

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA NEWS LETTER

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

The news in this publica-
tion is released for the press on
receipt.

NE 30, 1920

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL VI, NO. 32

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, L. R. Wilson, E. W. Knight, D. D. Carroll, J. B. Bullitt.

Entered as second-class matter November 14, 1914, at the Postoffice at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of August 24, 1912

PUBLIC WELFARE INSTITUTES

COURSES AND LECTURERS

Thirty-one college-quarter, summer courses, June 22-August 3 and August 3-September 13, for public welfare officials, and social workers of all types; under the joint direction of Dr. Edward W. Odum, formerly dean of the college of Liberal Arts of Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., and now Kenan Professor of Sociology, University of North Carolina; Dr. Philip Klein, director of Education and Research, Southern Division of the American Red Cross; and Hon. Roland F. Beasley, State Commissioner of Public Welfare.

1. Social Problems, by Dr. H. W. Odum.
2. Social Research Laboratory, by the staff.
3. Rural Social Problems, by E. C. Branson, Kenan Professor of Rural Social Science, University of North Carolina.
4. Rural Economics, by S. H. Hobbs, Assistant Professor of Rural Social Science, University of North Carolina.
5. Rural Research Laboratory, by Messrs. Branson and Hobbs.
6. Small Town Problems, by Dr. Odum.
7. General Economics, by Professor D. D. Carroll, dean of the School of Commerce, University of North Carolina.
8. Theories of Economic Reform, by Professor Carroll.
9. Public Finance, by Professor Carroll.
10. Introduction to Psychology, by Dr. J. B. Dashiell, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of North Carolina.
11. Social Psychology, by Professor Dashiell.
12. Survey Methods, by Mr. A. F. Gilman, Survey Department of the Southern Division, American Red Cross.
13. Visual Instruction and Mass Education, by Dr. W. K. Dudley, Extension Division, University of Wisconsin.
14. Family Case Work, by Miss Kathryn Farra, Supervisor of Field Work, Southern Division, American Red Cross, and Dr. J. F. Steiner, director of Educational Service of the National Red Cross.
15. Social Psychiatry, by Dr. Bernard Glueck, Professor of Mental Hygiene, New York School of Social Work.
16. Juvenile Delinquency and Prevention, by Mr. Harry G. Newman, State Board of Public Welfare.
17. Child Welfare, by Mr. Newman.
18. Child Welfare Institute, by Mrs. A. D. Hasbrouck, National Child Welfare Association.
19. Child Psychology, by Dr. Dashiell.
20. Story Telling, by Miss Henriette Casseling, Atlanta Public Schools.
21. Play and Recreation, by Dr. E. Lindeman, State College for Women, Greensboro.
22. Public Health, by Dr. E. A. Abernethy, Health Officer, University of North Carolina.
23. Social Hygiene, by Dr. George W. Hunter, Carleton College, Minn.
24. Home Hygiene, by Miss Martha Altner, Nursing Department, Southern Division, American Red Cross.
25. Home Dietetics, by Miss Arthur, head of the department of Dietetics and Home Economics, Southern Division, American Red Cross.
26. Home Economics: Cooking, by Miss Frieda Rentchler, Chapel Hill High School.
27. Problems of the Country School, by Dr. E. W. Knight, School of Education, University of North Carolina.
28. Administration of Social Work, by Mr. A. H. Burnett, School of Public Welfare, University of North Carolina.
29. Record Keeping in Social Work, by Mrs. Mary Burnett, School of Public Welfare, University of North Carolina.
30. Personal Conference Periods, by Dr. Odum.
31. Field Work in Family Case Work, Laboratory Studies and Special Investigations, and County Surveys, by Miss Kathryn Farra, supervisor Southern Division, American Red Cross, and Professor A. H. Burnett, formerly director Health Division, Cincinnati Social Unit, and Mrs. A. H. Burnett.

SPECIAL LECTURES

In addition to two or three men of national importance, whose names may not now be listed, the lecturers before the Public Welfare Institutes June 22-September 13 will include:

Governor Thomas W. Bickett.
Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay, professor of Social Legislation, Columbia University.
Dr. Bernard Glueck, head of the department of Mental Hygiene, New York School of Social Work.
Dr. Frank P. Watson, director Pennsylvania School for Social Service.
Dr. E. L. Morgan, director of Rural Service, American Red Cross.
President H. W. Chase, University of North Carolina.
Hon. E. C. Brooks, State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
Dr. N. W. Walker, University of North Carolina.
Dr. J. F. Steiner, director Educational Service, American Red Cross.
Hon. Roland F. Beasley, State Commissioner of Public Welfare.
Dr. Amos W. Butler, State Commissioner of Charities and Corrections, Indiana.
Mrs. Clarence A. Johnson, director Child Welfare, State Board of Public Welfare.
Dr. W. S. Rankin, State Superintendent of Public Health.
Hon. Joseph C. Logan, assistant manager, Southern Division, American Red Cross.
Mr. Murray A. Auerbach, secretary Southern Division National Anti-Tuberculosis Association.
Miss Margaret Byington, director Field Service, American Red Cross.
Mr. Virgil Johnson, secretary National Travellers' Aid Society.
Dr. Philip Klein, director Education and Research, Southern Division, American Red Cross.
Miss Jane Van de Vrede, director department of Nursing, Southern Division, American Red Cross.
Dr. Thomas H. McDonald, director Federal Public Roads Bureau.
Miss Ada S. Woolfolk, director Chapter Service, American Red Cross.

A PROGRESSIVE STATE

One of the significant reconstruction movements comes from that progressive social state of North Carolina. I so designate it deliberately because in no other state in the South, and hardly in any other state of the Union, is there a more definitely organized social movement, partly under state auspices and largely at the inspiration of a state welfare council that could with helpfulness be studied and adopted elsewhere. The University of North Carolina has been another leading factor. That aggressive institution has a North Carolina Club which this year is following the lead of the State Reconstruction Commission and its committees. To this end, the Club has established a working relationship with the Commission. On October 27th, the Club elected an unofficial member of the State Reconstruction Commission and, at a subsequent meeting, a member of each Commission committee. These men brought back to the Club from time to time the wisdom of the Commission and the Commission committees.

Each Club committee chairman chose his cabinet of conferees, laid out the committee work, held committee meetings at will, and passed on to the Club on stated schedule dates such committee findings as the committee thought to be fundamentally necessary to progress under the new order of things in North Carolina. Each committee was set to the task of puzzling out and stating "What is, What ought to be, and What possibly might be in North Carolina. No proposal, policy, or plan will be effective unless it appeals to the common sense and the common aspirations of the common man in the commonwealth."

Thus during the year 1919-20 the work of the wisely called North Carolina Club will be spent upon hammering out A State Reconstruction Program that will evidence a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. This document will be finally fashioned for Club approval, by the collaboration commit-

A GREAT QUARTER

Public Welfare Institute
June 22-Sept. 13

Child-Welfare Institute
July 5-10

Commercial Club Secretaries Institute
August 9-14

Community Service Institute
August 10-20

State and County Council
August 17-19

Write for Bulletins

tee, after the reports and findings of the various Club committees are rendered as per the adopted schedule. It will be the subject of the final Club session in early June, 1920.

The University News Letter carries a bibliography of books, bulletins, reports, clippings, and the like, arranged according to the schedule adopted for committee investigations and findings.

Certainly an ambitious and useful program which other state universities and organizations might well follow!—Dr. Clinton Rogers Woodruff, in The Living Church.

THE BEAUFORT BULLETIN

Beaufort County: Economic and Social, is the title of a booklet of eleven chapters just finished and sent to the printers by the Beaufort-Hyde County Club at the University of North Carolina, as follows:

1. Historical Background.—Miss Lydia Rodman.
2. Washington.
3. Natural Resources.—E. W. Clark, Jr.
4. Industries and Opportunities.—B. L. Susman.
5. Facts About the Folks.—E. J. Harris.
6. Wealth and Taxation.—Jack Warren.
7. The Public Schools of Beaufort.—Jack Oden.
8. Farm Conditions and Practices.—R. B. Lee.
9. Food and Feed Production and the Local Market Problem.—H. C. Harris.
10. Things to be Proud of in Beaufort.—J. M. Taylor.
11. Our Problems and Their Solution.—D. D. Topping.

The officership of the Beaufort-Hyde Club is: D. D. Topping, editor-in-chief, B. L. Susman, business manager, assisted by Messrs. Clark and Oden.

These economic and social studies of Beaufort were undertaken at the instance of W. L. Vaughn, Esq., and the Washington Chamber of Commerce, which is undertaking the distribution of the 3,000 copies of the bulletin. The publication was financed by the advertising of the business men of the county.

Other County Bulletins

Each county in the state ought to have such a study of its local conditions, enterprises, organizations, and possibilities, and it can have it if only the home folks will call upon their boys in the University, and help them to finance the undertaking.

Five such bulletins have already been issued—Sampson, Durham, Wake, Rockingham, and Rutherford.

The Gaston County Bulletin by Messrs. S. H. Hobbs, Jr., and T. J. Brawley is just coming from the press. The Granville, Surry, Pitt, Halifax, Union, Lenoir, and Guilford bulletins are ready for the printers. They await the interest and activity of thinkers and leaders among the home folks in these seven counties.

COUNTRY HOME CONVENIENCES

LETTER SERIES No. 16

32 vs 110-VOLT LIGHTING PLANTS—II

Last week we told you about the manufacturer who advertised that the full power of his plant could be delivered anywhere within a radius of one mile. You have heard of the man who couldn't see the forest for the trees. Well this manufacturer's trouble was that he couldn't see the trees for the forest. His big idea was that fundamentally the higher the voltage the farther you can transmit electrical power. And he was trying without saying so directly to show how much better his plant was than the ordinary 32-volt plant. He got into trouble because he couldn't see the trees of economic fact in his forest of engineering supremacy.

Quite a number of manufacturers are putting out 110-volt plants, some without and some with storage batteries. The superiority of the 110-volt plant is variously stated by explaining that the outside wiring for the 32-volt plant costs much more. Some say 8 to 15 times as much, some 11 to 17 times. And what is more they prove it too—to their own satisfaction. They use the same formula calculating the size of wire that all electrical engineers use. Their mathematics is perfect. But their result is wrong.

Stuffing the Ballot Box

One reason why their figures are too high is that they do not apply the formula correctly. They stuff the electrical ballot box by not comparing the two plants on the same basis. Theoretically the wire for a 32-volt plant should cost almost exactly 12 times as much as that for a 110-volt plant. For technical reasons connected with the standard size

of wires that can be bought this maximum theoretical figure is rarely ever reached. The cost of 32-volt wiring is more often from 5 to 8 times the cost of 110-volt wiring.

Even these relative costs, however, apply only in case the figure obtained by multiplying the number of watts to be used by the length of the line in feet is greater than about 300,000.

For Example

Suppose for example that a farmer has a barn 200 ft. from his plant and he has lamps to the amount of 200 watts to be lighted at the same time. Allowing a loss of two volts in the 32-volt line, it would require No. 8 wire costing 6c. per foot or a total of \$24 for the wire. A proportionate loss on the 110-volt system would be 6.88-volts and the size wire called for by the formula would be No. 19. But No. 19 wire is altogether too small because it is not nearly strong enough mechanically. From the standpoint of strength the smallest size of wire that should be used for outside wiring on the farm is No. 10. As this costs about 4.5c. per foot the total cost of wire for the 110-volt plant would be \$18. The outside wiring for a 32-volt plant for a case of this kind therefore costs only one-third more than for a 110-volt plant.

As the distance increases, or the load to be transmitted, or both increase the comparison favors more and more the 110-volt plant, but never to the extent of 15 to 17 times. Those figures are more than extravagant. They are impossible on a fair basis of comparison of the two plants.—P. H. D.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

In my judgment there has never been a time at which the systematic and impartial study of social and economic questions has been so urgent as the present day. We stand on the threshold of a new age. The problems which confront us and the other leading democratic states of the world are of the most complex and the most vital character, and can only be solved by patient examination conducted in a spirit of scientific detachment accompanied by a wide diffusion of adult civic education. To avert grave conflict between classes and interests we must in good time inquire into and determine so far as possible their causes and conditions. We need, therefore, today and at once, a much more adequate provision for social research and for giving publicity to the results of such research.—Lord James Bryce in The Intercollegian.

COOPERATIVE MARKETING

During the first hundred days of 1920 98 cooperative carloads of hogs were shipped from 22 Arkansas counties. The 6,480 hogs in the cars were owned by 700 different farmers, or an average of more than 10 shippers to each carload. Returns totaling \$127,590 were received for these hogs at the central markets. The average cost of shipping was only 94.3 cents per hundredweight. The amount made above the highest price offered locally, where there was a local market, amounted to \$260 per car, or a total saving of more than \$17,500 on all shipments.

The season for shipping Arkansas cattle has not yet started; but in 1919 cattle shipments from that state exceeded the cooperative shipments of hogs, and indications this year are that almost all the Arkansas cattle will be shipped cooperatively.

The cooperative shipping of live stock by the method advocated by the United States Department of Agriculture has been found practicable and profitable in all sections of the country where live stock is produced in connection with general or specialized systems of farming.—Federal Farm News.

IRVIN COBB ON CAROLINA

Once upon a time I thought North Carolina was one of the most backward states in this Union. Today I am sure it must be one of the most prosperous of all our great sisterhood. Certainly no state is presently more progressive. In the outskirts of such a town as Wilson or

Gastonia or Durham or Winston-Salem one passing through aboard train beholds more convincing evidence of substantial improvements than formerly one would have seen in a ride across the entire state. Trim and tidy bungalows are replacing the shacks and shanties of a preceding decade. Big, broad-winged brick school buildings rear their bulk in rural settings. Neatly painted fences surround flower beds and grass plots where once were yards of bare ugly turf. Along with civic pride an individual pride has blossomed. Oftener than not, in the background there rear up those tall iron standards which carry the harnessed energy of distant water courses hundreds of miles across country to be transmuted into heat and light and power.

I drove through one North Carolina town with a population which could not have exceeded three thousand. On the principal business street, which indeed, was the only business street, I took account in passing of eight buildings, all in process of construction and all being constructed of brick. On one corner a big general store neared completion. Diagonally across from it a three-story building for offices and lodge rooms was going up. There was a structure which could mean nothing else except a new movie palace. One next door plainly was destined to be a garage, and there was yet another whose purpose I could not divine offhand. Possibly it is to be a service station for ouija boards—the folks are getting to be most terrifically up to date in North Carolina.

This was not all. By no means was it all. The red-clay bowels had been ripped out of every street, main street and cross street, and in the deep trenches iron water mains were being laid to bear underground company with sewer pipes and electric conduits. New cement sidewalks threaded off in all directions. From the width and the number of the new pavements one judged that practically all the business men and most of the householders in that town had become confirmed concrete drunkards.

With excusable vainglory a citizen of the place told me that last year by practically a unanimous vote the citizens had voted a bond issue for electric lights, municipal waterworks and a modern sewage system; this, too, in addition cheerfully to bearing their proportionate share in a million-dollar bond issue for good roads through the county and a second county bond issue of two hundred thousand dollars for building a system of modern graded schools and a high school building. Recalling how easily, just a few years ago, the average rural Tar Heel was satisfied in the matter of drainage and public utilities, or the lack of them, this statement spelled something to my understanding.—Irvin Cobb, in The Saturday Evening Post.