment is of total enrollment (1925).	7.2	12.9	39	2
Number books in rural school libraries (1924)	3,022	3,245	23	21
Value of rural school library books per county (1923)	$ 1,979	$ 3,250	34	14
Per cent of rural schools having libraries (1923)	38	50	10	22
Number of white people per white student in Tennessee colleges (1924)	883	114	60	1
Clerical help for Superintendent from rural school funds (1923)	0	$ 1,380.00	32	3

Table 175. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES. (continued)

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Number newspapers published per week - 1925	1	20	54	2
% of farmers subscribing to Southern Agriculturist 1925 ...	24.9	28.3	43	31
% of farmers subscribing to Southern Ruralist 1924...	35.5	25.3	9	15
% of farmers subscribing to Progressive Farmer 1924 ..	6.1	15.6	69	17
% of farmers subscribing to Country Gentlemen 1923 ...	1.2	8.7	68	3
Number subscribers to three leading magazines 1924 ...	119	4,279	71	4
% of families subscribing to American Magazine 1924 ...	1.8	13.5	50	3
% of families subscribing to Literary Digest 1924	0.9	9.0	69	1
% of families subscribing to McCalls Magazine 1924	2.5	7.0	67	10
% of families subscribing to Woman's Home Companion 1924.	2.6	9.1	24	3

Table 176. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	2.00	2.75
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	No data	No data
Value of School Equipment	No data	No data
No. Single Desks	62.60	27.50
No. Double Desks	8.14	42.28
Enrollment per Teacher	43.00	40.00
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	2.00	2.00
Library (Number of Volumes).....	14.43	47.80
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	6.40	5.40
" " Investment in Facilities	No data	No data
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	10.35	5.30
No. in College	1.00	1.30
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Averages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan - 1925:

Kind of Building: The eight communities of Hawkins Counties had all wood frame school buildings. Five of these had two-room buildings, two one-room, and one four-room. The eight communities of Sullivan had all wood frame except one, it being a four-room concrete-block building. Of the frame buildings, one had five rooms, two had three rooms, three had two rooms, and one had one room.

Water Supply: The eight communities of Hawkins had four schools that used water from springs off the grounds, and four had wells on the ground. The eight communities of Sullivan had two schools receiving water from springs off the grounds, and two springs on the ground, three schools had wells and one had a cistern off the ground.

Special School Needs: The eight communities of Hawkins needed better buildings, consolidation, equipment, more desks. One school needed another teacher, one reported as needing teachers better prepared. In one place a junior high school and library were needed. The eight communities of Sullivan needed: better buildings, better lights, library, consolidation, buildings painted, agriculture taught in rural schools, one more teacher, better heating system.

Table 177 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	1.40	1.82
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	No data	No data
Value of School Equipment	No data	No data
No. Single Desks	0	0
No. Double Desks	10.13	9.28
Enrollment per Teacher	47.00	41.00
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	1.80	0.80
Library (Number of Volumes).....	0	0
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	6.40	13.8
" " Investment in Facilities	No data	No data
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	7.07	0
No. in College	0	0.29
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 178. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1914	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1925
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	1.4	2.00
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	No data	No data
Value of School Equipment	No data	No data
No. Single Desks	0	27.5
No. Double Desks	9.28	42.28
Enrollment per Teacher	41.00	40.00
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	0.8	2.0
Library (Number of Volumes).....	0	47.8
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	13.8	5.4
" " Investment in Facilities	No data	No data
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	0	5.3
No. in College	0.29	1.3
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Averages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan - 1914:

Kind of Buildings: No data.

Water Supply: No data

Special School Needs: No data.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Sullivan in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925:

Kind of Buildings: The eight communities of Sullivan in 1914 had either one room, small school buildings, or used the church. One was a one-room log building. In 1925 they had just one school with one room, the other having from two to five rooms.

Water Supply: In 1914 the eight communities of Sullivan County had seven springs, three of which are off the school ground, and one cistern. In 1925 they had four springs, three wells and one cistern.

Special School Needs: In 1914 the data was not complete for the eight communities of Sullivan, but these were a few of their needs: buildings painted, another teacher, maps, charts, etc., consolidation, library, agriculture taught in rural community, new building, better heating system and better lights, better trained teachers, longer school term.

In 1925 they needed: better buildings, better lights, better heating system, buildings painted, maps, charts, etc., library, another teacher, new desks.

Table 179. COMPARISON OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1914	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1925
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	1.82	2.75
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	No data	No data
Value of School Equipment	No data	No data
No. Single Desks	0	62.6
No. Double Desks	10.13	8.14
Enrollment per Teacher	47.00	45.00
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	1.8	2.0
Library (Number of Volumes).....	0	14.43
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	6.4	6.4
" " Investment in Facilities	No data	No data
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	7.07	10.85
No. in College	0	1.0
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925:

Kind of Building: Between 1914 and 1925 there was not much change in the kind of school buildings in eight rural communities of Hawkins. Four of them still have the same building. Two communities gave no data in 1914. One that used a church in 1914 had a four-room frame building in 1925, and one that had a one-room had a two-room frame in 1925.

Water Supply: There has been no change in the water supply of eight communities of Hawkins between 1914 and 1925, they still had the same system in every case.

Special School Needs: In 1925 the eight communities of Hawkins needed: consolidation, better buildings, more desks, another teacher, teacher better prepared, library, and in one community a junior high school. The data for 1914 was not complete, but a few of their needs were as follows: consolidation, better buildings, more desks, another teacher, teacher better prepared, library, one community a junior high school, longer term, better equipment both in the buildings and on the playgrounds.

Table 180. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE WITH LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1925.

Items,	Most Accessible Hawkins County	Least Accessible Hawkins County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	2.0	2.0
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	No data	No data
Value of School Equipment	No data	No data
No. Single Desks	72.6	37.5
No. Double Desks	5.0	16.0
Enrollment per Teacher	36.8	52.0
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	2.0	2.0
Library (Number of Volumes).....	15.2	12.5
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	5.8	7.3
" " Investment in Facilities	No data	No data
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	15.49	3.11
No. in College	1.25	0
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 181 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH % INCREASE IN THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE 1914-1925.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Hawkins County	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Hawkins County
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	50.4	33.3
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	No data	No data
Value of School Equipment	No data	No data
No. Single Desks	?	?
No. Double Desks	- 28.6	4.6
Enrollment per Teacher	- 15.2	- 3.7
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	0	50.4
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	?	?
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	0	0
" " Investment in Facilities	No data	No data
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	119.1	?
No. in College	?	?
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Most Accessible with Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1925:

Kind of Buildings: The three least accessible communities of Hawkins each had two-room frame school buildings in 1925. The most accessible houses ranged from one to four rooms each.

Water Supply: The three least accessible communities have two wells, and one spring, the spring being off the school ground. The five most accessible communities have two wells and three springs.

Special School Needs: The three least accessible communities need consolidation, another teacher, teachers better prepared, more equipment.

The five most accessible need: better buildings, more desks, consolidation, equipment, library, and one junior high school.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins with Percentage Increase in Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins 1914-1925:

Kind of Buildings: No data.

Water Supply: No data.

Special School Needs: No data.

Table 182 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	1.33	2.0
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	No data	No data
Value of School Equipment	No data	No data
No. Single Desks	0	72.6
No. Double Desks	7.0	5.0
Enrollment per Teacher	43.4	36.8
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	2.0	2.0
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	0	15.2
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	5.8	5.8
" " Investment in Facilities	No data	No data
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	7.07	15.49
No. in College	No data	No 1.25
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 183. COMPARISON OF THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH THE AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Kind of Houses	**	**
No. Rooms in Schools	1.5	2.0
Investment in Elementary Buildings and Equipment	No data	No data
Value of School Equipment	No data	No data
No. Single Desks	0	37.5
No. Double Desks	15.3	16.0
Enrollment per Teacher	54.0	52.0
Water Supply	**	**
Number Toilets	1.33	2.0
Library (Number of Volumes).....1.	0	12.5
Schools Having Medical Inspection.	0	0
Schools Having Dental Inspection..	0	0
High School, Distance to	7.5	7.5
" " Investment in Facilities	No data	No data
" " % Ele. Enrollment in ...	No data	3.11
No. in College	No data	0
Special Needs	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

SCHOOLS.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average for Same Communities in 1925:

Kind of Buildings: There was but little change in kind of buildings in the most accessible communities. One used a church in 1914, but had a four-room building in 1925. The others remained the same.

Water Supply: The five most accessible communities of Hawkins had the same kind of water supply in 1925 as they did in 1914. They had three springs and two wells.

Special School Needs: In 1925 the five most accessible communities of Hawkins needed: consolidation, better buildings, more desks, more equipment, one junior high school. The data for 1914 was incomplete. However, they needed the following: consolidation, better buildings, more desks, more equipment, one junior high school, better prepared teachers, longer school term.

Comparison of Three Least Accessible in Hawkins in 1914 with Average for the Same Communities in 1925:

Kind of Buildings: Two of the three least accessible communities of Hawkins had the same type of school buildings in 1925 as they had in 1914, but the other had changed from a one-room to a two-room school.

Water Supply: The three least accessible communities of Hawkins had the same kind of water supply in 1925 as they had in 1914.

Special School Needs: The three least accessible communities of Hawkins needed: consolidation, another teacher, better qualified teachers, more equipment. The data for 1914 was incomplete. However, they needed consolidation, another teacher, better qualified teachers, more equipment, longer school term, better buildings.

Table 184. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Per cent of illiteracy of native whites (1920)	10.5	14.1	65	87
Per cent of illiteracy of negroes (1920)	21.9	23.9	34	48
Number consolidated schools (1924)	1	4	79	44
Number of one-room schools (1923)	45	63	50	78
Per cent of all rural elementary schools that are one-room (1923)	54.2	66.0	20	48
Average salary of rural teachers (white, colored) (1924)..	$ 561	$ 450		
Average salary of rural teachers (white, colored) (1923)..	$ 568	$ 453	10	35
Salary of County Superintendent (1924)	$ 1,800	$ 2,600	62	16
Length of rural elementary schools (1923)	149	134	20	33
Length of rural elementary schools (1924)	145	128		
Per cent of enrollment in average daily attendance (1923)	66	65	42	53
Per cent of rural elementary enrollment in average daily attendance (1923)	63.4	63.5	50	49
Per cent of rural elementary teachers having attended normal school or college (1923)	34.9	36.7	25	23

Table 184.COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES (continued)

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Per cent of teachers having only elementary school training (1923)	3.1	0	40	One of last
Per cent of teachers without previous experience (1923)...	22.7	30.5	72	89
Per cent of revenue of rural elementary schools paid by county itself (1923)	78.7	72.5	13	34
Expenditure per pupil enrolled in rural elementary schools (1923)...	$ 26.43	$ 16.65	25	68
Expenditure per rural high school pupil (1923)	$ 86.63	$ 47.28	25	71
Expenditure per rural person for rural elementary schools (white, colored) (1923)	$ 4.08	$ 3.36	31	58
Expenditure per capita of total population for rural elementary schools (white, colored) (1923)	$ 2.35	$ 3.36	80	43
Total receipts for rural elementary schools from state and county funds per pupil enrolled (1924)	$ 27.00	$ 15.07	17	65
Total receipts for rural elementary schools from county tax levy (1924)	$ 97, 072.52	$ 36,071.93	7	50
Total receipts of county elementary schools from state and county funds (1924)	$165, 236.93	$ 85,596.38	9	42
County tax levy for rural elementary schools per enrollment in schools (1924)	$ 15.86	$ 6.33	11	67

Table 184. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES (contiued)

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Receipts per square mile from county tax levy for rural elementary schools (1924)	$ 222.64	$ 74.84	8	53
Average value of rural elementary school property per school (1923)	$ 3,574.00	$ 1,402.00	5	50
Value of rural elementary school property per rural person (1923)....	$ 13.13	$ 6.00	5	45
Value rural elementary school buildings and heating plants per school (1923)	$ 2,094.00	$ 1,116.00	21	51
Per cent of rural elementary school enrollment finishing elementary school (1923)	2.6	1.8	49	67
Per cent of scholastic population finishing high school (1923)	0.4	0.5	69	57
Per cent of total enrollment enrolled in high school (1923)	No data	5.8	?	45
Per cent high school enrollment is of total enrollment (1925).	7.2	6.9	40	46
Number books in rural school libraries (1924)	3,036	6,389	22	6
Value of rural school library books per county (1923)	$ 2,407	$ 4,680	27	5
Per cent of rural schools having libraries (1923)	57.0	29.0	16	52
Number of white people per white student in Tennessee colleges (1924)	1,079	835	66	56
Clerical help for Superintendent from rural school funds (1923)	$ 2.50	$ 300.00	30	14

Table 184. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES (continued)

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
No. newspapers published per week 1925	9	2	8	30
% of farmers subscribing to S Southern Agriculturist 1925....	26.6	17.4	36	69
% of farmers subscribing to Progressive Farmer 1924 ..	6.9	6.2	62	67
% of farmers subscribing to Southern Ruralist 1924 ...	22.5	12.0	20	33
% of farmers subscribing to Country Gentleman 1923	5.1	2.4	16	43
No. subscribers to three leading magazines 1924 ...	1,413	232	5	53
% of families subscribing to American Magazine 1924 ...	5.0	1.4	15	59
% of families subscribing to Literary Digest 1924	4.6	1.5	9	44
% of families subscribing to McCalls Magazine 1924..	7.7	4.4	4	31
% of families subscribing to Woman's Home Companies 1924	4.4	0.9	10	63

Table 185.

TENNESSEE

COMPARISON OF/COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Per cent illiteracy of native whites (192)...	8.0	8.4	10.5	8.9
Per cent illiteracy of negroes (1920)	22.5	24.7	31.0	26.2
Number consolidated schools per county (1924) ...	9.7	7.1	3.4	6.9
Salary of County Superintendent (1924).	$ 2,479	$ 2,022	$ 1,628	$ 2,029
Average salary of rural teachers (1924)	$ 518	$ 423	$ 431	$ 460
Length of rural school term (1924)	137	128	123	129
% of enrollment in average daily attendance (1923)	67.13	66.13	65.42	66.21
Per cent of all rural elementary teachers without previous experience (1923) ...	17.19	17.48	19.54	18.12
Per cent of rural teachers with only elementary training (white) (1923) ...	5.08	8.65	11.17	8.39
Per cent of rural elementary teachers having attended normal school or college (1923)	37.10	23.35	16.39	26.42
Value of rural elementary school property per rural person (1923)	$ 8.88	$ 6.43	$ 5.39	$ 6.78

Table 185.

TENNESSEE

COMPARISON OF COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING (continued)

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Average value of buildings and heating plant of rural elementary schools (1923)	$ 2,224	$ 1,351	$ 1,030	$ 1,517
Expenditure per capita total population for rural elementary schools (1923)	$ 3.13	$ 3.28	$ 3.44	$ 3.29
Expenditure per rural person for rural elementary schools (1923).	$ 4.42	$ 3.59	$ 3.44	$ 3.81
Per cent rural elementary school revenue paid by county itself (1923)...	76.39	67.43	58.88	67.38
Total receipts of county elementary schools from state and county (1924)	$ 218,289.87	$ 83,263.67	$ 50,996.54	$ 116,116.27
Receipts of county elementary schools from state and county funds per pupil enrolled (19 (1924) ...	$ 28.55	$ 18.64	$ 15.63	$ 20.83
Receipts for county elementary schools from county tax levy (1924)	$ 119,564.92	$ 39,922.92	$ 21,198.11	$ 59,406.86
Receipts of county elementary schools from county tax levy per pupil enrolled in schools (1924)	$ 15.68	$ 8.85	$ 6.19	$ 10.16
Receipts per square mile from county tax levy for county elementary schools (1924)	$ 233.55	$ 84.25	$ 63.45	$ 125.74
Per cent of elementary enrollment finishing elementary school (white) (1923).	3.12	2.74	2.45	2.77

Table 185. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING (continued)

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Per cent of scholastic population finishing high school (1923)	0.98	0.74	0.58	0.76
Number people per white college student (1924).	1,025	885	1,949	1,311
Per cent high school enrollment is of total enrollment (1923)	7.4	5.8	4.8	5.2
Per cent high school enrollment is of total enrollment (1925)	8.1	6.6	5.1	6.5
Per cent counties having over 700 people per college student (1924).	29.0	51.6	63.6	
Per cent of rural schools without libraries(1923)	56.5	65.3	70.9	61.1
Total number books in rural school libraries (1924)...	4,009	2,365	1,512	2,607
No. newspapers published per week 1925	5.29	1.96	1.08	2.74
% farmers subscribing for Southern Agriculturist 1925	32.5	26.8	17.9	25.6
% farmers subscribing for Country Gentleman 1923.....	5.7	4.5	1.5	3.8
% farmers subscribing for Southern Ruralist 1924	19.2	11.0	12.2	14.1
% farmers subscribing for Progressive Farmer 1924	16.9	9.8	10.3	12.3

Table 185. **COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING (continued)**

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
% families subscribing for American Magazine 1924	4.87	2.57	1.34	2.89
% families subscribing for Literary Digest 1924	3.10	1.95	1.07	2.03
% families subscribing for McCalls Magazine 1924	4.80	3.96	2.96	3.89
% families subscribing for Womans Home Companion 1924	3.90	1.66	0.77	2.10

Table 186.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Per cent illiteracy of native whites (1920)	2.3	2.5	2.4
Per cent illiteracy of negroes (1920)	11.2	12.2	11.7
Number consolidated schools (End of 1924)	314	179	247
Length of school term in days 1921 - 1922	171	158	164
Average number days attended by each pupil enrolled (1922) ..	137.7	77.9	109.4
Per cent school population (5-17, inc.) in daily attendance (1922)	64.9	65.6	65.3
Per cent of enrollment in average daily attendance (1922)	80.5	78.5	79.4
Average number years school life on basis of 180-day year 1921-1922	7.44	6.89	7.06
Median salary of full professors of Universities (1924)	$ 3,773	$ 3,137	$ 3,611
Average annual salaries of teachers, supervisors, and principals (1921-1922)	$ 1,204	$ 967	$ 1,085
Per cent that salaries paid in one-room schools is of salaries paid in cities (1922)	46.5	53.2	52.2
Total current expenses and outlays of schools (1921-1922)	$ 43,801,632	$ 12,559,711	$ 28,347,340
Expenditure per capita (total population) for public school education (1921-1922)	$ 14.27	$ 15.65	$ 14.96
Total receipts from educational institutions (1921-1922)	$58,747,660	$13,329,945	$35,575,356

Table 186.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING (continued)

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
State and Local funds per dollar of Federal funds used for Agricultural Experiment Stations in 1924	$ 8.58	$ 3.50	$ 6.11
State and Local funds per dollar of Federal funds used for Agricultural Extension (1923)	$ 3.06	$ 2.98	$ 2.13
State and Local funds per dollar of Federal funds used for Vocational Education (1924)	$ 2.80	$ 2.05	$ 2.90
Average value school property per pupil enrolled (1922)	$ 141.00	$ 124.00	$ 132.00
Per cent high school enrollment is of total enrollment (1924)	14.70	13.32	13.95
Per cent total people without public library service (1920)	41.23	55.66	43.00
Number volumes in public libraries per 1000 population (1920)	556	461	508
Number volumes per capita in public libraries (1920)	0.74	0.52	0.62
Circulation of books from public libraries per capita (1920)	2.39	1.60	2.13
Expenditure per capita for all public libraries (1920)	$ 0.36	$ 0.23	$ 0.33
Number people per each college student residing in state (1923)	229	236	232
No. daily newspapers in circulation 1922	1,053,188	150,597	601,892

Table 186 (continued)

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
% total circulation of eight leading magazines in each state 1926	3.37	0.76	2.04
% farmers subscribing for Country Gentleman 1924	20.7	40.4	31.3
% farmers subscribing for the Farm Journal 1924	36.0	39.6	37.8
% families subscribing for the American Magazine 1924	9.7	9.2	9.3
% families subscribing for Literary Digest 1924	6.0	6.3	6.1
% families subscribing for McCalls 1924	8.2	8.2	8.2
% families subscribing for Woman's Home Companion 1924.	8.5	7.5	7.9
No. inhabitants per copy of daily newspapers 1926	4.23	7.95	3.10

Table 187. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT IN ANDERSON COUNTY IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County	Eight Communities Anderson County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	11.9	19.7
Physicians--Number	1.13	0.25
" Age	58.0	54.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	1.63	3.5
" % people having telephone connection with.	3.31	4.80
Dentist--Number	0	0.15
" Age	0	25.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	9.8	6.5
" % people having telephone connection with.	3.86	4.67
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	**no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

HEALTH.

Table 188. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County 1896	Eight Communities Knox County 1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	11.9	11.9
Physicians--Number	1.88	1.13
" Age	43.3	58.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	1.31	1.63
" % people having telephone connection with.	0	3.31
Dentist--Number	0.13	0
" Age	25.0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	11.2	9.8
" % people having telephone connection with.	0	3.86
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

HEALTH.

Table 189 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Anderson County 1906	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	19.5	19.7
Physicians--Number	0.5	0.25
" Age	31.3	54.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	2.75	3.5
" % people having telephone connection with.	0	4.80
Dentist--Number	0.13	0.25
" Age	40.0	25.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	6.5	6.5
" % people having telephone connection with.	1.5	4.67
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

HEALTH.

Table 190 COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN 1896 IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1896	Most Accessible Knox County 1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	12.7	12.7
Physicians--Number	2.75	2.0
" Age	41.3	57.5
" If none here, distance (miles)	0	0
" % people having telephone connection with.	0	3.46
Dentist--Number	0.25	0
" Age	25.0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	11.3	10.0
" % people having telephone connection with.	0	3.66
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

HEALTH.

Table 191. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County 1906	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	18	18
Physicians--Number	0.75	0.50
" Age	34.0	54.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	2.38	2.38
" % people having telephone connection with.	0	4.9
Dentist--Number	0.25	0.25
" Age	40.0	25.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	6.1	6.1
" % people having telephone connection with.	0	4.9
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 192 . COMPARISON OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1896	Least Accessible Knox County 1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	11.0	11.0
Physicians--Number	1.0	0.25
" Age	47.5	60.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	0.63	3.25
" % people having telephone connection with.	0	2.76
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	11.0	9.5
" % people having telephone connection with.	0	4.81
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data **
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 193. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Anderson County 1906	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	21.0	21.0
Physicians--Number	0.25	0
" Age	25.0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	3.13	4.63
" % people having telephone connection with.	1.50	4.44
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	6.9	6.9
" % people having telephone connection with.	1.5	4.15
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 194 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Knox County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	12.7	11.0
Physicians--Number	2.0	0.25
" Age	57.5	60.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	-	3.25
" % people having telephone connection with.	3.46	2.76
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	10.0	9.5
" % people having telephone connection with.	3.66	4.81
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 195 COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	18.0	21.0
Physicians--Number	0.5	0
" Age	54.0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	2.38	4.63
" % people having telephone connection with.	4.90	4.44
Dentist--Number	0.25	0
" Age	25.0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	6.1	6.9
" % people having telephone connection with.	4.9	4.15
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no** data	no** data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

HEALTH.

Table 196 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	12.7	18.0
Physicians--Number	2.0	0.5
" Age	57.5	54.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	-	2.38
" % people having telephone connection with.	3.46	4.90
Dentist--Number	0	0.25
" Age	0	25.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	10.0	6.1
" % people having telephone connection with.	3.66	4.9
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 197 COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	11.0	21.0
Physicians--Number	0.25	0
" Age	60.0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	3.25	4.63
" % people having telephone connection with.	2.76	4.44
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	9.5	6.9
" % people having telephone connection with.	4.81	4.15
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 198 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	12.7	21.0
Physicians--Number	2.0	0
" Age	57.5	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	0	4.63
" % people having telephone connection with.	3.46	4.44
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	10.0	6.9
" % people having telephone connection with.	3.66	4.15
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 199 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON 1926

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1926	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	11.0	18.0
Physicians--Number	0.25	0.50
" Age	60.0	54.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	3.25	2.38
" % people having telephone connection with.	2.76	4.90
Dentist--Number	0	0.25
" Age	0	25.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	9.5	6.1
" % people having telephone connection with.	4.81	4.90
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table n 200 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE, 1896-1926

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	0	0
Physicians--Number	- 27.2	- 75
" Age	39.2	- 36.8
" If none here, distance (miles)	0	420.0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	?
Dentist--Number	- 100.0	0
" Age	- 100.0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	- 11.1	- 13.6
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	?
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 201. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE, 1906-1926

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	41.5	0
Physicians--Number	- 33.3	- 100.0
" Age	58.8	- 100.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	0	48.0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	?
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	- 37.5	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	0	0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	176.7
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 202 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON.

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	0	41.5
Physicians--Number	- 27.2	- 33.3
" Age	39.2	58.8
" If none here, distance (miles)	0	0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	?
Dentist--Number	-100.0	0
" Age	-100.0	- 37.5
" If none here, distance (miles)	- 11.1	0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	?
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 203 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	0	0
Physicians--Number	- 75.0	- 100.0
" Age	- 36.8	- 100.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	420.0	48.0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	?
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	- 13.6	0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	176.7
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

HEALTH.

Table 204 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	0	0
Physicians--Number	- 27.2	- 100.0
" Age	39.2	- 100.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	0	48.0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	?
Dentist--Number	-100.0	0
" Age	-100.0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	- 11.1	0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	176.7
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 205. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH % INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Per Cent Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Per Cent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	0	41.5
Physicians--Number	- 75	- 33.3
" Age	- 36.8	58.8
" If none here, distance (miles)	420.0	0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	?
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	- 37.5
" If none here, distance (miles)	- 13.6	0
" % people having telephone connection with.	?	?
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	no data	no data
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 206. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Number full-time health units (1925)	0	0		
Per cent practicing physicians over 50 years of age (1923)..	42	45	26	36
Number of people per physician (1923)	1,525	601	87	8
Number farms of average size per physician (1923)	307	22	76	3
Per cent of births not attended by a physician (1923)	10.8	1.9	48	6
Number people per dentist (1923).	6,039	2,684	55	6
Deaths per 1,000 population (white only) (1921).....	10.6	10.9	76	79
Number summer resort hotels (1924)	0	1	One of last	15

HEALTH.

Table 207. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN COUNTY 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	8.6	6.25
Physicians--Number	0.25	0.63
" Age	60.00	48.00
" If none here, distance (miles)	4.38	1.38
" % people having telephone connection with.	11.7	49.6
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	6.75	6.25
" % people having telephone connection with.	11.7	49.6
" Communities visited ..	0	0
Infectious Diseases	**	**
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

HEALTH.

Table 208 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	11.5	23.38
Physicians--Number	0.63	1.38
" Age	39.00	36.00
" If none here, distance (miles)	2.0	0.6
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	no data
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	6.75	15.4
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	no data
" Communities visited ..	0.38	0.88
Infectious Diseases	**	**
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 209. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1925 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1914.

Items.	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1914	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1925
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	23.38	6.25
Physicians--Number	1.38	0.63
" Age	36.00	48.00
" If none here, distance (miles)	0.6	1.38
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	49.6
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	15.4	6.25
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	49.6
" Communities visited ..	0.88	0
Infectious Diseases	**	**
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 210. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1914	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1925
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	11.5	8.6
Physicians--Number	0.63	0.25
" Age	39.00	60.00
" If none here, distance (miles)	2.0	4.38
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	49.6
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	6.75	6.75
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	49.6
" Communities visited ..	0.38	0
Infectious Diseases	**	**
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 211. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE WITH LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County	Least Accessible Hawkins County
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	6	13
Physicians--Number	0.4	0
" Age	60.00	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	3.6	5.67
" % people having telephone connection with.	12.3	5.3
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	6.0	8.0
" % people having telephone connection with.	12.3	5.3
" Communities visited ..	0	0.33
Infectious Diseases	**	**
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

HEALTH.

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Averages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan in 1925:

Infectious Diseases: Our data are inadequate to show any of the infectious diseases except typhoid fever. There is no difference in the average of the two sections as to the amount of typhoid.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Average of Eight Communities in Sullivan: 1914:

Infectious Diseases: There was a great deal more typhoid fever in the eight Sullivan communities in 1914 than there was in the eight Hawkins communities.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Sullivan in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925:

Infectious Diseases: In every one of the eight communities of Sullivan there was more typhoid fever in 1914 than there was in 1925.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925:

Infectious Diseases: Several of the communities in Hawkins County had more typhoid in 1914 than they did in 1925. None of them had less in 1914.

Comparison of Average of Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1926 with Average of the Three Least Accessible in 1925:

Infectious Diseases: There was no difference in the amount of typhoid in the most and in the least accessible communities of Hawkins.

Table 212 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH % INCREASE IN THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE 1914-1925

Items.	Per Cent Increase Hawkins County Most Accessible	Per Cent Increase Hawkins County Least Accessible
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	0	- 38.1
Physicians--Number	- 50.0	-100.0
" Age	51.8	-100.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	500.0	31.8
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	no data
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	0	0
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	no data
" Communities visited ..	-100.0	?
Infectious Diseases	**	**
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 213. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	6	6
Physicians--Number	0.8	0.4
" Age	39.5	60.0
" If none here, distance (miles)	0.6	3.6
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	12.3
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	6	6
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	12.3
" Communities visited ..	0.6	0
Infectious Diseases	**	**
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 214 . COMPARISON OF THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1925.
Local Hospital Facilities.....	0	0
Distance to Hospital	21	13
Physicians--Number	0.33	0
" Age	No definite data	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	4.3	5.67
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	5.3
Dentist--Number	0	0
" Age	0	0
" If none here, distance (miles)	8.0	8.0
" % people having telephone connection with.	no data	5.3
" Communities visited ..	0	0.33
Infectious Diseases	**	**
Child Labor--Extent Used Harmful	0	0
" " No. Harmful Effects	0	0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

HEALTH

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Sullivan and Hawkins Counties.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins with Percentage Increase in Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins 1914 - 1925:

Infectious Diseases: No data.

Comparison of Average of Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average for Same Communities in 1925:

Infectious Diseases: There was a much larger amount of typhoid in five most accessible communities in 1914 than there was in 1925.

Comparison of Average of Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average of Same Communities in 1925:

Infectious Diseases: Some more typhoid in the three least accessible communities of Hawkins County in 1914 than there was in 1925.

Table 215. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Number full-time health units (1925)	0	0		
Per cent practicing physicians over 50 years of age (1923)...	46	76	38	92
Number of people per physician (1923) ...	755	917	23	46
Number farms of average size per physician (1923)	75	158	7	38
Per cent of births not attended by a physician (1923)	2.2	8.3	14	44
Number people per dentist (1923)..	2,789	7,639	17	64
Deaths per 1,000 population (white only) (1921)	10.0	8.3		
Number summer resort hotels (1924)	0	2	One of last	12

Table 216. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Avorage per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Number full time health units (1925)	0.23	0.06	0	0.9
Per cent of all practicing physicians over 50 years of age (1923)	42.4	53.1	50.6	48.2
Number people per practicing physician(1923)	936	995	1,349	1,099
Average number square miles per practicing physician (1923)	20.4	28.9	47.4	30.6
Number farms of average size per practicing physician (1923)	169.7	239.9	346.4	254.0
Per cent of births not attended by a physician (1923)	11.6	13.9	18.3	14.7
Number people per dentist (1923)	4,976	6,773	9,551	6,274
Number deaths per 1,000 (white only, non-residents excluded) (1921).....	9.2	8.7	8.2	8.7
Total number deaths per 1,000 (excluding non-residents)(1921)..	9.6	8.9	8.4	9.0

Table 217.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Number of hospitals (1926)	300	429	366
Number people per dentist (1924) ..	2,083	2,397	2,243
Number deaths per 100,000 population (white) (1922)....	1,155.6	1,058.8	1,141.6
Total number deaths per 100,000 population (crude rate) (1922)..	1,193.0	1,125.9	1,181.7
Number full time health officers... (1925)....	7	5	5.8

Table 218. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County	Eight Communities Anderson County
Number	3.75	3.00
No. People per Church	264.00	165.38
% People Church Members	26.50	46.75
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	1.50	0.63
Total Membership	240.0	189.4
Membership per Church	62.13	66.38
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.9	1.3
Attendance - Number	236.25	96.25
Church Attendance per Church	62.50	65.63
% Is As Should Be	30.0	29.4
Total Sunday School Enrollment	178.75	108.75
Enrollment per Church	50.75	48.25
No. Singing Services per Month	1.57	1.43
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	77.5	77.5
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 1581.25	$ 441.25
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$ 4750.00	$2750.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0.25
Education of Pastors (Grades)	12.5	9.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.75	2.13

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 219. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County 1896	Eight Communities Knox County 1926
Number	2.25	3.75
No. People per Church	399.38	264.00
% People Church Members	24.37	26.50
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	1.13	1.50
Total Membership	180.6	240.0
Membership per Church	72.0	62.13
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.0	1.9
Attendance - Number	143.125	236.25
Church Attendance per Church	61.88	62.50
% Is As Should Be	24.0	30.0
Total Sunday School Enrollment	128.13	178.75
Enrollment per Church	56.25	50.75
No. Singing Services per Month	1.71	1.57
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	75.0	77.5
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 563.75	$ 1581.25
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$3475.00	$ 4750.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	7.38	12.5
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.25	1.75

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 220. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities AndersonCounty 1906	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926.
Number	2.5	3.0
No. People per Church	198.13	165.38
% People Church Members	39.00	46.75
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	0.38	0.63
Total Membership	153.1	189.4
Membership per Church	59.88	66.38
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.2	1.3
Attendance - Number	172.5	196.25
Church Attendance per Church	71.88	65.63
% Is As Should Be	39.2	29.4
Total Sunday School Enrollment	71.25	108.75
Enrollment per Church	43.88	43.25
No. Singing Services per Month	1.50	1.43
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	75.75	77.50
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 180.00	$ 441.25
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$2275.00	$2750.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0.25
Education of Pastors (Grades)	6.5	9.25
% Adequate	no data	na data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.13	2.13

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 221. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1896	Most Accessible Knox County 1926
Number	3.0	6.0
No. People per Church	583.25	315.5
% People Church Members	20.42	26.18
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	1.75	3.00
Total Membership	290.00	406.00
Membership per Church	92.0	73.0
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.0	2.3
Attendance - Number	100.0	400.0
Church Attendance per Church	68.75	75.0
% Is As Should Be	19.7	20.1
Total Sunday School Enrollment	193.75	301.25
Enrollment per Church	62.5	55.25
No. Singing Services per Month	1.67	0.33
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	77.5	80.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 875.00	$ 2750.00
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$5900.00	$ 7750.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	6.00	11.75
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.25	2.00

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 222 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County 1906	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Number	2.5	3.0
No. People per Church	263.5	202.0
% People Church Members	35.0	43.0
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	0.75	0.50
Total Membership	181.0	238.7
Membership per Church	65.75	77.75
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.5	1.5
Attendance - Number	191.25	247.5
Church Attendance per Church	72.50	78.75
% Is As Should Be	20.8	15.3
Total Sunday School Enrollment	103.75	146.25
Enrollment per Church	42.75	51.5
No. Singing Services per Month	1.50	2.0
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	72.5	80.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 300.00	$ 787.50
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$2925.00	$ 4375.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0.5
Education of Pastors (Grades)	6.00	10.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.25	2.25

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 223. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF THE FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1896	Least Accessible Knox County. 1926.
Number	1.5	1.5
No. People per Church	215.5	212.5
% People Church Members	26.33	26.75
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	0.5	0
Total Membership	71.25	74.0
Membership per Church	52.0	51.25
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.0	1.5
Attendance - Number	86.25	72.5
Church Attendance per Church	55.0	50.0
% Is As Should Be	28.3	39.9
Total Sunday School Enrollment	62.50	56.25
Enrollment per Church	50.0	46.25
No. Singing Services per Month	1.75	2.50
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	72.5	75.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 252.50	$ 412.50
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$1050.00	$1750.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	8.75	13.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.25	1.50

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 224. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926

Items.	Least Accessible Anderson County 1906	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Number	2.5	3.0
No. People per Church	132.75	128.75
% People Church Members	43.0	50.5
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	0	0.75
Total Membership	125.0	140.0
Membership per Church	54.0	55.0
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.0	1.0
Attendance - Number	153.75	145.0
Church Attendance per Church	71.25	52.5
% Is As Should Be	57.6	43.4
Total Sunday School Enrollment	38.75	71.25
Enrollment per Church	45.0	45.0
No. Singing Services per Month	1.50	0.67
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	75.0	75.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 60.00	$ 95.00
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$1625.00	$1375.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	7.00	8.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.00	2.00

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 225. COMPARISON OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Knox County.
Number	6.0	1.5
No. People per Church	315.5	212.5
% People Church Members	26.18	26.75
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	3.00	0
Total Membership	406.0	74.0
Membership per Church	73.0	51.25
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	2.3	1.5
Attendance - Number	400.0	72.5
Church Attendance per Church	75.0	50.0
% Is As Should Be	20.1	39.9
Total Sunday School Enrollment	301.25	66.25
Enrollment per Church	55.25	46.25
No. Singing Services per Month	0.33	2.50
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	80.0	75.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 2750.00	$ 412.50
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$ 7750.00	$ 1750.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	11.75	13.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	2.00	1.50

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 226 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Number	3.0	3.0
No. People per Church	202.0	128.75
% People Church Members	43.0	50.5
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	0.50	0.75
Total Membership	238.7	140.0
Membership per Church	77.75	55.00
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.5	1.0
Attendance - Number	247.5	145.0
Church Attendance per Church	78.75	52.50
% Is As Should Be	15.3	48.4
Total Sunday School Enrollment	146.25	71.25
Enrollment per Church	51.5	45.0
No. Singing Services per Month	2.0	0.67
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	80.0	75.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 787.50	$ 95.0
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$ 4375.00	$ 1375.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0.5	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	10.25	8.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	2.25	2.00

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 227. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County.
Number	6.0	3.0
No. People per Church	315.5	202.0
% People Church Members	26.18	43.0
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	3.00	0.50
Total Membership	406.0	238.7
Membership per Church	73.0	77.75
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	2.3	1.5
Attendance - Number	499.0	247.5
Church Attendance per Church	75.00	78.75
% Is As Should Be	20.1	15.3
Total Sunday School Enrollment	301.25	186.25
Enrollment per Church	55.25	51.5
No. Singing Services per Month	0.33	2.0
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	80.0	80.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 2750.00	$ 787.50
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$ 7750.00	$ 4375.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0.5
Education of Pastors (Grades)	11.75	10.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	2.00	2.25

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 228 . COMPARISON OF AVEFAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Number	1.5	3.0
No. People per Church	212.5	128.75
% People Church Members	26.75	50.5
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	0.	0.75
Total Membership	274.0	140.0
Membership per Church	51.25	55.00
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.5	1.0
Attendance - Number	72.5	145.0
Church Attendance per Church ...	50.00	52.50
% Is As Should Be	39.9	43.4
Total Sunday School Enrollment ...	56.25	71.25
Enrollment per Church	46.25	45.0
No. Singing Services per Month ...	2.50	0.67
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate ..	75.00	75.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)..	$ 412.50	$ 95.00
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip. ..	$ 1750.00	$ 1375.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	13.25	8.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.50	2.00

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 229. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON COUNTY - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County	Least Accessible Anderson County
Number	8.0	3.0
No. People per Church	315.5	128.75
% People Church Members	26.18	50.5
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	5.00	0.75
Total Membership	406.0	140.0
Membership per Church	73.0	55.0
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	2.5	1.0
Attendance - Number	400.0	145.0
Church Attendance per Church	75.0	52.5
% Is As Should Be	20.1	43.4
Total Sunday School Enrollment	301.25	71.25
Enrollment per Church	55.25	45.0
No. Singing Services per Month	0.33	0.67
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	80.0	75.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 2750.00	$ 95.00
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$ 7750.00	$ 1375.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	11.75	8.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	2.00	2.00

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 230. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County	Most Accessible Anderson County
Number	1.5	5.0
No. People per Church	312.5	202.0
% People Church Members	26.75	43.0
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	0	0.50
Total Membership	74.0	238.7
Membership per Church	51.25	77.75
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.5	1.5
Attendance - Number	72.5	247.5
Church Attendance per Church	50.0	73.75
% Is As Should Be	39.9	15.3
Total Sunday School Enrollment	56.25	146.25
Enrollment per Church	46.25	51.5
No. Singing Services per Month	2.50	2.0
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	75.0	80.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 412.50	$ 787.50
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	$1750.00	$ 4375.00
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0.5
Education of Pastors (Grades)	13.25	10.25
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.50	2.25

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 231. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX - 1926-1936

Items.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Knox County	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Knox County.
Number	100.0	0
No. People per Church	- 45.9	- 13.9
% People Church Members	28.3	- 5.5
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	71.4	-100.0
Total Membership	40.1	3.5
Membership per Church	- 20.6	- 1.4
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	200.0	50.0
Attendance - Number	65.8	- 11.1
Church Attendance per Church	9.0	- 9.0
% Is As Should Be	2.0	41.1
Total Sunday School Enrollment	55.5	10.0
Enrollment per Church	- 13.1	- 7.5
No. Singing Services per Month	- 80.0	42.8
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	3.2	3.4
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	214.3	63.3
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	31.3	66.6
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	95.8	51.4
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	60.0	20.0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 232 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1906 - 1926

Items.	Percentage Increase Anderson County Most Accessible	Percentage Increase Anderson County Least Accessible
Number	20.0	80.0
No. People per Church	- 23.4	- 3.0
% People Church Members	22.8	17.4
% Condition of Buildings	No data	No data
No. Resident Ministers	- 33.3	0
Total Membership	31.7	12.0
Membership per Church	18.2	1.8
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	20.0	0
Attendance - Number	- 12.8	- 29.8
Church Attendance per Church	8.6	- 26.3
% Is As Should Be	- 26.2	- 24.7
Total Sunday School Enrollment	41.0	33.9
Enrollment per Church	20.4	0
No. Singing Services per Month	33.3	- 33.3
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	10.3	0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	162.5	58.3
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	49.5	- 16.3
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	70.8	17.8
% Adequate	no-data	no-data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	80.0	100.0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 233 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Percent Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percent Increase Most Accessible Anderson County. 1906-1926
Number	100.0	20.0
No. People per Church	- 45.9	- 23.4
% People Church Members	28.3	22.8
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	71.4	- 33.3
Total Membership	40.1	31.7
Membership per Church	- 20.6	18.2
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	200.0	20.0
Attendance - Number	65.7	- 12.8
Church Attendance per Church	9.0	8.6
% Is As Should Be	2.0	- 26.2
Total Sunday School Enrollment	55.5	41.0
Enrollment per Church	- 13.1	20.4
No. Singing Services per Month	- 80.0	33.3
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	3.2	10.3
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	214.3	162.5
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	31.3	49.5
No. Abandoned Churches	0	-
Education of Pastors (Grades)	95.8	70.8
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	60.0	80.0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 234. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Anderson County. 1906-1926
Number	0	20.0
No. People per Church	- 13.9	- 5.0
% People Church Members	- 5.5	17.4
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	- 100.0	?
Total Membership	3.5	12.0
Membership per Church	- 1.4	1.8
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	50.0	0
Attendance - Number	- 11.1	- 29.8
Church Attendance per Church	- 9.0	- 26.3
% Is As Should Be	41.1	- 24.7
Total Sunday School Enrollment	10.0	83.9
Enrollment per Church	- 7.5	0
No. Singing Services per Month	42.8	- 33.3
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	3.4	0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	83.3	58.3
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	66.6	- 15.3
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	51.4	17.8
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	20.0	100.0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 235. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH % INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON COUNTY - 1926

Items.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Number	100.0	20.0
No. People per Church	- 45.9	+ 3.0
% People Church Members	28.3	17.4
% Condition of Buildings	no-data	no-data
No. Resident Ministers	71.4	?
Total Membership	40.1	12.0
Membership per Church	- 20.6	1.8
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	200.0	0
Attendance - Number	65.7	- 29.8
Church Attendance per Church	9.0	- 26.3
% Is As Should Be	2.0	- 24.7
Total Sunday School Enrollment	55.5	83.9
Enrollment per Church	- 13.1	0
No. Singing Services per Month	- 80.0	- 33.3
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	3.2	0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	214.3	58.3
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	31.3	- 15.3
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	95.8	17.8
% Adequate	no-data	no-data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	80.0	100.0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 236. COMPARISON OF % INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH % INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Knox County.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Anderson County.
Number	0	20.0
No. People per Church	- 13.9	- 23.4
% People Church Members	- 5.5	22.8
% Condition of Buildings	no data	no data
No. Resident Ministers	-100.0	- 33.3
Total Membership	3.5	31.7
Membership per Church	- 1.4	18.2
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	50.0	20.0
Attendance - Number	- 11.1	- 12.8
Church Attendance per Church ...	- 9.0	8.6
% Is As Should Be	41.1	- 26.2
Total Sunday School Enrollment ...	10.0	41.0
Enrollment per Church	- 7.5	20.4
No. Singing Services per Month ...	42.8	33.3
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate ..	3.4	10.3
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)..	63.3	182.5
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip. ..	66.6	49.5
No. Abandoned Churches	0	-
Education of Pastors (Grades)	51.4	70.8
% Adequate	no data	no data
Special Needs	**	**
Number	20.0	80.0

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

CHURCHES.

Table 237. **COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.**

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
% population church members 1916	38.6	42.8	38	20

MAMMOTH FILM BOND

Table 238. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN - 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County.
Number	2.0	2.0
No. People per Church	151.5	283.0
% People Church Members	48.2	35.8
% Condition of Buildings	74.4	80.0
No. Resident Ministers	0.13	0
Total Membership	149.0	119.0
Membership per Church	80.8	81.0
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.3	1.4
Attendance - Number	107	127.0
Church Attendance per Church	52	66
% Is As Should Be	29.3	24.0
Total Sunday School Enrollment	83.75	98.75
Enrollment per Church	44	61
No. Singing Services per Month	0.62	0.37
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	80.0	77.5
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 164.00	$277.0
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	no data	no data
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0.13
Education of Pastors (Grades)	no data	no data
% Adequate	68.5	60.0
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.25	2.6

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 239. COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County	Eight Communities Sullivan County
Number	2.0	1.86
No. People per Church	151.5	270.8
% People Church Members	38.8	38.0
% Condition of Buildings	71.0	80.0
No. Resident Ministers	0	0
Total Membership	119	117
Membership per Church	71.5	86.6
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.1	1.3
Attendance - Number	106	91
Church Attendance per Church	53	70
% Is As Should Be	29.6	26.25
Total Sunday School Enrollment	90.71	78.57
Enrollment per Church	49.7	58
No. Singing Services per Month	0.5	0.37
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	80.0	77.5
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 78.00	$209.00
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	no data	no data
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	no data	no data
% Adequate	63.5	57.5
Special Needs	**	**
Number	2.0	1.8

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 240. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities 1914	Eight Communities 1925
Number	1.86	2.0
No. People per Church	270.8	283.0
% People Church Members	38.0	35.8
% Condition of Buildings	80.0	80.0
No. Resident Ministers	0	0
Total Membership	117.0	119.0
Membership per Church	86.6	81.0
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.3	1.4
Attendance - Number	91	94
Church Attendance per Church	70	66
% Is As Should Be	26.25	24.0
Total Sunday School Enrollment	78.57	98.75
Enrollment per Church	58	61
No. Singing Services per Month	0.37	0.37
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	77.5	77.5
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 209.00	$277.0
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	no data	no data
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0.13
Education of Pastors (Grades)	no-data	no data
% Adequate	57.5	60.0
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.8	2.6

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 241. COMPARISON OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH THOSE COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities 1914	Eight Communities 1925
Number	2.0	2.0
No. People per Church	151.5	151.5
% People Church Members	36.8	48.2
% Condition of Buildings	71.0	74.4
No. Resident Ministers	0	0.13
Total Membership	119	149
Membership per Church	71.3	80.8
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.1	1.3
Attendance - Number	886	107
Church Attendance per Church	53	52
% Is As Should Be	26.9	29.3
Total Sunday School Enrollment	90.71	93.75
Enrollment per Church	49.7	44.0
No. Singing Services per Month	0.5	0.62
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	80.0	80.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 76.00	$ 164.00
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	no data	no data
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	no data	no data
% Adequate	63.3	68.5
Special Needs	**	**
Number	2.0	1.25

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 242. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE WITH THE LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County	Least Accessible Hawkins County
Number	1.8	2.0
No. People per Church	192.6	83.0
% People Church Members	49.3	42.7
% Condition of Buildings	80.0	65.0
No. Resident Ministers	0	0.33
Total Membership	164.0	75.0
Membership per Church	87.0	50.0
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.4	1.0
Attendance - Number	93.4	56.0
Church Attendance per Church	58.8	28.0
% Is As Should Be	28.8	32.0
Total Sunday School Enrollment	114.0	53.0
Enrollment per Church	80.0	25.0
No. Singing Services per Month	0.80	0.33
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	80.0	80.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 177.00	$ 100.00
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	no data	no data
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	no data	no data
% Adequate	72.0	60.0
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.25	no data

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 243 . COMPARISON OF % INCREASE IN FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH % INCREASE IN THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE (1914-1925)

Items.	Most Accessible Percentage Increase	Least Accessible Percentage Increase
Number	- 10.0	0
No. People per Church	0	0
% People Church Members	26.1	70.8
% Condition of Buildings	3.9	13.0
No. Resident Ministers	0	?
Total Membership	23.3	0
Membership per Church	15.1	0
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	16.7	0
Attendance - Number	0	-12.5
Church Attendance per Church ...	- 0.4	-12.5
% Is As Should Be	- 1.4	0
Total Sunday School Enrollment ...	1.8	-12.0
Enrollment per Church	0	31.6
No. Singing Services per Month ...	0	?
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate ..	0	0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)..	110.7	100.0
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip. ..	no data	no data
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	no data	no data
% Adequate	16.1	-14.3
Special Needs	**	**
Number	25.0	?

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 244. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible 1914	Most Accessible 1925
Number	2.0	1.8
No. People per Church	192.6	192.6
% People Church Members	39.1	49.3
% Condition of Buildings	77.0	80.0
No. Resident Ministers	0	0
Total Membership	133.0	164.0
Membership per Church	75.6	87.0
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.2	1.4
Attendance - Number	93.4	93.4
Church Attendance per Church	57.0	56.8
% Is As Should Be	29.2	28.8
Total Sunday School Enrollment	112.0	114.0
Enrollment per Church	60.0	60.0
No. Singing Services per Month	0.80	0.80
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	80.0	80.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 84.00	$ 177.00
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	no data	no data
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	no data	no data
% Adequate	62.0	72.0
Special Needs	**	**
Number	1.0	1.25

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

Table 245. COMPARISON OF THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Least Accessible 1914	Least Accessible 1925
Number	2.0	2.0
No. People per Church	83.0	83.0
% People Church Members	25.0	42.7
% Condition of Buildings	57.5	65.0
No. Resident Ministers	0	0.33
Total Membership	50.0	78.0
Membership per Church	50.0	50.0
Frequency of Services - Per Month.	1.0	1.0
Attendance - Number	64.0	56.0
Church Attendance per Church	32.0	28.0
% Is As Should Be	32.0	32.0
Total Sunday School Enrollment	37.5	33.0
Enrollment per Church	19.0	25.0
No. Singing Services per Month	0	0.33
Condition of Grounds-% Adequate	30.0	30.0
Annual Budget (Current Expenses)	$ 50.00	$ 100.00
Investment in Bldgs. & Equip.	no data	no data
No. Abandoned Churches	0	0
Education of Pastors (Grades)	no data	no data
% Adequate	70.0	60.0
Special Needs	**	**
Number	no data	no data

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but is presented elsewhere in this chapter verbally.

CHURCHES.

Table 246. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
% population church members 1916	34.3	36.4	57	49

MICROFILMED AMERICAN GENEALOGICAL

Table 247. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST; MEDIUM, and LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
% population church members 1916	36.5	36.0	34.6	35.6

CHURCHES.

Table 248.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
% population church members 1916	42.0	36.5	39.1
Value of church property per capita 1916	$ 16.63	$ 11.84	$ 16.43

CHURCHES.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Knox County with Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County - 1926:

Special Church Needs: The eight communities of Knox in 1926 needed more church workers, young leaders, union of churches, more leaders, resident and regular pastors, better church buildings, better attendance, better educated pastors.

The eight communities in Anderson in 1926 needed fewer churches, which is same as union. Better pastors were needed, trained leaders, young people's organizations, better attendance, educated pastors, changed attitude of people toward the church.

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Knox County - 1926:

Special Church Needs: There is no difference in the needs of most and least accessible communities in Knox County. Each needs: better educated pastors, better attendance, better educated and more leaders, regular and resident pastors.

Comparison of Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County with Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County, 1926:

Special Church Needs: The four most accessible communities of Anderson needed union of churches, efficient pastors, trained leaders, young people's organizations, better attendance, and educated pastors.

CHURCHES.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Special Church Needs: The four most accessible communities in Anderson in 1906 needed: more leaders, better educated pastors, better attendance, young people's organizations, consolidation of churches. In 1906 they still needed: better attendance, two places needed better educated pastors, trained leaders, young people's organization, union of churches.

Comparison of Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with Average of the same Communities in 1926:

Special Church Needs: The four least accessible communities in Anderson in 1906 needed better educated pastor, more financial support, better educated leaders. In 1926 they needed: financial support, general up-build of the church, two needed better educated pastors, one needed a change in attitute of the people.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Knox County in 1896 with Average of Same Eight Communities in 1926:

Special Church Needs: The eight communities in Knox in 1896 needed better educated pastors, better roads, better attendance, more leaders, young leaders, consolidation of churches. In 1926 they needed: better attendance, resident pastor, better educated leaders, more young leaders, consolidation.

CHURCHES.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with the Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Special School Needs: The eight communities in Anderson County in 1906 needed more leaders, better educated pastors, financial support, better attendance, consolidation, young people's organizations. In 1926 they needed fewer churches, better educated pastors, better trained leaders, better attendance, financial support, and young people's organizations.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox 1896-1926:

Special Church Needs: No data.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson 1906-1926:

Special Church Needs: No data.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Special Church Needs: No data.

CHURCHES.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County - 1926:

Special Church Needs: Both of these sections needed consolidation, and more young leaders. The four communities of Knox needed more leaders, and resident pastors. The four communities in Anderson needed more efficient pastors, which means better educated, and better attendance.

Comparison of Average of Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Anderson County - 1926:

Special Church Needs: The four least accessible communities in Knox County needed: better educated pastor, roads, more leaders, and consolidation. The four communities in Anderson needed: more leadership, consolidation, better educated pastor, trained leaders, better attendance.

Comparison of Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County in 1896 with Average for the Same Communities in 1926:

Special Church Needs: The four most accessible communities in Knox in 1896 needed: better educated pastors, better roads, more church workers, young leaders, and consolidation. In 1926 they needed resident pastor, young leaders, church union, and more church workers.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County in 1896 with the Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Special Church Needs: The four least accessible communities in Knox in 1896 needed better churches, better educated pastors, trained leaders, better attendance. In 1926 they needed better attendance, young leaders, and one needed a regular pastor.

CHURCHES.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Average of the Four Leaxt Accessible of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Special Church Needs: No data.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Average of the Four Least Accessible of Anderson County, 1926:

Special Church Needs: The four most accessible in Knox in 1926 needed: young leaders, consolidation, resident pastors, and more church workers. The four least accessible in Anderson in 1926 needed: better educated pastors, general up-build of church, financial support, more leaders, and better trained leaders, consolidation.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County - 1926:

Special Church Needs: The four least accessible communities in Knox in 1926 needed: better attendance, stimulation of young people, better educated leaders, better educated pastors. The four most accessible in Anderson in 1926 needed: better educated pastors, financial support, up-building of the church organization.

CHURCHES.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Special Church Needs: No data.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County: (Knox 1896-1926) (Anderson 1906-1926)

Special Church Needs: No data.

CHURCHES.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Averages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan - 1925:

Special Church Needs: The eight communities in Sullivan needed better pastors, more pay, leadership, union of churches, and better church buildings. The eight communities of Hawkins needed resident pastors, better educated pastors, more personal visits from pastor. They do not mention the need for union churches, but certainly need them in many cases.

Comparison of Averages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan - 1914:

Special Church Needs: No data.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Sullivan in 1914 with those Communities in 1925:

Special Needs: Only one-half of the eight communities in Sullivan made a report in 1914, and these reported the same needs as in 1925, viz: consolidation, better educated ministers, more leaders, and larger salaries for ministers.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925:

Special Church Needs: Only one community out of the eight in Hawkins gave data for 1914, this community reporting the same needs in 1914 as in 1925, viz: resident pastor, better educated pastor, more personal visits by the pastor. They do not mention union of churches. In other words, no progress was reported.

CHURCHES.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Most Accessible with Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1925:

Special Church Needs: No data at all was given on the least accessible communities of Hawkins. The most accessible communities needed: personal visits, resident pastors, and better educated pastors.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins with Percentage Increase in Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins 1914-1925:

Special Church Needs: No data.

Comparison of Average of Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average for Same Communities in 1925:

Special Church Needs: But one gave data in 1914, and it gave the same needs as in 1925. The five communities in 1925 needed more personal visits by pastor, better educated pastor, and resident pastor.

Comparison of Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average for the Same Communities in 1925:

Special Church Needs: No data.

Table 249. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1927

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County 1927	Eight Communities Anderson County 1927
No. Church Socials per Year.....	7.3	12.0
No. School Entertainments per Year.....	6.0	3.1
No. Ice Cream Suppers per Year	2.4	1.3
No. Pie Suppers per Year	1.6	2.3
No. Ball Games per Year	22.3	6.9
No. Picnics per Year	5.8	1.0
No. Fairs per Year	0.8	0.4
No. Card Parties per Year	4.2	0
No. Dances per Year	15.3	0
No. Movies per Year	0	0

RURAL RECREATION.

Table 250. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX - 1927.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1927	Least Accessible Knox County 1927
No. Church Socials per Year.....	8.7	6.0
No. School Entertainments per Year.....	10.0	2.0
No. Ice Cream Suppers per Year	3.0	3.0
No. Pie Suppers per Year	2.5	1.0
No. Ball Games per Year	27.3	7.0
No. Picnics per Year	7.8	1.3
No. Fairs per Year	1.0	0
No. Card Parties per Year	7.5	2.0
No. Dances per Year	0	20.3
No. Movies per Year	0	0

Table 251 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1927.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County 1927	Least Accessible Anderson County 1927
No. Church Socials per Year.....	1.7	19.8
No. School Entertainments per Year.....	4.7	2.0
No. Ice Cream Suppers per Year	2.0	0.7
No. Pie Suppers per Year	2.7	2.0
No. Ball Games per Year	8.3	5.8
No. Picnics per Year	1.0	1.0
No. Fairs per Year	0.7	0
No. Card Parties per Year	0	0
No. Dances per Year	0	0
No. Movies per Year	0	0

RURAL RECREATION.

Table 252 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1927.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1927	Most Accessible Anderson County 1927
No. Church Socials per Year.....	8.7	1.7
No. School Entertainments per Year.....	10.0	4.7
No. Ice Cream Suppers per Year	3.0	2.0
No. Pie Suppers per Year	2.5	2.7
No. Ball Games per Year	27.3	8.3
No. Picnics per Year	7.8	1.0
No. Fairs per Year	1.0	0.7
No. Card Parties per Year	7.5	0
No. Dances per Year	0	0
No. Movies per Year	0	0

FARMERS BOND

RURAL RECREATION.

Table 253. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON 1927.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1927	Least Accessible Anderson County 1927
No. Church Socials per Year.....	6.0	19.8
No. School Entertainments per Year.....	2.0	2.0
No. Ice Cream Suppers per Year	3.0	0.7
No. Pie Suppers per Year	1.0	2.0
No. Ball Games per Year	7.0	5.8
No. Picnics per Year	1.3	1.0
No. Fairs per Year	0	0
No. Card Parties per Year	2.0	0
No. Dances per Year	20.3	0
No. Movies per Year	0	0

Table 254. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON 1927.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1927	Least Accessible Anderson County 1927
No. Church Socials per Year.....	8.7	19.8
No. School Entertainments per Year.....	10.0	2.0
No. Ice Cream Suppers per Year	3.0	0.7
No. Pie.Suppers per Year	2.5	2.0
No. Ball Games per Year	27.3	5.8
No. Picnics per Year	7.8	1.0
No. Fairs per Year	1.0	0
No. Card Parties per Year	7.5	0
No. Dances per Year	0	0
No. Movies per Year	0	0

Table 255 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON - 1927.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1927	Most Accessible Anderson County 1927
No. Church Socials per Year.....	6.0	1.7
No. School Entertainments per Year.....	2.0	4.7
No. Ice Cream Suppers per Year	3.0	2.0
No. Pie Suppers per Year	1.0	2.7
No. Ball Games per Year	7.0	8.3
No. Picnics per Year	1.3	1.0
No. Fairs per Year	0	0.7
No. Card Parties per Year	2.0	0
No. Dances per Year	20.3	0
No. Movies per Year	0	0

Table 256. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN - 1927.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1927	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1927
No. Church Socials per Year.....	3	2.2
No. School Entertainments per Year.....	2.8	3.0
No. Ice Cream Suppers per Year	2.0	2.7
No. Pie Suppers per Year	1.5	2.7
No. Ball Games per Year	10.5	7.6
No. Picnics per Year	4.3	2.5
No. Fairs per Year	0.5	0.3
No. Card Parties per Year	1.5	8.0
No. Dances per Year	0	2.8
No. Movies per Year	0	1.7

RURAL RECREATION.

Table 257. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE WITH LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS - 1927.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1927	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1927
No. Church Socials per Year.....	1.5	4.5
No. School Entertainments per Year.....	3.5	2.0
No. Ice Cream Suppers per Year	2.0	2.0
No. Pie Suppers per Year	1.5	1.5
No. Ball Games per Year	20.0	1.0
No. Picnics per Year	5.0	3.5
No. Fairs per Year	0.5	0.5
No. Card Parties per Year	0	3.0
No. Dances per Year	0	0
No. Movies per Year	0	0

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 258. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County 1926	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	2.76	0.39
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	7.2	1.9
(c) % homes having furnace	0.9	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	19.0	13.5
(b) % homes having radio	1.8	1.65
(c) % homes having phonographs.	17.2	25.1
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.88	0.25
(b) % law is enforced	65.0	78.1
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	5.3 mis.	6.3 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	76.3	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.00	$ 1.40
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	5
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	70.0	70.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 259. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Knox County 1896	Eight Communities Knox County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	2.76
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	7.2
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0.9
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	8.5	19.0
(b) % homes having radio	0	1.8
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	17.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.38	0.88
(b) % law is enforced	58.1	65.0
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	3.3 mis.	5.3 mis
(b) % satisfactory	61.3	76.3
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.19	$ 1.00
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	0
Community Loyalty or Spirit:		
(a) % adequate	62.5	70.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing:		
(a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 260 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON COUNTY IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Eight Communities Anderson County 1906	Eight Communities Anderson County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	0.39
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	1.9
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	5.4	13.5
(b) % homes having radio	0	1.65
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	25.1
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.63	0.25
(b) % law is enforced	70.6	78.1
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	7.8 mis.	6.3 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	61.3	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 2.25	$ 1.46
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	5.0
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	55.0	70.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing:		
(a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Knox County with Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County - 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: In the eight communities of Anderson the price of labor became higher and it is said that there was a tendency for some of the farmers to take their girls out of school to work in the field, and also in the house. This did not seem to be true in Knox County.

In the eight communities of Knox it was so easy for young folks to make money that they became great spenders, and it was a temptation for them to dissipate. This was true to a much less extent in Anderson.

In both sections alike some of the young people were drained from the country because they saw that they could make more for themselves in the city; this includes some who would have become rural leaders.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: In both the eight communities of Knox and the eight communities of Anderson the tax burdens were lowered on farmers because of the coming of manufacturing plants. The eight communities of Knox had a much greater reduction in this respect than those in Anderson.

In both sections the price a man could receive for his labor increased very much. By some farmers this is thought to be harmful, but it enabled the man working for wages to have a higher standard of living. In the long run it causes the farmer to get more for the crops he produces, and it adds to the general prosperity of the community by placing more money in the community. In both sections the market for farm products has improved, but a much greater change has come to Knox. In both sections there was work for the girls and young men. A much larger amount of work can be had

MISCELLANEOUS.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

in

in Knox County. This work enabled the poor girls to dress themselves as other girls dressed, and also relieved their parents of the burden of trying to provide clothes for them.

In the Knox County section the State University is close enough to the work for a poor boy to go to college and at the same time work to pay his expense.

The more progressive young men and girls will go somewhere to find work, and this manufacturing furnished it to them close enough home for them to work in town during the day and return to their homes at night. This kept the community from losing some of its best leaders.

The improved market for farm products caused the people to need better roads and has furnished them money to build roads with. The employment in town also caused people to want better roads into town, and furnished money with which to build them. This prosperity has caused a much better system of schools and roads to develop than otherwise would have been the case. It has improved the rural church also.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Knox County in 1896 with the Average of Same Eight Communities in 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Comparison of the Average of Eight Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with the Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 261 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1896	Most Accessible Knox County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	2.25
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	8.5
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0.7
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	10.3	24.0
(b) % homes having radio	0	2.2
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	65.8
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.25	1.0
(b) % law is enforced	66.25	72.5
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	2.8 mis.	6.0 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	65.0	80.0
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.19	$ 1.00
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	0
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	65.0	85.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 262 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County 1906	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	0.45
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	2.25
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	7.4	14.7
(b) % homes having radio	0	1.85
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	10.85
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.5	0
(b) % law is enforced	71.5	80.0
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	7.6	6.2
(b) % satisfactory	57.5	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 2.25	$ 1.40
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	7.5
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	55.0	85.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 263 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX IN 1896 WITH THE AVERAGE OF THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1896	Least Accessible Knox County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	3.28
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	5.8
(c) % homes having furnace	0	1.1
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	6.45	18.9
(b) % homes having radio	0	1.35
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	18.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.5	0.75
(b) % law is enforced	50.0	57.5
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	3.8	4.5
(b) % satisfactory	57.5	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.19	$ 1.00
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	0
Community Loyalty or Spirit:		
(a) % adequate	50.0	55.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing:		
(a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 264 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON IN 1906 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Anderson County 1906	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	0.33
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	1.5
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	3.14	12.35
(b) % homes having radio	0	1.45
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	32.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.75	0.50
(b) % law is enforced	68.75	76.25
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	8.0	6.4
(b) % satisfactory	65.0	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 2.25	$ 1.40
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	2.5
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	50.0	55.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

(continued)

**Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County in 1896 with Same Communities in 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Anderson County in 1906 with Average of the Same Communities in 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Comparison of Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County in 1896 with Same Communities in 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Comparison of Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson County in 1906 with Same Communities in 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 265 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN KNOX - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1926	Least Accessible Knox County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	2.25	3.28
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	8.5	5.8
(c) % homes having furnace	0.7	1.1
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	24.0	13.9
(b) % homes having radio	2.2	1.35
(c) % homes having phonographs.	15.8	18.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	1.0	0.75
(b) % law is enforced	72.5	57.5
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	6.0 mis.	4.5 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	80.0	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.00	$ 1.00
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	0
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	85.0	55.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible in Knox County, 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: In the four least accessible communities of Knox, the roads not being developed as well as in the accessible area, many of the young people left the community and went to town to live, while in the most accessible communities they returned home at night. This has caused a much greater loss of young leadership in the least accessible communities.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: The most accessible communities of Knox have a much better system of roads developed; and also give a much greater opportunity for outside work, as they are closer to town and have a better road over which to come. If those from the least accessible communities came in to work the cost for transportation is much greater. The most accessible communities furnished a greater opportunity for growing fruits and vegetables, as they could be gotten to market quicker and with less cost.

The closer contact to market, to work, and to what is going on in other places has caused the people of the most accessible communities to develop a higher standard of living and a better school system than has the least accessible communities.

The fact that the most accessible communities have more home conveniences, and a greater opportunity to work and return home at night has caused them to have a much less loss of young leaders than has the least accessible.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 266. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN ANDERSON WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0.45	0.33
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	2.25	1.5
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	14.7	12.35
(b) % homes having radio	1.85	1.45
(c) % homes having phonographs.	10.85	32.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0	0.50
(b) % law is enforced	80.0	76.25
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	6.2	6.4
(b) % satisfactory	72.5	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.40	$ 1.40
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	7.5	2.5
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	85.0	55.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing:		
(a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Averages of Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County with the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: The high price of labor, and scarcity of girl labor has caused some children, especially girls, to be taken out of school. This is true in both the most and the least accessible communities alike. While this is often blamed on nearby manufacturing development as a cause, the fact is that the inaccessible areas suffered as much or more than the accessible areas. In the least accessible communities several girls have gone to Knoxville, while in the most accessible they are able to return to their homes each night. The least accessible communities have had a much greater loss of young leadership than has the most accessible.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: The most accessible communities of Anderson have a greater chance to produce fruits and vegetables at a profit than do the least accessible because the most accessible have better roads and can get their products on the market quicker and at a lower cost.

The people of the most accessible communities have a much greater chance to work in town and return home at night because their roads to town are better, it takes less time to go, and the cost of transportation is much less.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 267 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926.

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1926	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926.
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	2.25	0.45
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	8.5	2.25
(c) % homes having furnace	0.7	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	24.0	14.7
(b) % homes having radio	2.2	18.5
(c) % homes having phonographs.	15.8	10.85
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	1.0	0
(b) % law is enforced	72.5	80.0
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	6.0	6.2
(b) % satisfactory	80.0	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.00	$ 1.40
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	7.5
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	85.0	85.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox with the Four Most Accessible of Anderson 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: The four most accessible communities of Anderson have had more children, especially girls, out of school to do work than have the four most accessible of Knox. But the temptation to spend money and waste time is said to be greater in the Knox communities than it is in the Anderson.

In both sections alike some of the best young leaders are of course drained from the community because they see greater opportunities in town.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: The four most accessible communities of Knox have abundant outside work at Knoxville, while in Anderson there is more scarcity of work. The four communities of Knox have a good market for almost any farm product, while the market is only fair in Anderson. Because of the fact that the four communities of Knox have a better market and a better supply of work, the people have more money and a higher standard of living; or in other words, they have more luxuries.

The tax burden of the farmers has been reduced much more in Knox than it has in Anderson because the large industries are carrying part of the load.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 268 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1926	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	3.28	0.33
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	5.8	1.5
(c) % homes having furnace	1.1	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	13.9	12.35
(b) % homes having radio	1.35	1.45
(c) % homes having phonographs.	18.2	32.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.75	0.50
(b) % law is enforced	57.6	76.25
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	4.5	6.4
(b) % satisfactory	72.5	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.00	$ 1.40
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	2.5
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	55.0	55.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 269 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX COUNTY WITH AVERAGE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON - 1926

Items.	Most Accessible Knox County 1926	Least Accessible Anderson County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	2.25	0.33
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	8.5	1.5
(c) % homes having furnace	0.7	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	24.0	12.35
(b) % homes having radio	2.2	1.45
(c) % homes having phonographs.	65.8	32.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	1.0	0.50
(b) % law is enforced	72.5	76.25
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	6.0 mis.	6.4 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	80.0	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.00	$ 1.40
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	2.5
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	55.0	55.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 270 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH AVERAGES OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF ANDERSON 1926.

Items.	Least Accessible Knox County 1926	Most Accessible Anderson County 1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	3.28	0.45
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	5.8	2.25
(c) % homes having furnace	1.1	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	13.9	14.7
(b) % homes having radio	1.35	1.85
(c) % homes having phonographs.	18.2	10.85
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.75	0
(b) % law is enforced	57.5	80.0
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	4.5 mis.	6.2 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	72.5	72.5
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.00	$ 1.40
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	7.5
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	55.0	85.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 271 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH PRCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE 1896-1926

Items.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	?	?
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	?	?
(c) % homes having furnace	?	?
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	128.0	115.5
(b) % homes having radio	?	?
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	no data
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	300.0	50.0
(b) % law is enforced	9.4	15.0
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	118.1	20.0
(b) % satisfactory	23.1	26.1
Tax Rate: per $100	- 16.0	- 16.0
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	0
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	30.8	10.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Average of Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with Average of Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson County 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: The four communities in Anderson have a greater tendency to keep children out of school to work than do the four communities of Knox County. The four communities of Anderson also have more girls leaving the community and going to town than do the Knox section.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: The four communities of Knox have a much better market than do the four communities of Anderson.

The four communities of Knox have a better supply of outside work than do the four communities of Anderson County.

Comparison of the Average of the Four Most Accessible Communities in Knox with the Average of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: In the four least accessible communities of Anderson there has been more children taken out of school to work than has been the case in the four most accessible communities of Knox. More of the girls have moved into town to work from the four Anderson communities than have from the four Knox communities.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: The four most accessible communities of Knox have a much greater supply of outside work, better market, and more home conveniences than have the four least accessible com-

MISCELLANEOUS.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

munities of Anderson. Persons from the four Knox communities can more easily get to work in town or to market than can those of Anderson because the distance is not so great and the road is better.

Comparison of Average of Four Least Accessible Communities in Knox County with Average of Four Most Accessible in Anderson County 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: The high price of labor has taken more students out of school to do work at home in the four most accessible Anderson communities than has been the case in the four least accessible of Knox County.

The temptation to spend money and "live a wasteful life" is said to be greater in the Knox section than it is in the Anderson section.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: The market is much better in the four Knox communities but the distance to a small market is less in the Anderson section. There is much more outside work available to the people in the Knox section but the distance to some outside work is much less in the Anderson section.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox 1896 - 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 272 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF ANDERSON WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE 1906-1926

Items.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	?	?
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	?	?
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	98.6	265.9
(b) % homes having radio	?	?
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	no data
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	- 100.0	- 33.3
(b) % law is enforced	10.3	10.9
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	- 19.7	- 6.3
(b) % satisfactory	26.1	11.5
Tax Rate: per $100	- 37.8	- 37.8
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	?	?
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	54.5	10.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing:		
(a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 273 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES OF KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE OF ANDERSON

Items.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	?	?
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	?	?
(c) % homes having furnace	?	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	128.0	98.6
(b) % homes having radio	?	?
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	no data
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	300.0	-100.0
(b) % law is enforced	9.4	10.3
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	118.1	- 19.7
(b) % satisfactory	23.1	26.1
Tax Rate: per $100	- 16.0	- 37.8
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	?
Community Loyalty or Spirit:	30.8	
(a) % adequate	30.8	54.5
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing:		
(a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 274 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	?	?
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	?	?
(c) % homes having furnace	?	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	115.5	265.9
(b) % homes having radio	?	?
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	no data
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	50.0	- 33.3
(b) % law is enforced	15.0	10.9
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	20.0	- 6.3
(b) % satisfactory	26.1	11.5
Tax Rate: per $100	- 16.0	- 37.8
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	?
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	10.0	10.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 275 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	?	?
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	?	?
(c) % homes having furnace	?	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	128.0	265.9
(b) % homes having radio	?	?
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	no data
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	300.0	-33.33
(b) % law is enforced	9.4	10.9
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	118.1	6.3
(b) % satisfactory	23.1	11.5
Tax Rate: per $100	- 16.0	- 37.8
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	?
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	30.8	10.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing:		
(a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities in Anderson 1906 - 1926:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson County:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Most Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percantage Increase in the Four Least Accessible Communities of Anderson County:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 276 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF FOUR LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN KNOX WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FOUR MOST ACCESSIBLE IN ANDERSON

Items.	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Knox County 1896-1926	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Anderson County 1906-1926
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	?	?
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	?	?
(c) % homes having furnace	?	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	115.5	98.6
(b) % homes having radio	?	?
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	no data
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	50.0	- 100.0
(b) % law is enforced	15.0	10.3
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	20.0	- 19.7
(b) % satisfactory	26.1	26.7
Tax Rate: per $100	- 16.0	- 37.8
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	0	?
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	10.0	54.5
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing:		
(a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

** Untabulated Data on Anderson and Knox Counties.

Comparison of the Percentage Increase of the Four Least Accessible Communities of Knox County with the Percentage Increase in the Four Most Accessible Communities of Anderson County:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Table 277. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES.

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
% families having electric lights 1925	20.2	64.7	18	2
Total value of all basic products 1922	$ 4375.00	$28,237.00	54	4
Total purchasing power per capita 1926	$ 155.00	$ 510.00	83	5
Number retail outlets per 100 square miles 1922	31.2	225.5	58	4
Number retail outlets per county 1922	197	1137	67	4
Index for purchasing power 1926..	28	185	53	4
Index for accessibility 1926....	112	577	44	4
Rank of counties among all counties of U. S. in purchasing power 1925	2278	791	74	14
County tax rate 1924	$ 1.60	$ 0.78	25	93
County tax rate for all purposes 1923	$ 1.34	$ 0.70	70	6
Total county taxes collected 1922.	$132,000.00	$885,000.00	40	4
% general property tax per capita is of all taxes per cap. 1922	92.6	89.6	25	51
% increase in general property taxes paid per capita 1912-22..	133.9	142.5	75	68
State taxes from general property tax - 1922	$32,000.00	$455,000.00	50	4
% of total property taxes paid by farm and timber lands 1924.	41.8	20.4	13	4
Number personal income tax returns 1922	173	6817	43	4

Table 277. COMPARISON OF ANDERSON AND KNOX COUNTIES. (continued)

Items.	Anderson	Knox	Rank Anderson	Rank Knox
Number income tax over $5,000 - 1922	4	642	53	4
Net agricultural income per county 1920	$1,114,559.00	$ 3,296,941	77	25
Net agricultural income per farm 1920	$ 665.00	$ 832.00	80	65
Net agricultural income per improved acre 1920	$ 15.70	$ 17.70	82	66
Percentage increase in gross debt less sinking fund 1912 - 1922.....	112.6	149.5	65	57
Index for standard of living 1926	28	91	39	4
Value added by manufacturing 1920	$ 608,000.00	$21,622,000	37	4
Value of public utilities 1922..	$3,024,000.00	$15,780,000	20	4
% of assessed value of all property in public utilities 1922.....	34.0	12.5	4	56
Value of express companies 1922.	$ 2,195.00	$ 38,059	25	3
Value of power and light companies 1922.....	$ 13,800.00	$ 378,808	43	10
Value of telegraph systems 1922.	$ 6,567.00	$ 75,944	59	4
Percent increase in value of public utilities 1916-1924...	80.1	174.0	50	15
Percent increase in value of public utilities 1920-1924...	- 6.1	12.1	41	8

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 278 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN COUNTY IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1925	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1925
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	2.1	2.56
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	8.33	3.98
(c) % homes having furnace	0.48	0.25
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	19.08	19.95
(b) % homes having radio	0.72	0.50
(c) % homes having phonographs.	20.0	27.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.3	0.5
(b) % law is enforced	88.6	90.6
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	6.8 mis.	6.4 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	82.0	90.0
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.90	$ 1.61
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	no data	no data
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	60.0	78.5
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan 1925:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: In the eight communities of Hawkins and also the eight in Sullivan higher wages for labor is given by some people as a harmful change. This is really a benefit because it causes higher wages for the farmers who have some time to work at outside work to get more for their labor.

In the eight communities of Sullivan there is only one community in which the community spirit is said not to be as good as it was.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: In the eight communities of Hawkins the Pressmen's Home furnishes work to several people. There is also one canning factory which furnishes a market for tomatoes. The Kingsport market furnishes market for lumber and wood.

For the eight communities of Sullivan there is plenty of work in Kingsport, so the farmers if not needed at home can earn cash with which to help support their families.

There is a much better market for farm products in Sullivan than in Hawkins. This gives the farmers of Sullivan a chance to practice a more diversified system of farming.

The supply of work in Sullivan gives the young folks a place to work close enough home to enable them to return at night instead of going to Northern cities to work. This keeps the young leaders at home to assist in carrying on the community's business. The people in Hawkins must leave the county to obtain work and this drains the community of its best young leaders.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 279 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGES OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY WITH EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN COUNTY IN 1914.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1914	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1914.
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	0
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	0
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	18.65	17.71
(b) % homes having radio	0	0
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	no data
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0	0
(b) % law is enforced	87.9	90.6
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	6.8 mis.	13.8 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	81.0	82.0
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.30	$ 1.90
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	no data	no data
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	55.0	73.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 280 . COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN SULLIVAN IN 1914 WITH THOSE SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1914	Eight Communities Sullivan County 1925
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	2.56
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	3.98
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0.25
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	17.71	19.96
(b) % homes having radio	0	0.50
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	27.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0	0.5
(b) % law is enforced	90.6	90.6
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	13.8 mis.	6.4 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	82.0	90.0
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.90	$ 1.61
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	no data	no data
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	73.0	78.5
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 281. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF EIGHT COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE OF SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1914	Eight Communities Hawkins County 1925
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	2.1
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	8.33
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0.48
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	18.65	19.08
(b) % homes having radio	0	0.72
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	20.0
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0	0.3
(b) % law is enforced	87.9	88.6
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	6.8 mis.	6.8 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	81.0	82.0
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.30	$ 1.90
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	no data	no data
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	55.0	60.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 282. COMPARISON OF MOST ACCESSIBLE WITH LEAST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS COUNTY - 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County	Least Accessible Hawkins County
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	1.82	0
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	22.2	0
(c) % homes having furnace	7.8	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	27.4	8.6
(b) % homes having radio	1.2	0
(c) % homes having phonographs.	22.8	17.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0.4	0
(b) % law is enforced	89.2	90.0
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	6 mis.	8 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	81.0	90.0
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.90	$ 1.90
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	no data	no data
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	65.0	50.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 283 . COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE 1914-1925

Items.	Percentage Increase Most Accessible Hawkins County 1914-1925	Percentage Increase Least Accessible Hawkins County 1914-1925
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	?	0
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	?	0
(c) % homes having furnace	?	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	12.3	- 4.4
(b) % homes having radio	?	0
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	no data
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	?	0
(b) % law is enforced	0.3	0
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	0	0
(b) % satisfactory	2.5	0
Tax Rate: per $100	46.2	46.2
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	no data	no data
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	30.0	- 16.7
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of the Averages of Eight Communities in Hawkins with Eight Communities in Sullivan 1914:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No manufacturing in either at that time.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No manufacturing in either at that time.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Sullivan in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: In 1914 there was no manufacturing near these eight communities of Sullivan. In 1925 there had been no harmful change except in one community, the community spirit was not so good as formerly.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: In 1914 there was no manufacturing near the eight communities of Sullivan. In 1925 there was plenty of work at Kingsport for all those needing outside work. There is a better market for the farm products. The fact that some have left the farm has kept down an over-production of farm products, giving the man who is still farming a good price for his product.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: In 1914 there was no manufacturing. No farmful effects were reported in 1925.

MISCELLANEOUS.

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Eight Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Those Communities in 1925 (continued):

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: In 1914 there was no manufacturing. In 1925 the Pressmen's Home furnished work to several people and also a market to some farm products. One community had a canning factory that gave a market for several acres of tomatoes.

Comparison of the Most Accessible with the Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins 1925:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No harmful changes in either the most of the least accessible communities of Hawkins County.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: The fact that the Pressmen's Home is located in one of the least accessible communities, there has been about as much changes that are helpful take place in the least accessible communities.

The most accessible have better roads than have the least accessible communities. The canning factory furnishes market for some tomatoes.

Comparison of Percentage Increase in the Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins with Percentage Increase in Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins 1914 - 1925:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 284. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF FIVE MOST ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR SAME COMMUNITIES IN 1925.

Items.	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Most Accessible Hawkins County 1925
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	1.82
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	22.2
(c) % homes having furnace	0	7.8
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	24.4	27.4
(b) % homes having radio	0	1.2
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	22.3
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0	0.4
(b) % law is enforced	87.0	89.2
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	6 mis.	6 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	79.0	81.0
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.30	$ 1.90
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	no data	no data
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	50.0	65.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing: (a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

Table 285 . COMPARISON OF THREE LEAST ACCESSIBLE IN HAWKINS IN 1914 WITH AVERAGE FOR THE SAME COMMUNITIES IN HAWKINS IN 1925.

Items.	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1914	Least Accessible Hawkins County 1925.
Home Conveniences: (a) % homes having running water	0	0
(b) % homes having lights other than oil	0	0
(c) % homes having furnace	0	0
Musical Instruments: (a) % homes having piano or organ ...	9.0	8.6
(b) % homes having radio	0	0
(c) % homes having phonographs.	no data	17.2
Morals: (a) No. centers immorality	0	0
(b) % law is enforced	90.0	90.0
Trading Center: (a) distance to..	8 mis.	8 mis.
(b) % satisfactory	90.0	90.0
Tax Rate: per $100	$ 1.30	$ 1.90
Community Planning: Extent in percentage	no data	no data
Community Loyalty or Spirit: (a) % adequate	60.0	50.0
Other Changes Due to Manufacturing:		
(a) Harmful	**	**
(b) Beneficial	**	**

** Data on this point could not be tabulated numerically but it is presented elsewhere in this chapter.

MISCELLANEOUS

(continued)

** Untabulated Data on Hawkins and Sullivan Counties.

Comparison of Average of Five Most Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Average of Same Communities in 1925:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing: No data.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: But little change in Hawkins County because there is but little manufacturing. Some lumber and wood sold to the Kingsport market, and a market is furnished for several acres of tomatoes by a small canning factory.

Comparison of Three Least Accessible Communities in Hawkins in 1914 with Those Same Communities in 1925:

Harmful Effects Due to Manufacturing. No harmful effects.

Beneficial Effects Due to Manufacturing: The Pressmen's Home furnishes work to several people and a market for a limited amount of farm products.

Table 286. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES.

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
% families having electric lights 1925	35.2	10.3	8	54
Total value of all basic products 1922	$ 9,518.00	$ 6,174.00	17	35
Total purchasing power per capita 1926	$ 344.00	$ 178.00	19	73
Index for purchasing power 1926	62	40	17	36
Rank of counties among all counties of U. S. in purchasing power 1925	1122	1155	23	24
Number retail outlets per 100 square miles 1922	103.8	37.1	6	45
Number retail outlets per county 1922	453	179	5	37
Index for accessibility 1926..	237	110	7	45
County tax rate 1924	$ 1.38	$ 1.70	41	73
County tax rate for all purposes 1923	$ 1.24	$ 1.52	57	83
Total county taxes collected 1922	$ 225,000.00	$ 192,000.00	13	21
% general property tax per capita is of all taxes per capita 1922	85.1	93.7	78	20
% increase in general property taxes paid per capita 1912-1922	211.0	411.2	27	1
State taxes from general property tax - 1922	$ 92,000.00	$ 45,000.00	11	34
% of total property taxes paid by farm and timber lands 1924.....	36.4	67.7	9	61

Table 285. COMPARISON OF SULLIVAN AND HAWKINS COUNTIES. (continued)

Items.	Sullivan	Hawkins	Rank Sullivan	Rank Hawkins
Number personal income tax returns 1922	905	219	7	34
Number income tax over $5,000 1922	57	13	8	30
Net agricultural income per county 1920	$ 2,671,000.00	$ 2,949,000	38	33
Net agricultural income per farm 1920	$ 806	$ 890	68	54
Net agricultural income per improved acre 1920	$ 17.70	$ 16.30	71	77
Percentage increase in gross debt less sinking fund 1912-1922	96.6	379.0	68	38
Index for standard of living 1926	55	30	8	32
Value added by manufacturing 1920	$ 3,989,000	$ 174,000	6	64
Value of public utilities 1922..	$ 4,169,000	$ 2,068,000	10	40
% of assessed value of all property in public utilities 1922	16.3	16.4	35	34
Value of express companies 1922.	$ 3,344.00	$ 2,149	12	30
Value of power and light companies 1922	$ 543,633	$ 60,376	9	31
Value of telegraph systems 1922..	$ 18,441	$ 3,624	38	55
Percent increase in value of public utilities 1916-1924....	176.8	218.2	15	10
Percent increase in value of public utilities 1920-1924....	4.4	- 11.7	19	54

Table 287. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
County tax rate 1924...	$ 1.44	$ 1.78	$ 1.39	$ 1.44
% total property tax paid by farm and timber lands 1924	44.7	64.0	74.7	61.7
% increase in general property tax per capita 1912-1922.....	171.6	178.0	199.4	183.4
% general property tax per capita is of all taxes per capita 1922.	89.9	90.6	88.5	89.7
Total value of all basic products 1922	$ 11,110	$ 5,661	$ 3,735	$ 7,031
Total purchasing power per capita 1926	$ 373	$ 231	$ 211	$ 270
Index for purchasing power 1926	71	39	23	46
Rank of Tennessee's counties among all counties of U. S. in purchasing power 1925	1,503	1,534	1,946	1,667
Number of retail outlets per 100 square miles 1922....	79.5	33.1	32.5	48.0
Number of retail outlets per county 1922.....	404	157	112	222
Index for accessibility 1926....	210	99	95	135
Index for standard of living 1926	42	27	17	28

Table 287. COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE COUNTIES HAVING MOST, MEDIUM, AND LEAST MANUFACTURING. (continued)

Items.	Most Mfg. 1/3 Counties Avorage per County	Medium Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	Least Mfg. 1/3 Counties Average per County	State Average per County.
Value added by manufacturing 1920 ...	$ 6,323,000	$423,000	$ 70,538	$ 2,226,176
% increase in gross debt less sinking fund 1912-1922.....	263.1	960.8	1,110.7	785.2
% assessed value of all property in public utilities 1922	18.6	14.77	9.17	13.14
% decrease in value of public utilities 1920-1924	3.4	14.3	11.3	9.7
% increase in assessed value of public utilities 1916-24....	158.4	89.3	121.5	124.0
Assessed value of Express Companies 1922....	$ 20,451.00	$ 1,504.00	$ 935.00	$ 7,479.00
Assessed value of power and light companies 1922	$ 446,383.00	$ 85,127.00	$20,671.00	$183,897.00
Assessed value of telegraph companies 1922.....	$ 37,406.00	$ 13,564.00	$ 7,424.00	$ 18,266.00
Assessed value of telephone companies 1922....	$ 282,147.00	$ 94,326.00	$ 31,249.00	$133,704.00

MISCELLANEOUS.

Table 288.

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING.

Items.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
% of families having electric lights 1925	58.2	40.6	49.2
Total value of all basic products 1922	$1,487,969,000	$ 359,401,000	$ 960,903,000
Number retail outlets per 100 square miles 1922	181	396	44
Number retail outlets per state 1922	43,499	10,800	26,843
Density of retail stores, all kinds 1922	311.6	2,809.4	1,584.8
State tax rate for state purposes only 1922	$ 0.36	$ 0.50	$ 0.43
% increase in general property tax per capita 1912-1922	157.7	128.3	143.9
% general property tax per capita is of all taxes per capita 1922	82.0	86.1	84.1
% state taxes from general property taxes 1922	39.2	63.2	52.56
Levies of general property tax per capita 1922	$ 33.20	$ 32.35	$ 32.23
No. of (effective incomes) income tax returns for not more than $10,000 (% U. S. in each state) 1922	3.55	0.59	2.04
% population filing returns 1923.	7.28	5.75	6.94
Percentage that Federal Aid to each state is of all Federal taxes collected in that state for the fiscal year 1925			

Table 288 (continued)

COMPARISON OF STATES HAVING MOST MANUFACTURING WITH THOSE HAVING LEAST MANUFACTURING

Itoms.	Most Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	Least Manufacturing ½ States Average per State	United States Average per State
Value added by manufacturing 1921	$698,885,000	$ 61,736,000	$ 373,809,000
Gross debt per capita less sinking fund 1922	$ 76.55	$ 73.40	$ 74.94
% increase in gross debt less sinking fund 1912-1922	182.6	211.9	127.4
% increase in assessdd value of all property per capita 1912-1922.....	71.2	131.5	106.0
Increase per capita assessed value of property subject to general property tax 1912 - 1922	$ 423.45	$ 702.73	$ 565.94
% increase per capita assessed value of property subject to general property tax 1912-1922	$ 147.03	- 107.01	17.42
Gross current income per non-farm dweller 1919	$ 685	$ 613	$ 652
Assessed value of all property per capita 1922....	$ 1,172.08	$ 1,248.54	$ 1,146.16
Assessed value of all property per capita 1923...	$ 1,256.00	$ 1,301.00	$ 1,279.00
Average effective income per capita (amount available for spending - inventory gains and surpluses not included) 1919 - 1923	$ 623	$ 539	$ 580
Actual effective income received by states. % of U. S. total in each state (money actually available for spending each year - inventory gains and surpluses nd inc. 1919-23	$ 3.43	$ 0.70	$ 2.40