of family nd the lower incomes, those of working-
men.

And jus Case 2 in Evenland taken as a yardstick,
we are en pare Cases 1 and 3, both in Oddland, so
Case 3 cou a yardstick to enable us to compare 2 and
4—both i and then go on to 6, 8, etc. In this way
we could ries of points on a corresponding curve for
Evenland.

Comparis wo Countries Possible

Moreov an we thus compare wantabilities between
different f and the same country under the same set
of prices a nditions and subject only to differences in
income, b make comparison between the two coun-
tries, invo t prices as well as different incomes.

All the lculations are supposedly worked out by
using the ps specified, food and rent. But the same
method a y other two sub-groups—food and cloth-
ing, for in thing and rent, as long as the three speci-
fied assum

Moreov method may be applied to two different
times inst fferent places, using, say, 1927 instead of
Oddland a ad of Evenland.

Wantabili Any Commodity Group

Thus f urves of want constructed relate to total
income, g tively the "law of diminishing utility" by
which the alue of a dollar diminishes as the number
of dollars me increases. But by similar methods we
may cons lity curves for the sub-groups, food, rent,
clothing,

Let us group, for instance. The money expendi-
tures for 1 and 3 were $S_1\ \phi_1$ and $S_3\ \phi_3$; while the
physical hat we first called "pounds," but what,
more exac escribed as an index of food consumption—
are $\frac{S_1\phi_1}{F_1}$ e corresponding marginal wants,—*i.e.*, for
food per found to be $W_1 F_1$ and $W_3 F_3$. These last
four expr g to food, the first pair being "physical"
quantities thereof) and the second pair being their