

The news in this publication is released for the press on receipt.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA NEWS LETTER

Published Weekly by the
University of North Carolina
for its University Extension Division.

OCTOBER 5, 1921

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL. VII, NO. 46

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, S. H. Hobbs, Jr., L. R. Wilson, E. W. Knight, D. D. Carroll, J. B. Bullitt, H. W. Odum. Entered as second-class matter November 14, 1914, at the Postoffice at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of August 24, 1912.

CAROLINA CROP WEALTH IN 1919

A HALF BILLION IN CROPS

A half billion dollars, or more exactly \$503,229,000, is the total of crop wealth produced in North Carolina in 1919 as reported by the Census Bureau. Twelve states made a better showing, and among these were three Southern states—Texas, Oklahoma, and Georgia, in the order named. See the table published elsewhere in this issue. These census values were recorded in January 1920 with cotton at 14 cents a pound, four months after cotton prices began to slump the August before. Nevertheless the total value of all crops in North Carolina was more than four times that in 1909.

In 1920, our farm crops declined another hundred millions in value, according to the Federal Crop Reporting Board. Nevertheless the total was more than three times that in 1909. We lost in total crop values, but we gained in rank, showing that though hard hit North Carolina was holding her own better than 42 other states. As a matter of fact, only five states made a better showing than North Carolina in total crop values in 1920—Texas, Iowa, Illinois, California, and New York, in the order named.

Animal Products Small

It is well to remember, however, that crops are only a part of the wealth produced by farms from year to year. Livestock and livestock products must be counted into the total. North Carolina ranks high in crop production, but low in livestock production. For instance, twenty-four states produced larger total values than North Carolina in 1919 in dairy products, chickens and eggs, wool and mohair, honey and wax. In 1909 twenty-two states stood ahead of us in the value of livestock sold or slaughtered, and in 1915, thirty-seven states made a better showing in this particular.

North Carolina has made great gains in work-animals during the last half century, and also in the quality of meat and milk animals—dairy cows, swine, poultry and the like. But in 1910 we had only twenty-four percent or less than a fourth of the livestock we needed in order to be even a lightly stocked farm area. Our meat and milk animals need to be multiplied by six or seven in our cotton and tobacco counties, and by at least five the state over, if ever our farming is to have a bread-and-meat basis. For these detailed studies, see the University News Letter, Volume II No. 20, and Vol. V Nos. 18 and 19.

Too much of our annual farm income is derived from the sale of crops, and too little of it from the sale of animals and animal products. We market too much of our farm wealth on four wheels. We need to market far more of it on four legs.

Farm wealth production means crop values plus livestock values. And if livestock values be added to crop values, at least six other states of the Union produced a greater total of farm wealth than North Carolina in 1919. These states are: Indiana, Wisconsin, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Kentucky. In all these states from two-thirds to three-fourths of the annual farm income is derived from the sale of livestock and livestock products. And these bread-and-meat states are the states that rank highest in accumulated farm wealth.

Too Little Food and Feed

We have gained in cotton production more than 2,000 percent since 1850, and more than 2,500 percent in tobacco production during the same period, but we have fewer hogs, fewer sheep, and fewer cattle other than milk cows, than we had seventy years ago. We have made immense gains in corn and wheat production but we are not yet self-sustaining even in these crops. When compared with the population to be fed in North Carolina, we have suffered during the last seventy years a decrease of 50 percent in milk cows, 70 percent in other cattle, 69 percent in swine, and 92 percent in sheep. In other words we have moved rapidly into the production of cotton and tobacco as ready cash crops, and we have based the production of these crops on a farm-tenancy, supply-merchant, crop-lien system. It is a system that produces great wealth, but it is also a system that makes it well-nigh impossible to retain the wealth in the areas that produce it, no matter what the price levels are.

The Ills of Farm Tenancy

And the look ahead is not encouraging. How can we ever produce cotton

and tobacco on a bread-and-meat basis when a third of our white farmers and two-thirds of our negro farmers are tenants—croppers mainly? In nine counties of the state from two-thirds to four-fifths of all the farms are cultivated by tenants. For the most part tenants on little pocket-handkerchief farms are not interested in raising food-and-feed crops and meat animals; indeed they do not want to be bothered as a rule with milk cows, pigs, and poultry.

And tenancy grows on us apace like creeping paralysis. We have 6,000 more farm owners in North Carolina in 1920 than we had ten years ago. But we have 10,000 more tenants. Whatever may be the economic value of tenancy as a farm system, the social problems it creates are appalling.

We have not yet considered as closely as we ought to do the trend of agriculture in North Carolina the last 70 years. But there are comforting signs of late that the thinkers and leaders of the state are getting busy with it. We invite attention to a detailed study of this subject in The University News Letter, Vol. 3 Nos 36 and 39, and Vol. 6, No. 21.

OUR NEW WEALTH IN 1919

The gross primary wealth produced in North Carolina in 1919 was a little more than one billion six hundred million dollars in round numbers.

It is almost exactly four times the volume of such wealth produced in the state in 1915. See the North Carolina Club Year-Book, Wealth and Welfare in North Carolina, pages 25-28.

It is almost exactly half the taxable wealth of the state in 1920, as shown in the revaluation figures of the State Tax Commission. Which is to say, in a single year we created one-half as much wealth as we were willing to put on our tax books after two hundred and fifty years of history.

The primary wealth created in North Carolina in 1919 averaged six hundred and twenty-one dollars per person, counting men, women, and children of both races. It was an average of more than three thousand dollars per family.

Counting out the cost of materials used in manufacture and the value of crops consumed by livestock, there is still left a total of more than one billion dollars of what can be called brand new wealth produced in North Carolina in 1919—the year covered by the 1920 census.

At this reduced figure our wealth-producing power averaged right around four hundred dollars per inhabitant, or two thousand dollars per family.

We speak of this wealth as primary, because it is (1) crude wealth produced by the farmers, foresters, miners, quarrymen, and fishers of the state, and (2) crude wealth put by our mills, factories and foundries into finished form for final consumption.

And the values put upon this wealth in the federal reports are farm and factory values ruling in December 1919, a full four months after the slump in cotton prices. These huge totals are not the prices paid by final consumers. They do not cover price increases due to transportation and the services of tradespeople of all sorts. They cover the farm and factory values of economic commodities produced in North Carolina. They do not cover the values of economic services. These totals are therefore minimum figures. They represent primary not secondary wealth, else the totals would need to be doubled at the very least.

For the most part they are authoritative figures. Indeed they are all authoritative except the value of livestock sold and slaughtered, the commercial output of our fisheries, and the value of our farm woodlot products. These particular figures are yet to come from the federal authorities at Washington. For the time being we are giving conservative estimates. Farm woodlot products, for instance, mean firewood, posts, sills, naval stores and the like. We put this total at twenty-two million dollars. It is not excessive, because the firewood cut alone has already been reported for the state at nineteen million dollars in 1919.

Holding Down Our Wealth

We say gross values rather than net values, because nobody knows the cost of producing this wealth, or what the net income of the state was in 1919.

It was small in agriculture; in our

THE HOME TOWN

We live in this town because we believe in it. We believe in it because it is a good town, regardless of its few defects, and its people are the peers of those to be found anywhere.

This town may not have the wealth of some more favored communities, but it has character, and character is a possession which can not be purchased with gold.

If you believe in your home town you will like it, and if you like it no effort toward its improvement will be too great for you.

Again we ask you to have faith in your own powers; to also have faith in your own town.

When you feel like criticising it, check the thought before it is spoken. You can always find something good to say instead, and even then the half of the truth will never be told.

It is a good town now, but faith, loyalty and united action, will make it a better one.

Our faith in this town, brother, is simply faith in you, because the town is a collection of yours.

Surely your faith is not less than ours.

Let us unite—let us act—for a more cohesive community.

It is your home—and ours.—The Scottish Chief.

cotton and tobacco areas, it was undoubtedly small or nothing at all or worse. It was larger in our tobacco counties, because tobacco prices held up somewhat longer and better than cotton prices.

On the other hand, net profits in the manufacturing industries of the state can be figured down almost to the last decimal, because cost-accounting is the rule in manufacture. In agriculture, it is everywhere the rare exception. The sad fact is that the farmers of the United States are not yet trained in business methods, as the Danish farmers are.

The mired wheel in the economic life of North Carolina is its agriculture, and it imperils every other business in the state as we are at last coming to see. But we are still far from considering the economic and social consequences of farm tenancy, the excessive cost of farm credit, the rapid descent of the state into small-scale farming, our deficiency in meat and milk animals, the decreasing per capita production of farm workers in contrast with the marvelous increase in per-acre and cash-crop totals, the sparse population in our farm areas, the lack of economic and social integration, organization and cooperation among our farm dwellers. And so on and on.

As a result we are great in farm-wealth creation. We are as weak as water in farm-wealth retention.

The Farmer's Share

Nevertheless, a vast volume of agricultural wealth is produced in North Carolina from year to year. And somebody gets it. The great problem is to move on into a system that will allow a righteous portion of it to stick to the palms that sweat it out. The farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is a pittance, and it is not likely ever to be larger until our farmers cooperate in business ways for business advantage as the California farmers have done.

The gross primary wealth of all sorts produced in North Carolina year by year must now be reckoned in billions, and these billions rank us among the first fifteen states of the Union. We are speaking of industrial wealth, farm and forest wealth of all sorts, and the output of our mines, quarries, and fisheries.

When the final state figures for manufacture are received we shall be ranking North Carolina among the industrial states just as we are today ranking North Carolina among the agricultural states of the Union.

The summary in detail of the new wealth created in North Carolina in 1919 is as follows:

Our New Wealth in 1919

Manufactured products, 1920 census \$943,810,000.

Farm crops, 1920 Census \$503,230,000. Livestock products—dairy products, chickens and eggs, wool and mohair, honey and wax, 1920 Census, \$35,860,000.

Livestock sold and slaughtered, estimated, \$40,000,000.

Mines and quarries, 1920 Census, \$2,745,000.

Fisheries, estimated, \$3,000,000.

Farm woodlot products, estimated, \$22,000,000.

Forest products—lumber, laths, and shingles, 1920 Census, \$50,000,000.

Total, \$1,600,645,000.

BUSINESS IN CAROLINA

As the Greensboro News said in an editorial the other day, "A lot of people in North Carolina made money last year, depression or no depression." Of course they did, and there was more money made in North Carolina than in any other Southern state, if we are to judge from the fact that the Tar Heels paid over \$50,000,000 more in federal taxes than the people of any other Southern state paid. And yet it is doubtful if there ever was more grumbling over hard times than was done in 1920, and is still being done. But it was natural that there should be grumbling, for the farmers were let down mighty hard. From soaring prices in 1919 and the first part of 1920, cotton and tobacco dropped to less than the cost of production. So it would have been strange had contentment prevailed.

Our Greensboro contemporary says that one reason why North Carolina leads the South in paying federal taxes is because of the immense tobacco interests. Yet, besides the tobacco taxes, North Carolina's "profits and income taxes reached nearly \$40,000,000, and were more than the total federal taxes (including tobacco) paid by any other Southern state with three exceptions—Texas, Virginia and Kentucky."

In view of this big tax-paying program by the people of our state, the News says aptly: "Folks are still doing business in North Carolina—doing such enormous business, in fact, that they are having to pay \$40,000,000 a year taxes on profits and income. In any state where there is that much trading, there is plenty of business to be had. The only question is how to dig it out. True, it no longer comes to the business man uninvited. He has to get up and dust to get it. But it's here; and if he has enough energy, persistence, and ability he can find it." That's straight talk, and, if followed, the vexed problem of business stagnation and unsettled conditions would be largely solved. We believe that the farmers are going to make a good start at solving it this year by entering heart and soul into the co-operative farm marketing plan. We believe that the merchants could solve the problem and dig out business if they be content with a small margin of profit, which would bring a bigger volume of business.

Yes, folks are still doing business in North Carolina, and the prospect is that with the fall months they will do bigger and better business than they have done for many months.—Fayetteville Observer.

FARM CROPS IN THE UNITED STATES

For the year 1919. According to the Fourteenth Census. Figures are given to the nearest thousand.

Crop values for North Carolina in 1909 were \$131,072,000. In 1919 they were \$503,229,000, or nearly four times as much. Our rank in 1919 was 12th.

In 1920, the hypothetical value of all crops in North Carolina was placed at \$412,374,000 by the Bureau of Crop Estimates of the Federal Agricultural Department. The value was less than in 1919 by nearly a hundred million dollars, but our rank was 6th. Only five states made a better showing, namely, Texas, Iowa, Illinois, California, and New York, in the order named.

Department of Rural Social Science, University of North Carolina.

Rank	State	Crop Values	Rank	State	Crop values
1	Texas	\$1,071,527,000	25	North Dakota	\$301,783,000
2	Iowa	890,391,000	26	Virginia	292,842,000
3	Illinois	864,738,000	27	Washington	227,212,000
4	Ohio	607,038,000	28	Louisiana	206,183,000
5	Kansas	588,923,000	29	Colorado	181,065,000
6	California	587,601,000	30	Oregon	131,885,000
7	Missouri	559,048,000	31	Idaho	126,492,000
8	Oklahoma	549,249,000	32	Maryland	109,811,000
9	Georgia	540,614,000	33	Maine	100,152,000
10	Nebraska	519,730,000	34	West Virginia	96,537,000
11	Minnesota	506,020,000	35	New Jersey	87,464,000
12	North Carolina	503,229,000	36	Florida	80,257,000
13	Indiana	497,230,000	37	Montana	69,975,000
14	Wisconsin	445,348,000	38	Utah	58,067,000
15	South Carolina	437,122,000	39	Massachusetts	53,701,000
16	New York	417,047,000	40	Vermont	48,000,000
17	Pennsylvania	410,934,000	41	Connecticut	44,492,000
18	Michigan	404,015,000	42	Arizona	42,481,000
19	Kentucky	348,655,000	43	New Mexico	40,620,000
20	Arkansas	341,565,000	44	Wyoming	30,271,000
21	Mississippi	336,207,000	45	New Hampshire	23,510,000
22	Tennessee	318,285,000	46	Delaware	23,059,000
23	South Dakota	311,007,000	47	Nevada	13,980,000
24	Alabama	304,349,000	48	Rhode Island	5,340,000