

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.

JUNE 14, 1922

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL. VIII, NO. 30

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.

LIVESTOCK LEVELS IN CAROLINA

OUT OF PRINT

North Carolina, Industrial and Urban, the 1920-21 Year-Book of the N. C. Club, is already out of print. The edition was small—only 1,500 copies, and the written requests exhausted the supply in less than three weeks.

We are saying this to the University News Letter readers as a public answer to the dozens of letters that are now reaching us daily.

And also as a reminder that if they want the 1921-22 Club Year-Book on Home and Farm Ownership they will need to apply for it at once, in order to secure a copy when it goes to the public next November. As usual the edition will be small and the 2,000 copies will be mailed out to applicants in order of requests.—E. C. Branson, Editor.

HOW BIG IS YOUR TOWN

How big is your town? We do not mean its area in feet or miles or blocks. We do not mean the number of men, women, and children. We do not mean the number of houses or the miles of paved sidewalks or hard surfaced roads. We mean is your town big in heart, and if so, how big? We mean is your town big in purpose, and if so, how big? We mean is your town big in ideals, and if so, how big? We mean is your town big enough to protect the weak, the innocent and the helpless? Is your town big enough in thought and purpose and motive to have fine churches, good preachers, good schools, and the things that elevate and educate? Does your town have a heart, a purpose, and an ideal? How big is your town? Give the answer without the use of the dollar mark.—Christian Sun.

LOW RANK IN LIVESTOCK

North Carolina stands only four places above the foot of the column of livestock levels in the United States. Forty-three states made a better showing in 1920. See the table in last week's issue.

The quality of our livestock considered, our position is even lower. Only two states of the Union had a smaller percent of pure-bred farm animals in 1920. Pure-bred livestock ratios will be exhibited in the University News Letter at an early date.

It is well to remember (1) that livestock is a term that covers food-animals—pigs, poultry, sheep, beef cattle, milch cows and the like, as well as work-animals—mules and horses mainly; (2) that our cotton and tobacco counties are deficient as a rule in food-animals and that such rank as they have in the livestock column in today's issue is lifted by the relatively large numbers of mules and horses used in cotton and tobacco culture; (3) that outside the cotton and tobacco belt the ratios are lifted by meat-and-milk animals; (4) that our eight-fold increase in work-stock since 1850 is explained by the twenty-fold increase in cotton production and the twenty-five-fold increase in tobacco production, and (5) that as our work-stock ratios have risen, our food-stock ratios have fallen during the last seventy years—milk cows 50 percent, other cattle 70 percent, hogs 69 percent, sheep 92 percent, and so on.

A county may be ahead in work-stock and behind in food-animals, as in the cotton-tobacco belt. Or it may be ahead in food-animals and behind in work-animals—as in a range or pasture-land area where cash-crop farming is relatively little, for instance the mountain and some of the tidewater counties.

With these interpretive considerations in mind, the student may ask, What is the livestock rank of my home county? Why is its rank high or low? Is its rank due to work-animals mainly or food-animals mainly? What penalties does my county pay for deficiency in food-animals? How can food-animals become profit-producing to the farmers of my county? What are the greatest obstacles to livestock development at present? What can be done about it under present conditions? And so on and on. And these are important questions for local bankers, merchants, and commercial club secretaries.

The Counties that Lead

Pasquotank with a ratio of 62 percent was far in the lead in North Carolina

in 1920, livestock levels considered, followed by Hyde, Camden, Perquimans, Haywood, Ashe, and Buncombe in the order named. See the table elsewhere.

These seven counties are well ahead of the average ratio in the United States—which is 44 percent. Forty-nine counties are above the state average—which is 31 percent. These are the counties that have fairly well spelled out the problem of balance in cash-crop, food-crop, and food-stock farming. In the measure in which they have solved this problem of a safely balanced farm system, they are fortified against the bankrupting results of the approaching boll weevil. But they are still in danger, if livestock means work-stock mainly in the home county.

The Counties that Lag

Twenty-seven counties are conspicuously below the livestock level of the state, in ratios that range around 75 to 85 percent below the level of a lightly stocked farm area. Which means that their meat-and-milk animals could be increased five to ten times in number and still they would be only lightly stocked farm areas. Could be, we say, but never likely to be unless local market facilities offer fair profits in ready cash for food animals and livestock products. The farmers are not book-keepers but they know well enough when they are behind or ahead of the game in any particular farm enterprise.

All of which means that the trend of local meat-and-milk production depends on the local cash profits the city consumers offer to nearby food farmers.

The livestock levels of the seven counties at the bottom of the column—Jones, Montgomery, Moore, Caswell, Granville, Bladen, and Brunswick, in the order named—range from 21 to 14 percent. That is to say, they are from 79 to 86 percent below the level of a lightly stocked farm area. Their farm land would sustain from five to seven times the number of livestock units they now have. Leaving out work-stock, the food animals of these counties could be multiplied by ten or more.

But will they be so multiplied under present conditions? Decidedly not. The farmers are not stupid. They know well enough in a rough way whether there is ready cash and a fair profit in this or that farm product.

And so at the last we run inevitably into the local market food problem—a city problem and every city's most important business necessity in the days at hand and ahead.

If the bankers and merchants will not help the farmers solve this problem, they will pay a very certain penalty in another year or so. It is a town-and-country problem in cooperation. Neither farmers nor city dwellers can solve it alone—a fact that cannot be too often stated or too promptly considered in earnest sort.

TOWN AND FARMERS

What does your town do for the farmers who trade in it?

We know of one village—it has only about 400 people—where there had been complaints that farmers were sending their money away to mail order houses and the merchants decided to create a more friendly feeling between the villagers and the surrounding farmers.

They found many things could be done. The first achievement was plenty of hitching posts for teams and places to park cars. They even went one step farther and provided sheds for cars and machines.

Again, it was found that farmers often have to wait in town for repairs and for other reasons. A room, 12 by 14, right on the main street, in an unused building, was fitted up simply with tables and chairs and rest room facilities, and now that room is filled most of the day with farmers' wives and their children, who have at last just what they have wanted for years. That room is used so much that it will soon have to be enlarged.

But one good thing usually leads to another. The farmers began to have a definite friendly feeling for the little village. Here was service without any

Released Week Beginning June 12
KNOW NORTH CAROLINA
Teaching Agriculture

Dean C. B. Williams

Most educational leaders now realize that special education and training in any special line, including agriculture, is highly essential for the greatest efficiency. It is only by special training in the hard school of personal experience and by profiting from the experience and observations of others that men learn to perform the operations of daily life most efficiently. It is only within comparatively recent times, however, that our people have adequately appreciated the value of teaching of agriculture in our public schools. Even yet, in some schools, agriculture, although required by law, is not taught as effectively as might be desired.

As North Carolina is made up largely of a rural population, any system of agricultural education and training will add to the efficiency of our boys in the country and will without doubt be in the interest of more profitable production and a fuller and happier country life.

We are entering upon an era of marked agricultural advancement throughout the South. Public schools and higher institutions are to play an important part in bringing about better conditions, provided they see their duty clearly and perform it intelligently. In almost every community of the State, there is a public school which is, or should be in reality, a center of community life. This school belongs to the community and should be the place at which almost every movement for its betterment should be planned and set in motion. One of the most effective ways to vitalize these centers will be the teaching of agriculture in the right way. To many it appears to teach rural children things that have little or no practical bearing on their future life. Of course it is recognized that the fundamental three R's are necessary. But after these there should be some marked differences between the work of rural schools and city schools. For instance, in teaching mathematics, it seems logical and practical to use problems largely of the kind that come up for solution in the life of boys and girls on the farm. Such problems may be used just as effectively in the teaching of mathematics as are the problems of the bank and the store.

North Carolina cannot train its rural youth for most efficient living on the farm until Agriculture is properly taught in all our rural schools. Our people realize as never before the value of special education with reference to farming.—C. B. Williams, Dean of Agriculture, State College of Agriculture and Engineering.

thought of immediate returns. Mail orders for goods began to fall off a little.

Then the business men of the village decided to have a meeting and ask the farmers in to talk things over. Luncheon and hot coffee was served. There were no set speeches. The villagers said they wanted to meet the farmers on the basis of genuine friendship. The farmers were treated with the utmost cordiality. There was no condescension shown. Just a friendly basis of equality.

Then someone suggested forming a community club, villagers and farmers all working together. The idea was immediately accepted. In a few months a community house was built. It proved remarkably easy to get the funds. The farmers contributed and there was a fine get-together feeling all around.

There will be movies in that little

community house. Dances will be held in it. Neighbors will visit and children play together there. The farmer comes to town now and he is greeted with a friendly smile on every corner. And the villagers say the farmers are the finest people in the world. And the farmers are warming up a little more every day.

We do not believe that after a year or so there will be many mail orders going out from that community.

The strange thing is, why don't more towns follow the example of this little place with 400 inhabitants? They could all do it with a little initiative.—Milwaukee Journal.

OUR COUNTRY CHURCHES

That which has concerned us for many years, and concerns us yet, is the great and undeveloped work of the country church. We have only praise for the fine work that the average country church is doing. It is the country church that is sending the ministerial students to our colleges; it is the country church that is giving the best and ablest leaders to the denomination, to all denominations, and to the whole nation. But while this is true, the country church is not measuring up to the great opportunity which she has. Magnificent school buildings have found their way into practically every locality. Most of these schools are being manned by college and university graduates. Subjects are being taught in these schools that a few years ago were taught in colleges. Community pride is asserting itself, and no man is acceptable as

a teacher unless he is thoroughly capable.

But what of the country church? We find practically the same type of country churches that we found ten years ago. It is true that we have built a few new churches, but we have not kept pace with other things or done our duty by the country church. How long can the church continue to hold the respect of her young people when she does not measure up in opportunity to other organizations in the community?

Where does the blame lie? The average community has fallen into the habit of contenting itself with a once-a-month service and claims that such is all it has time for.

The country cannot demand the ablest men so long as \$25,000 worth of automobiles are parked in the church yard while the people listen to a \$200-preacher. God cannot prosper a cause where the people will pay more for gasoline to be used as a means to help get them to church, than they pay the preacher who must speak to them after they get there.

This is no tirade against automobiles. We believe in the modern conveyance, but we should be willing to pay to help the church advance along with other things. The church can demand the respect of the world only as the membership of the church respects the church. Let us have good schools and good teachers, but let us also have good church buildings and good preachers. Let us have automobiles, but let us pay our pastors enough salary to put them beyond the starvation line and give them a chance to study and to serve at their best.—The Christian Sun.

LIVESTOCK LEVELS IN CAROLINA

In January 1920

Counties ranked from high to low according to the ratio of animal-units to the number needed to make a lightly stocked farm area. Ratios based on the 1920 census figures(1) for all livestock and (2) the acres of farm land.

A lightly stocked farm area calls for one animal-unit for every five acres, and an animal-unit is one work-animal or one dairy cow, or two other cattle, five hogs or ten pigs, or one hundred poultry being counted as one animal-unit, because they consume about the same amount of feed as one work-animal or one dairy cow.

The average of the U. S. was 44 percent; for N. C. 31 percent; for Iowa 91 percent. N. C. averages range from 62 percent in Pasquotank to 14 percent in Brunswick county.

Table of bills for imported food by counties, in next week's issue.

Robert W. Proctor, Robeson County

Department Rural Social Economics, University of North Carolina

Rank	County	Percent	Rank	County	Percent
1	Pasquotank	62	50	Gates	31
2	Hyde	52	50	Iredell	31
3	Camden	51	50	Stanly	31
4	Perquimans	50	54	Anson	30
5	Haywood	48	54	Avery	30
6	Ashe	47	54	Halifax	30
7	Buncombe	47	54	Hertford	30
8	Cleveland	43	54	Robeson	30
9	Graham	43	54	Swain	30
10	Madison	43	54	Wake	30
11	Mecklenburg	43	61	Alexander	29
12	Alleghany	42	61	Craven	29
13	Gaston	41	61	Davidson	29
14	New Hanover	41	61	Lenoir	29
15	Tyrrell	41	61	Sampson	29
16	Mitchell	40	61	Vance	29
17	Dare	39	67	Caldwell	28
18	Greene	39	67	Cherokee	28
19	Cabarrus	37	67	Duplin	28
20	Lincoln	37	67	Durham	28
21	Transylvania	37	67	Hoke	28
22	Wilson	37	67	Polk	28
23	Clay	36	67	Wilkes	28
24	Henderson	36	74	Harnett	27
25	Jackson	36	74	Martin	27
26	Pitt	36	74	Scotland	27
27	Yancey	36	74	Yadkin	27
28	Catawba	35	78	Chatham	26
29	Chowan	35	78	Cumberland	26
30	Forsyth	35	78	Lee	26
31	Edgecombe	35	78	Macon	26
32	Johnston	35	78	Orange	26
33	Northampton	35	83	Burke	25
34	Rowan	35	83	Columbus	25
35	Union	35	83	Person	25
36	Bertie	34	83	Rockingham	25
37	Currituck	34	83	Surry	25
38	Guildford	34	88	McDowell	24
39	Rutherford	34	88	Onslow	24
40	Washington	34	88	Pender	24
41	Watauga	34	88	Randolph	24
42	Wayne	34	88	Richmond	24
43	Alamance	33	93	Carteret	22
44	Beaufort	33	94	Jones	21
45	Familico	33	94	Montgomery	21
46	Franklin	32	94	Moore	21
47	Nash	32	97	Caswell	20
48	Stokes	32	97	Granville	20
49	Warren	32	99	Bladen	15
50	Davie	31	100	Brunswick	14