

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

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

APRIL 5, 1922

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL. VIII, NO. 20

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, S. H. Hobbs, Jr., L. R. Wilson, E. W. Knight, D. D. Carol, 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.

DOUBLING WEALTH IN TEN YEARS

SHORT: \$235,000,000

The most important state-wide campaign that Governor Morrison has ever waged is well under way; and it is not a political campaign in behalf of high office for himself, but an economic campaign in behalf of greater wealth for North Carolina.

It is a campaign to save 235 million dollars a year. It means right around a billion dollars of increased wealth in North Carolina every four years. It means doubling the entire wealth of the state in the next ten years.

His propositions are very simple and entirely practicable. Let every farm in the state, says he, feed the farm folks and the farm animals, and let every home, town and country, have a garden.

And he means business. Already he has an active organization, headed by Mr. John Paul Lucas, for a whirlwind campaign to accomplish these ends.

If it is effective, North Carolina will hold down the 235 million dollars of cotton and tobacco, wage and salary money that went out of the state in 1920 to pay for the pantry and farm supplies that we did not raise at home.

These figures are minimum figures. They refer to standard farm and garden products alone—to bread-and-meat, hog and hominy, corn, wheat and oats, and the like, not to extras, dainties and luxuries, and not to any food or feed that we cannot produce in North Carolina.

The details of the situation appear in the following studies by Prof. S. H. Hobbs, Jr., and Miss H. R. Smedes of the department of Rural Social Economics at the University.

Foodless Farms

North Carolina, says Prof. Hobbs, has reached an enviable position as a producer of crop wealth. Only four states produced greater crop values in 1921. We are a great cash-crop state. The production of crop values has become so nearly universal with us that many people think of agriculture as a crop-producing business solely. The statement has been spread abroad that North Carolina ranks fifth state in the production of agricultural wealth. We have confused crop wealth with agricultural wealth, because crop farming is so nearly universal with us.

We are not the fifth largest producer of agricultural wealth, because as a livestock state we are one of the poorest developed in the entire Union. In many states livestock and animal products are the chief source of cash income for the farms. It is seldom considered in this state, for only about a fourth of the farm wealth we create each year comes from the sale of livestock and livestock products. The status of the eastern half of North Carolina, the great tenant, cash-crop area, as a livestock region is pitiful.

Neither is our state even moderately developed as a producer of the food crops needed for home consumption. Our bill for imported food and feed supplies is 235 million dollars a year for milk in tin cans, for meat in tin boxes, for potatoes, flour, canned fruits, and a thousand other things which we can raise as cheaply as they can be raised anywhere in the nation. Our farmers do not produce enough to feed themselves, much less the nearby town and city dwellers. These two hundred and thirty-five million dollars must be retained in this state if we are ever to become a wealthy agricultural people. If our farmers could retain a fair proportion of the wealth they annually produce they would become rich. But a system of agriculture based almost entirely on cash crops, in which the market value of the crops is consumed in producing them, can never be a safe or sane system.

It is the common opinion that we are rapidly developing as a livestock state. We have improved our breeds somewhat, but it is doubtful if we are better off in numbers than in 1910. At that time we were 75 percent below the level of even a lightly stocked farm area. A lightly stocked farm state means a state with one animal unit to every five acres—an animal unit being a horse, a cow, five hogs, or 100 fowls, and so on. In 1920 we were 80 percent below the level of a lightly stocked farm area. Our livestock units actually decreased while

our population increased sixteen percent. The 1920 census was taken before the spring animals came on, which accounts in part for the decrease.

Cowless, Sowless Farms

North Carolina, too, has her cowless, sowless farms. We have 78,957 farms, or nearly a third of them all, with no cattle of any description. We have 99,559 farms, or nearly two of every five, that have no milk cows. On these farms are more than a half million people who hardly know the taste of butter or milk, the best foods known to man. They are mainly eastern Carolina farms, where cash-crop farming prevails. There is not a single eastern Carolina county that ranks above the state average in the production of milk or butter. Many of these counties produce less than one pound of butter per person per year. Great masses of our people do not taste butter or milk for entire years at a time. When the baby gets sick, milk must be borrowed from a neighbor. And the babies are often sick from lack of milk. One-third of our farmers eat no butter and drink no milk because they have no milk cows. This is deplorable. Farmers in the North and West would scarcely believe it is true. Iowa with fewer farmers has better breeds and feed times as many milk cows. North Carolina had fewer cattle in 1920 than in 1910, although she had a few more dairy cattle.

As for sheep, they are almost a curiosity in this state. We raised them in large quantities before the Civil War, but today only 28 of every 1,000 farms keep sheep. Our dogs increased, but our sheep decreased 60 percent during the last ten years. As for goats, they have almost disappeared from our borders.

We have 47,733 farms that did not raise a single pig in 1919. One of every six farms produced no pork. The meat consumed by these farmers consisted largely of white-sides purchased from supply-merchants. This meat was bought in pound quantities at time prices, or came in tin cans at almost prohibitive prices, and this in a state that can produce pork as cheaply as any state in the Union. With such a tremendous number of meatless and milkless farms, how can we be a well-fed people?

It is interesting to note in passing that while we have fewer cattle now than ten years ago, and almost the same number of hogs, our horses increased from 166,151 to 171,436, while our mules increased from 174,711 to 256,569 or nearly fifty percent. The advent of the automobile, the farm truck, and the tractor, has had no visible effect on diminishing the number of our workstock. An increase in mules and horses means an increase in cotton and tobacco farming. Nearly nine-tenths of all the mules of the nation are in the South, and most of them are in use by negro tenants on cotton farms.

Feedless Farms

Just as we buy large quantities of milk and meat in tin cans, so do we buy flour in sacks, and hay in bales in almost unbelievable amounts. We produce barely more than half the corn needed for home consumption, and 16,737 farms did not grow a grain of corn in 1919. The farms growing no oats numbered 235,116 or seven-eighths of them all. We produced in the state less than half the wheat consumed. We imported nearly six million bushels of wheat because 180,425 farmers, or more than two-thirds of them all, grew no wheat. Half of the farms of the state produced no hay or forage for their workstock. Many thousands of them were tenant farmers who own no work animals, no cows, no hogs, no poultry, and raised little or no food and feed for man or beast. Nearly exactly half the farmers of the state bought the feed they might have produced at home, and spent in this way twelve and a quarter million dollars in cold cash.

The two heaviest yielding standard farm crops known to man are sweet and Irish potatoes. Every farm in North Carolina can grow either of these. They are grown in every county in the state, but not by nearly exactly half of our farmers in the case of sweet potatoes, and not by seven-tenths of our farmers in the case of Irish potatoes. Two Virginia counties grew more than three

(Released week beginning April 3)

KNOW NORTH CAROLINA Buy Carolina Products

Students of history tell us that the collapse of Russia in 1918, a country of 136 million souls and of untold wealth, was due in a large measure to inadequate industrial development. Russia had the agricultural products, but she did not have the stored-up manufactured goods to withstand a devastating war.

How much more fortunate North Carolina is! With one section devoted almost wholly to farming and another region largely engaged in turning these products into salable wares, we are organized, both agriculturally and industrially, to take care of our own needs. Practically everything that the average man uses is grown or manufactured within the borders of the state.

Yet our ability to supply manufactured goods, made in North Carolina, and on a competitive basis of quality and price with other products, is not generally known. We need to advertise Carolina goods. In furniture, cotton goods, blankets, shoes, lumber, tobacco, and in many other lines, Carolina products are as good as the best. Why not use them? Certainly prosperity, like charity, must have its beginning at home.—A. W. McLean, War Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.

times as many Irish potatoes as the entire state of North Carolina. These same two counties grew half as many sweet potatoes as our entire state. One county in Maine grows ten times as many Irish potatoes as the entire state of North Carolina. And we can grow as many to the acre as any state in the Union. But we prefer to buy them, or what is worse, to do without them.

Gardenless Farms

And lastly, 44,197 farms in our state had no garden in 1919. These farmers were too busy growing cotton and tobacco for the market to find time to grow fresh vegetables for the family table. It is almost incredible that any farmer would give his whole attention to money crops and entirely neglect the family table. Farmers could have fresh vegetables every day in the year, with just a little attention, but one of every six farmers in the state produces no home-grown vegetables whatsoever. With idle land all around them and with idle weeks and months they find no place or time to produce vegetables for the family use.

The simple truth is that thousands of our farms do not begin to feed the farm family and livestock. The people on these farms live on short rations especially in lean years. Their diet is ill-balanced and insufficient. They are undernourished, their children badly fed and their physical development stunted. How could it be otherwise when a hundred thousand farms have no milk cows and consume no butter or milk, when nearly fifty thousand farms have no hogs, when half of all our farms produce no sweet potatoes, and seven-tenths of them no Irish potatoes, when 44,197 farms have no gardens and produce no vegetables? The Army Draft told humiliating tales on us in this matter, and the News Letter of March 8, 1922, published the facts.

Farm people should be the best fed of all people. They should and could have a well-balanced diet, with just a little attention to food production. Every farm in our state should feed itself first. Our farmers would produce surpluses for sale in our towns and cities if only our towns and cities would settle the local market problem for home-raised food and feed supplies. Instead the people of North Carolina spent 235 million dollars a year for imported food and feed supplies. Neglecting home-raised food crops and buying farm supplies of this sort with cotton and tobacco money is a hopeless way of getting rich and getting on and up in the world. We have tried it for seventy years and we ought to know it

by this time. Producing cotton and tobacco on a bread-and-meat basis is now and always has been the only sensible farm system in the South.

When the boll weevil comes, we'll produce our own food supplies or we'll go hungry in North Carolina. It is Hobson's choice.

Foodless, Foolish Farmers

The following table shows the number of stockless, foodless farmers in North Carolina in 1920:

	269,763	Pct.
Total farms in the state	269,763	
Farms with no cattle	78,957	29.3
With no milk cows	99,559	36.9
With no sheep	262,022	97.2
With no goats	265,690	98.6
With no hogs	47,733	17.7
Growing no corn	16,737	6.2
Growing no oats	235,116	87.2
Growing no wheat	180,425	67.0
Growing no hay or forage	134,424	49.8
Growing no Irish potatoes	190,694	70.7
Growing no sweet potatoes	132,533	49.1
Having no garden	44,197	16.4

A PARENT-TEACHER HELP

A Handbook for Parent-Teacher Associations, prepared by Professor Harold D. Meyer of the University School of Public Welfare for the University Extension Division, has just been received from the press. Its purpose is to encourage the organization of parent-teacher associations and to assist them with their meetings. Outlines of study are given, and reference books cited for outside reading. Package libraries and books have been secured by the Extension Division for the use of those who make the necessary arrangements for this service. The bulletin is divided into three parts.

Part one concerns the Parent-Teacher at Work. It explains the ideals and purposes of a parent-teacher association, showing how to organize, how to develop and maintain interest, and how to secure funds for active work.

Part two is devoted to Suggested Programs. These are arranged in six groups, ten subjects to each group: The School Building and Grounds, Child Welfare, Educational Aims and School Laws, The Teacher and Some School Programs, Agencies Aiding the Community and the School, Miscellaneous Subjects.

Part three contains Constitutions and Directories. Here we have the constitutions of the National Organization, the State Organization, and Local Organization, along with State and National Directories.

A copy of the bulletin will be sent free of charge to every parent-teacher association in the state, to every high school principal and to every superintendent. Additional copies may be secured at the following rates; 1 copy 50 cents, 12 copies \$4.50, 100 copies \$25.

For further information regarding this bulletin and the programs, it contains, address The Bureau of Public Discussion, University Extension Division, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

NEW BOOK ON SOCIAL WORK

In the current issue of the American Journal of Sociology there appears the following excellent review of the recent volume Education for Social Work, by Professor Jesse Frederick Steiner of the School of Public Welfare of the University of North Carolina, published by the University of Chicago Press:

The thinness of this little volume is significant, for it typifies in an excellent manner the smallness of the body of information and opinion up to this time on the subject of training for social work. For Dr. Steiner has said about all the significant things that are to be said, to date, on the subject. There may be difference of opinion within the ranks of social workers with some of the positions of the author, but it cannot well be said that he has failed to discuss at least the outstanding aspects of professional training of this new profession.

The purpose is stated in the Preface 'to bring about a growing recognition of the scientific basis upon which the structure of social work must be built.' Throughout the book the position is maintained that the professional character of social work depends essentially upon a training that has scientific foundations to the same extent that the other professions have, although it is recognized that it will take some time to reach the standards attained in the training for the older fields.

Dr. Steiner does not hesitate to pronounce criticism on some of the methods employed in the past, and continued to the present, but the point of view is essentially constructive. The difficulties that have been encountered by all who have pioneered in the field are recognized and their point of view sympathetically interpreted.

The difference in the point of view of the earlier schools that grew out of training courses established by social workers, and that of the universities which have more recently entered the field is recognized. The position is frankly taken that the universities must assume the chief responsibility for this training as they have for legal, medical, educational, and engineering training. The contributions, however, that the schools maintained by practical workers have made are clearly recognized, and the need of the universities making use of it is pointed out.

Probably the greatest contribution made in the study is the analysis of the problem of securing facilities for laboratory and clinical study. Two excellent chapters are given to an analysis of this problem and to constructive suggestions for the establishment of social-work laboratories and clinics. The distinction between these two types of facilities is one which has not always been clearly recognized in the training schools.—Cecil C. North, Ohio State University.

IMPORTED FOOD AND FEED SUPPLIES

In North Carolina in 1920
\$235,000,000 is the Bill

Based on the 1920 census of Quantities and Farm Values. Food and feed needed in 1920 for man and beast, \$482,022,000; produced in the state, \$247,447,000. What we do not produce in North Carolina must of course be imported from other states and countries.

The bill for imported food and feed in 1920 was therefore \$234,575,000, and this figure covers only standard staple food and feed crops, not extras, dainties, luxuries, etc. If these be included the bill is many millions larger.

Miss Henrietta R. Smedes,
 Department of Rural Social Economics, University of North Carolina

Food and Feed Needed

For 2,560,000 people at \$155 a year	\$396,800,000
468,000 work-animals at \$78 a year	36,504,000
498,000 dairy cows at \$37 a year	18,426,000
199,000 other cattle at \$16 a year	3,184,000
92,000 sheep at \$3 a year	276,000
1,862,000 swine at \$13 a year	24,206,000
117,000 animal units of poultry at \$78 a year	9,126,000
Total food and feed needed	\$482,022,000

Food and Feed Produced

Food and feed crops	\$172,520,000
Dairy products, not consumed on farms	14,912,000
Poultry products	18,080,000
Honey and wax	356,000
Animals sold and slaughtered, estimated	41,579,000
Total food and feed produced	\$247,447,000
Deficit	\$234,575,000