

The news in this publication is released for the press on the date indicated below.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA NEWS LETTER

Published weekly by the University of North Carolina for its Bureau of Extension.

JUNE 28, 1916

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL. II, NO. 31

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, J. G. deK. Hamilton, L. R. Wilson, L. A. Williams, R. H. Thornton, G. M. McKie. Entered as second-class matter November 14, 1914, at the postoffice at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of August 24, 1913.

NORTH CAROLINA CLUB STUDIES

MORE THAN 800 PRESENT

As the University News Letter goes to press, the first week of the Summer School, the enrollment reaches 922 or nearly a hundred more than were registered during the entire session last year. And still they come. The total looks like a thousand this summer.

This increasing enrollment represents the response of the State to the increasing advantages offered by the University to the teachers of North Carolina.

A LAND OF HOMES

Legislation which opens or closes the door of opportunity to the man who wants a home and is worthy of it touches the very vitals of society. Give us a land of homes and the people will take care of the problems of government.

Decrease the percentage of homes and the very foundation of government is weakened.

The relative number of home-owners in the United States is rapidly decreasing. This is not an evidence of national weakening merely; it is national weakening in process.—Congressman H. W. Summers.

OUR COUNTY EXHIBITS

I feel like I'm robbing my county when I take money for printing our county financial exhibit year by year, said a North Carolina editor the other day.

What he was saying was not quite so clear to us at the time as it is now. The files of The North Carolina Club are being filled with the yearly financial exhibits of the counties, clipped from the county papers as they come in.

Most of them are beyond understanding or interpretation. Some of them are an affront to the taxpayers; they really are a sinful waste of printers ink. It is conceivable that a student with weeks of effort could group expenditures, reduce them to classified accounts and really know something definite about county finances; but in many or most instances it would be a hard task for an expert accountant.

Usually no exhibit of receipts is shown; no exhibit of bond indebtedness, or county assets, or unpaid, outstanding, current accounts. How the county really stands at the end of the year, nobody can tell from the published exhibits, in the vast majority of instances.

And by the way, the Orange County financial statement for 1915 has never yet been given to the public as the law requires.

Three counties are to be congratulated upon their published exhibits—Wake, Granville, and Surry. There may be others in this class, but their exhibits have not yet come under examination in our Club studies of North Carolina.

By the way, if county officials or thoughtful citizens anywhere would like to see a simple, understandable financial balance sheet for a county, drop us a postcard and we will take pleasure in mailing them the very best one we have so far found in the South.

AN UNSTABLE AGRICULTURE

Here is a phrase used so often in discussing the market and credit problems of the farmer that it is worth while to ask what it means.

A farm civilization is financially unstable, unsound, and unsafe when the farm income is derived from crop sales merely or mainly, whether the crop be cotton, tobacco, wheat, corn, or whatnot.

For instance, in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Texas more than three-fifths of the crop wealth from year to year is produced by cotton alone. In 24 counties of North Carolina more than three-fifths of the crop wealth is produced by cotton or tobacco or both; in Anson, Wilson and Robeson, more than three-fourths, and in Scotland county more than four-fifths of it. In North Dakota where interest rates are so high, nearly nine-tenths of the farm wealth is produced by crops alone, and barely one-tenth of it by livestock. In South Dakota more than seven-tenths of the annual farm wealth is produced by crops alone.

All these are regions of high interest rates. They are all deficient in livestock farming. Soils deteriorate. Cash in-

comes from crop sales descend like an avalanche during a brief market season and disappear almost as quickly. Profits upon investment, time, and labor turn upon market quotations as upon the spin of a roulette wheel.

Small Farms Devoted to Cash Crops Alone

Small farms, devoted to cash crops mainly or merely, do not yield safe, steady, reasonable dividends from year to year.

This fact appears in a region of small farms, devoted to hand-made crops like cotton and tobacco. For instance, our investment in North Carolina in work-stock and farm implements, on a per acre basis, is not far below that of Iowa. In North Carolina, the average is one work-animal per 25 cultivated acres, and \$2.10 worth of implements for each cultivated acre. In Iowa the average is one work-animal per 19 cultivated acres, and \$3.23 worth of implements for each cultivated acre. But in North Carolina the farms average only 37 cultivated acres. In Iowa they average 130 acres.

We average barely more than one work-animal per farm; they average seven per farm. They can invest profitably in labor saving machinery, and distribute hand and horse power evenly throughout the year, with a minimum waste of time and energy. We are crop farmers mainly on small farms. They are livestock farmers mainly on medium size farms.

As a result 605,000 farmers in North Carolina produced crops and animal products in the census year worth \$180,000,000; while 341,000 farmers in Iowa produced farm wealth worth \$596,000,000. That is to say, barely more than half the number of farmers in Iowa produced more than three times the wealth. While the North Carolina farmer produced an average of \$290 in farm wealth the Iowa farmer produced an average of \$1,680; or nearly six times as much.

But the contrast is even more startling when the per capita country wealth of the two states is compared: in North Carolina it was \$322 in the census year, but in Iowa it was \$3,386.

Livestock Farming on Medium Size Farms

Here, then, is the reason in the very nature of things why farmers borrow money on personal security at an average total cost of 7.9 per cent in Iowa, and 10.2 per cent in North Carolina. And why loans on land mortgages cost Iowa farmers an average of 5.9 per cent and North Carolina farmers 7.7 per cent. And also why the insurance companies let Iowa farmers have \$150,000,000 at less than 6 per cent on farm lands. The insurance loans on farm lands in this one state are more than in the entire South.

The whole story lies in the fact that farming in Iowa is a sound, safe, well-established business. It yields reasonable returns upon the investment, and can be safely counted upon to do so in any kind of season or upon any turn of the market. It is livestock farming based on soil building instead of crop farming based on soil waste. Farm properties steadily increase in value. Farm land in such a region is worth more and more in the open market and in the credit centers.

These are some of the things covered by the term safe agriculture.

SPECIAL CITY SCHOOL TAX RATES IN NORTH CAROLINA

City	Property	Poll
Burlington	30	90
Chapel Hill	58 1-3	175
Charlotte	30	90
Concord	40	120
Durham	20	60
Edenton	30	90
Elizabeth City	40	120
Goldsboro	31 1-3	94
Graham	30	90
Greenville	40	120
Henderson	30	90
Hickory	40	120
High Point	45	135
Laurinburg	40	120
Lenoir	66 2-3	200
Lexington	65	195
Lumberton	30	90
Marion	60	180
Morganton	60	180
Mount Airy	35	105
New Bern	25	75
Raleigh	35	105
Reidsville	30	90
Rocky Mount	40	120
Salisbury	20	60

COMMONWEALTH BUILDING

Attorney-General T. W. Bickett

The obligation and the opportunity of the hour is to make life on the farm just as profitable and just as attractive as life in the town. The man who most deeply feels this obligation, who most clearly sees this opportunity will most surely serve his day and generation. He who would render this high service must bring to his task a serene faith, superb common sense and supreme unselfishness.

The first step to be taken is to give to every man who tills the soil a fair chance to own it. This is the mud-sill upon which alone can be builded a profitable and attractive rural civilization. The small farm owned by the man who tills it is the best plant-bed in the world on which to grow men. A landless population will always make a Mexico, but the citizen standing in the doorway of his own home is at once the builder and the bulwark of the commonwealth.

Statesville	30	90
Tarboro	40	120
Thomasville	40	120
Washington	45	135
Wilson	30	90

Wilmington and Winston-Salem are omitted from the above table because the schools of Wilmington are included in the country school system and paid for out of the general fund. The schools of Winston-Salem are supported out of the general fund of the city, being considered part of the city government.—E. C. Brooks, in N. C. Education.

THE IRON LAW OF TRADE

Keep producers and consumers as far apart as possible; pass commodities from one to the other through as many hands as possible; pay producers as little as possible; charge consumers as much as possible—such is the iron law of trade.

The unorganized, whether producers or consumers, are the legitimate prey of the organized; and trade is a closely knit organization down to the last man and the detail involved in it. As a result the consumer gets too little for his money and the farmer too little for his products.

Team-Work Necessary

Artificial interference with the laws of trade has far less to do with the farmer's end of the problem than teamwork in production, teamwork in lowering cost units of production, teamwork in grading and standardizing products to suit trade demands, teamwork in warehousing and trading, teamwork in securing market information, and teamwork in assembling collateral and borrowing money.

Some of these things must have the support of legislation, but here again the attention and action of lawmakers, state and national, can be secured only by teamwork.

Both consumers and producers can afford to think of Ben Franklin's saying: We must all hang together or we shall all hang separately.

Decreasing the distance between producers and consumers is a market problem of critical importance to both.

CROP WEALTH PER FARM WORKER

The table in this issue is the work of Mr. O. L. Goforth of Durham county. It is based on the 1910 Census volumes on Agriculture and Occupations.

It is one of some forty-odd studies by University students on The Small Per Capita Country Wealth of North Carolina. In the Census year it was only \$322 against \$995 in the country-at-large, \$860 in Oklahoma, and \$3,386 in Iowa.

They have been hunting down the causes for our feeble wealth-retaining power in North Carolina, the consequences, and the remedies.

In the Census year, the production of crop wealth per farm worker ranged from \$135 in New Mexico to \$1,378 in North Dakota. In North Carolina our average was \$236, and our rank was 44th. Only Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and New Mexico made a poorer showing.

Acre for acre we outranked 40 states in power to produce crop wealth; but work-

er for worker we fell behind 43 states of the Union.

Food for Reflection

The contrasts are startling. In North Carolina 605,000 farm workers on 8,813,000 cultivated acres, produced crop values amounting to \$142,890,000. But in North Dakota 132,000 farm workers, on 20,455,000 cultivated acres, produced crop values amounting to \$180,635,000.

That is to say, we had more than four times as many farm workers as in North Dakota, we cultivated less than half as many acres, but they produced greater crop wealth by nearly \$40,000,000. In per-acre production we beat North Dakota two and a half times over; in per-worker production North Dakota beat us nearly six times over.

Here indeed is food for reflection. Our soils produce abundantly, but our farmers produce meagrely.

The Counties That Lead

The production of crop wealth per farm worker in North Carolina in the Census year ranged from \$111 in Cherokee to \$692 in Edgecombe.

Six counties in North Carolina lead all the rest by a large margin. Named in descending order they are Edgecombe, Scotland, Robeson, Greene, Johnston, and Wilson. Production per farm worker in Edgecombe was \$692, and in Scotland \$604. In all these counties the bulk of the crop wealth produced consists of cotton or tobacco or both—the two most valuable of the standard farm crops, in per-acre yields.

Thirty-six counties more were above the state average of \$236. For the most part they are in the cotton and tobacco region.

The Counties That Lag

Only seven counties in the state produced less crop wealth per farmer than the French farmers, whose average is \$126. Named in descending order they are Henderson, Graham, Swain, Watauga, Wilkes, Mitchell, and Cherokee. They are all mountain counties, and the bulk of their crop wealth is produced by grain and forage crops. The per acre value of such crops is everywhere small when compared with that of cotton and tobacco.

In some of these counties, as Alleghany, Ashe, and Watauga, the cultivated acre-

age is small. Large areas are in permanent pasture, and the cash income is from livestock sales. The crop wealth produced per farm worker in Alleghany was only \$172, but the per capita rural wealth in farm properties was \$560. Edgecombe leads in per capita crop production, but Alleghany leads in per capita rural wealth.

Ashe ranks 84th in the production of per capita crop wealth, but 6th in the power to retain farm wealth per inhabitant. Watauga ranks 93rd in the per capita production of crop wealth, but 14th in the power to retain farm wealth. A large part of the farm prosperity of Alleghany, Ashe, and Watauga lies in the livestock farming of this region.

Tenacity a Fundamental Evil

We shall always need to grow cotton and tobacco in North Carolina, but we must learn to produce larger yields on the same or smaller areas, and to lower production costs.

We need farms of larger average size. In North Carolina they average 34 cultivated acres, in North Dakota 275 acres. We need farms large enough to re-enforce human labor advantageously with horse and machine power. In North Carolina the farm worker cultivates only 14 acres upon an average; in North Dakota 156 acres.

We need more farms cultivated by owners and fewer by tenants, or we shall not cease to be crop farmers merely or mainly. We need to rise into livestock farming as in Iowa where the per capita wealth in farm properties is \$3,386 against \$322 in North Carolina. Livestock farming in a tenacity region is well nigh an impossibility. Our farm system needs to be well-balanced, stable, and safe, and in this all important matter farm tenacity is a rock of offense.

The greatest hindrance to agricultural development in the South today lies in tenacity farming; and for two weeks or so we have had a chance to study this problem at close range in Mississippi, where the evil is most acute in the United States. Later we shall be submitting some notes on Mississippi, made on our zigzag journey throughout the state in early June.

CROP PRODUCTION PER FARM WORKER IN NORTH CAROLINA, 1910 CENSUS

O. L. GOFORTH, Durham County, University of North Carolina

Rank	County	State Average, \$236	Per Capita Production	Rank	County	Per Capita Production
1	Edgecombe	692	50	Lincoln	223	
2	Scotland	604	50	Hyde	223	
3	Robeson	465	52	Chatham	222	
4	Greene	429	53	Pasquotank	218	
5	Johnston	411	54	Stanly	215	
6	Wilson	404	55	Onslow	212	
7	Pitt	377	56	Washington	211	
8	Wayne	370	57	Cumberland	208	
9	Lenoir	366	58	Craven	206	
10	Halifax	341	59	Yadkin	204	
10	Anson	341	60	Pender	198	
12	Cleveland	334	61	Tyrrell	194	
13	Mecklenburg	328	62	Perquimans	190	
14	Martin	323	63	Randolph	189	
15	Nash	312	64	Surry	188	
16	Hertford	311	65	Polk	187	
17	Wake	305	66	Rockingham	186	
17	Jones	305	67	Buncombe	183	
19	Northampton	302	68	Bladen	176	
20	Guilford	301	69	Forsyth	175	
21	Pamlico	290	69	Clay	175	
22	Sampson	288	71	Alamance	174	
23	Warren	275	72	Alleghany	172	
24	Person	273	73	Montgomery	170	
25	Dare	270	74	Alexander	166	
26	Camden	268	74	Davie	165	
26	Union	268	76	Rutherford	158	
28	Duplin	265	76	Haywood	156	
29	Beaufort	264	78	Caldwell	157	
30	Richmond	254	78	Moore	157	
31	Bertie	258	80	Jackson	146	
32	Gates	256	81	Yancy	145	
33	Caswell	255	82	Transylvania	143	
34	Catawba	253	83	Brunswick	142	
35	Vance	252	84	Ashe	136	
36	Cabarrus	251	85	Madison	134	
37	Stokes	245	85	Carteret	133	
38	Franklin	241	87	Macon	130	
39	Davidson	240	87	Durham	130	
39	Granville	240	89	McDowell	127	
39	Chowan	240	89	New Hanover	127	
42	Harnett	238	91	Burke	126	
43	Iredell	236	92	Henderson	124	
44	Rowan	233	93	Graham	122	
44	Columbus	233	93	Swain	122	
46	Gaston	230	93	Watauga	122	
47	Lee	227	93	Wilkes	122	
47	Orange	227	97	Mitchell	118	
49	Currituck	225	98	Cherokee	111	