The following article is based on a portion of a detailed report, Tomatoes and Tomato Products—Economic Trends and F.O.B. Price Relationships, by Sidney Hoos, Mimeographed Report No. 185, available on request addressed to Giannini Foundation, 207 Giannini Hall, University of California, Berkeley 4.

The complex structure of the tomato industry in California is affected by the multiple use of tomatoes in processing and by the interaction between the fresh and the processing markets. Furthermore, California growers and canners are concerned with potential influences from other major areas producing tomatoes for processing. In terms of value as well as volume, tomatoes and tomato products—a group—comprise a leading vegetable grown and processed in California.

A significant aspect of the California processed tomato industry concerns the number of different products manufactured from tomatoes. The complete list includes about a dozen different products, the major ones being tomato paste, sauce, catsup, juices, canned whole tomatoes, and puree. Recently, frozen tomato juice concentrate has been introduced, indicating a further widening of the tomato products line; and tomato juice powder—crystals—is at an advanced stage of development for commercial distribution.

The total market for tomatoes in processed forms has increased substantially more than has the market for fresh tomatoes.

During the war years, as compared with the prewar period, the percentages for juice, puree, and paste increased, while the percentage for canned whole tomatoes decreased sharply. Since the wartime developments, the canned whole tomato outlet has remained near 10%, juice at 13%, paste near 32%, but sauce and catsup have gained some percentage points. Puree, however, has declined substantially and in recent years has been under its prewar percentage level. The minor products—as a group—have remained stable at near 10%. Tomato paste remains the largest single outlet for California processing tomatoes. In recent years, paste and sauce together have accounted for nearly half of the total tonnage of California tomatoes that are processed.

Production

During the past 15 years or so, a sharp upward trend developed in the national production of tomatoes but the trend increased much more sharply in California than in other producing states.

From 1939-1943 to 1949-1953 national production of tomatoes for processing increased by about 25% compared with about 130% in California. Production decreased in 1954-55 by some 500,000 tons for the national figure and by about 100,000 tons in California. In terms of proportions, California tomato production for manufacture into products accounted for 25% of the national tonnage in 1939-1943 compared with 45% in 1949-1953 and about 50% in 1954-55.

Tomato acreage—in both California and the nation—advanced to peaks in the period of the war and the immediate postwar years, then receded. This occurred relatively more sharply for the processed than the fresh outlets, reflecting the wartime acreage expansion. The processing tomato acreage decline has been relatively sharper in California than the country in general.

The continued upward trend in yield per acre has been one of the more outstanding developments in the commercial tomato-growing industry. But the upward trend has been much steeper in California, with an increase for the fresh market of more than three tons per acre between 1939-1943 and 1954-55 compared to about 2½ of a ton increase for the country during the same period.

The state's 1954-55 yield for processing was about 41% above the average yield for 1939-1943; during the same period, the national yield increased about 36%.

The interaction between acreage and yield resulted in production changes. The national production of tomatoes for processing trended up from the late 1940's through 1948, then declined. A sharp rise to an all-time peak in 1951 was followed by declines in the next several years. Without the rising trend in yields during the past half-dozen years, national production would have declined more than it actually did.

In California, there was an upward trend in acreage of processing tomatoes from 1938 through 1947. Postwar adjustment was reflected in a sharp cutback, but suddenly in 1951 acreage reached an all-time peak after which there was another sharp cutback to near the 1948-1950 average.

California per acre yield of processing tomatoes had been persistently upward, influencing the long-term trend in production. The short-term trends in production have been influenced by the variable short-term trends in acreage.

The over-all average farm price levels
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—now ready for distribution—

Single copies of the following publications except the Manual—or a catalog of Agricultural Publications may be obtained without charge from the local office of the Farm Advisor or by addressing a request to: Agricultural Publications, 22 Giannini Hall, University of California, Berkeley 4.

IRRIGATION WATER RIGHTS IN CALIFORNIA, by Wells A. Hutchins, Cir. 452.

FARM FEEDING BEEF CATTLE TO MARKET HOMEGROWN FEEDS, by Horace T. Strong, Richard G. Jones, Robert F. Miller, and Roy V. Parker, Cir. 453.

BARN MOW HAYDRYING FOR BETTER QUALITY HAY, by John B. Dobie and M. Butlerfield, Leaf. 62.

MARKET HOMEGROWN FEEDS, by Robert F. Miller, and Roy V. Parker, Cir. 454.

GROWING CANE BERRIES IN YOUR GARDEN, by Leonard C. Gibbs and H. M. Butterfield, Leaf. 62.

DONATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Gifts to the University of California for research by the Division of Agricultural Sciences accepted in May 1956

BERKELEY

American Cyanamid Company .......................................... 1 gal. Thimet
For walnut insect investigations
California Strawberry Institute .................................. 2,500 strawberry plants
For research work on verticillium wilt
Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc. ....................... $1,061.61
For study of use of corn syrups in canning of fruits
The Dow Chemical Company ................................... Two 5-gallon drums of Telone
For nematode control studies
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Grasselli Chemicals Dept. ...................... 200 lbs. Copper A
For development and use of antibiotics to control diseases of plants
Geigy Agricultural Chemicals .................................. 160 lbs. Diazinon, 25% wettable powder
For walnut insect investigations
S. B. Penick & Company ....................................... 600 lbs. Ryanicide 100
For walnut insect investigations
Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co. ............................. 8 l-gal. cans Penco Sytan
For nematode control studies

DAVIS

American Iron & Steel Institute, % United States Steel Corp. .......................... 4890 lbs. galvanized 7/8" corrugated steel sheets
For experimental livestock shade in the Imperial Valley Field Station
American Potash Institute, Inc. .................................. $2,000.00
For leaf analysis studies
California Olive Association ...................................... $2,500.00
For investigation of cultural problems of the olive
California Olive Association ...................................... $2,500.00
For food technological research on olives
Henninger, Inc. ................................................ $750.00
For research relating to the utilization of by-products from the egg industry
Herbel California Fruits Products Co., Inc. ......................... $375.00
For study of the effect of nitrogen fertilizers on the quality of processed fruits
Monsanto Chemical Company, Organic Chemicals Division .................. $2,000.00
For research on insecticidal action of chemical compounds

SMITH, KLINE & FRENCH LABORATORIES, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DIV.
For research on the use of thorazine on fowl $2,327.00
For study of the role of the sweetener in food preservation
Sugar Research Foundation, Inc. .................................. $1,125.00
To study the sweetness in fruit
Stauffer Chemical Company .................................. $2,500.00
For study of the utility of ferric sulfate and compound T-867 as soil amendments

LOS ANGELES

George J. Ball, Inc. ................................................ $100.00
For flower breeding research

RIVERSIDE

Air Pollution Foundation ..................................... $8,000.00
For studies of plant response to smog
American Potash Institute, Inc. .................................. $2,000.00
For research on soils and plant nutrition
The Upjohn Company ............................................... $1,500.00
For research on insecticidal properties of selected organic compounds

STATEWIDE

Naugatuck Chemical Division, U. S. Rubber Company .......................... 5 gals. Alamine #3 weed killer; 2 drums (100#) of Alamine #3 20% granular weed killer
For weed control research
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. .................................. 2 lbs. Nebaron
For experimental herbicide use in lawns and alfalfa
Shell Chemical Corporation ................................... 200 lbs. of 3% aldrin granules
To be used in controlling wireworms prior to potato planting
Stauffer Chemical Company .................................. 60 gallons Vapam soil fumigant; 100# Agr. ferric sulfate
For soil research
Velcrit Chemical Corporation ................................. 200 lbs. of 2% Hesperichlor insecticide
For soil research
Wheeler, Reynolds & Stauffer .................................. 50 lbs. Anchor Carbon Bisulphide
For weed control studies

TOMATOES
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gross returns per ton at the first delivery point—for tomatoes during wartime and postwar years exceeded those of the prewar years, reflecting expanded markets and inflationary tendencies acting on prices of most products. After the 1949–1953 period, state and national prices tended to decline for both fresh and processing tomatoes. The decline was more for processing tomatoes than for the fresh market and more in California than in the country at large. For the fresh market, California tomatoes return a higher farm price per ton and gross return per acre than the national average. In the processing outlets, California farm prices per ton average less than the national price; but California's gross return per acre exceeds the national figure because of the state's sufficiently higher level of yield.

Sidney Hoos is Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of California, Berkeley.