

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.

AUGUST 9, 1922

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL. VIII, NO. 38

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, B. 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, 1913.

IMPROVED COUNTY GOVERNMENT

THE COUNTY BOARDS MEET

The State Association of County Commissioners meets in annual session on the campus of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, August 15, 16, 17.

Place of meetings Gerrard Hall. Headquarters, the University Y. M. C. A. building—a place for rest, comradeship, reading, writing, etc. Meals in the town cafeteria and cafes. Charges moderate.

Tuesday, August 15

7:30 P. M. Registration at the University Y. M. C. A. building. Assignment to dormitory rooms as guests of the University.

8:30 P. M. Call to Order, by President B. A. Patton, Asheville, N. C. Invocation. Addresses of Welcome, H. W. Chase, President of the University, and E. C. Branson, Department Rural Social Economics. Response, C. W. Morgan, Vice-President, Hertford, N. C.

Report of the Secretary and Treasurer.

Appointment of Committees on (1) Resolutions, (2) Legislation, (3) Nominations, (4) Auditing.

Wednesday, August 16

10:00 A. M. Invocation. Improved County Government.

Address, Governor Cameron Morrison. Discussion by (1) the State Commission on County Government, and (2) the County Commissioners of the State.

12:00 A. M. A Campus Barbecue.

2:00 P. M. The County Home. Roy M. Brown, State Department of Public Welfare. Discussion opened by Mrs. Clarence A. Johnson, State Commissioner of Public Welfare.

8:30 P. M. County Government and Public Education. E. C. Brooks, State Superintendent Public Instruction. Questions and discussion.

Thursday, August 17

10:00 A. M. Agriculture in North Carolina. Frank Parker, State Agricultural Statistician. Open meeting and discussion.

12:00 M. Report of Committees. Adjournment.

OUR RANK IN AGRICULTURE

As a crop-producing state, the rank of North Carolina is high. In the production of gross crop values in 1919, only three states made a better showing—Illinois, Iowa, and Texas, in the order named. In 1920 ten states stood above us, but in 1921 the states ahead of us were only four—Texas, California, Illinois, and New York. All of which means that farm crops alone considered we rank among the best half dozen states of the Union in average years.

And our rank is high in the per-acre production of crop values. In 1921 only one real farm state produced greater crop values per acre, and that state was California with her wonderful areas of fruit and truck farming. The seven other states that stood above us in this particular are states in which agriculture is an insignificant business—one is an irrigation state in the Rockies and the other six are industrial states in the East.

But our rank as an agricultural state cannot be based on crops alone. Livestock and animal products of all sorts must be counted in, when states are ranked in the production of agricultural wealth; and when counted in, North Carolina's rank drops from fourth to fortieth on a per capita basis, in round numbers in average years.

Crops are an important item; they are right around three-fourths of all the farm wealth produced in North Carolina year by year. And nearly two-thirds of our total crop values are produced by cotton and tobacco alone.

But crops are not the whole of the farm wealth produced in any state; they are barely more than half the total in such states as Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Nebraska. In Iowa and Missouri they are distinctly less than half of the total farm wealth produced in average years. In North Carolina

in 1920 they were less than one-fifth of the total farm wealth produced.

We are strong in gross crop values, but our agriculture is weak in livestock and in animal products.

Students of political economy are referred to the University News Letter Vol. VIII, Nos. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, and 32, in which we have been exhibiting in detail this particular deficiency in our agriculture, and we have been doing so with the hope that students of political economy are also interested in North Carolina. It is much more than a farm problem. It is a state problem, and when the boll weevil arrives, it will be found to concern every business and everybody in North Carolina. The business men of the state will then be bunched like partridges in a snow storm, and just as helpless—unless they look ahead wisely and get busy effectively long before the day of calamity. The boll weevil is no respecter of businesses, town or country.

Farm-Worker Production

The production of gross and per-acre crop values is one thing; the retention of farm wealth is another. And it is in this last most important matter that North Carolina falls down.

As a cue to our thinking about it we are presenting elsewhere in this issue a table of farm wealth production per farm-worker. And by farm wealth we mean both crops and animal products.

The gross value of the farm wealth produced in North Carolina in 1920, counting both crops and animal products, was 470 million dollars—crops \$78 millions and animal products \$2 millions; and fifteen states made a better showing.

But states differ so greatly in size and population that they must be reduced to a unit of comparison. The unit that is most significant is not the acre but the worker—not the land but the man.

There is immense significance in the fact that the average farm worker in North Carolina in 1920 produced only \$984 of farm wealth; that the average was larger in forty states and that five of these were Southern; that in twenty-four states the average ran beyond \$2000 per farm-worker, and in five states, beyond \$3000 per farm-worker. In Nebraska and Iowa it was right around \$3,500 per farm-worker. The states that made a poorer showing than North Carolina were all Southern—all of them cotton producing states. The state that foots the column is Mississippi, which is now in the trough of the boll weevil wave.

Per Capita Country Wealth

Per-acre production of crop values is significant, but per-worker production of farm wealth is more significant. The states that have the highest averages of per-worker farm production are livestock states, with larger farms, more profit-producing farm machinery, more cultivated acres per man, and a lower production cost per bushel, per pound, per ton. These are the farm states that produce less per acre, but more per worker. The result is a wider margin of profits and a better chance to retain and accumulate farm wealth.

In the per-worker production of farm wealth in 1920, North Carolina ranked 41st, and in the per capita accumulation of wealth in farm properties—our country dwellers held exactly the same rank.

Accumulated farm wealth per country dweller, \$684; rank 41st. Produced farm wealth per worker, \$984; rank 41st. That's North Carolina in 1920.

The farm worker produces in a single year in North Carolina just about as great wealth as he has been able to accumulate and retain in two hundred and fifty years.

Per-worker production and per capita accumulation run along side by side in every state of the Union. There is a causal relation between these two fundamental facts in agriculture everywhere. The Belgian farmers lead Europe in the per-acre production of small grains; they also led Europe in 1914 in per capita poverty.

Iowa farmers, man for man, produce nearly four times as much as Carolina farmers—\$3,554 against \$984 in North Carolina; and man for man they are

Released week beginning August 7 KNOW NORTH CAROLINA Wealth and Welfare

Prof. C. B. Williams, dean of Agriculture at State College, has been impressed with the condition in North Carolina that allows poor-paying farms to affect the homes, the schools, and the churches of the state to the degree that has been displayed in the last few years.

Poor homes, inadequate church and school facilities are more prevalent than we should like to see them in North Carolina, says Professor Williams, because of the fact that so many of our farms are producing such poor yields and net returns for the efforts put into their operations.

During the past few years in our visits to different sections of the state, I have been struck very much with the marked correlation between the productiveness of the soil and the character of the farm homes and their surroundings; schools and churches; with the healthfulness of the families; and with the educational qualifications of the people. In close proximity to such areas, it is not uncommon to find other areas sparsely settled, with the people living in humble homes without beautification and with their children not permitted to enjoy social, religious, and educational advantages as do the communities established on more productive lands. The underlying conditions largely causing these differences is not hard to find. My observations are that to a large extent they are fundamentally connected with differences in the productiveness of the soils of these different communities. Does not this, then, unmistakably point to the fact that the greatest and most fundamental necessity of North Carolina farming is that of securing and applying information that will aid in the economic building up of the productiveness of soils of the state? No community, state, or nation dependent upon its agriculture, can prosper when its soils are not productive.

North Carolina farming, in a general way, therefore, cannot be profitable unless goodly acreage yields are secured and at economic costs per unit. No amount of temporizing along other lines in a broad way can bring prosperity to the masses of our people on the farm. Year in and year out, where farmers do not get goodly yields of their crops, it is not possible to secure large returns for labor and expenses put into their production, it matters not how favorable prices may ordinarily be.—Dean C. B. Williams, State A. and E. College, in News and Observer.

The Way Up

Not fewer acres, but more acres better farmed, with more horse and machine power. Not more farmers but fewer, with larger farms and better balanced farm systems. Not less cotton and tobacco, but more, and more cotton and tobacco produced on a home-raised bread and meat basis. More home-owning farmers and fewer tenants, white and black. More and better livestock. A few meat and milk animals on every farm, at least enough to feed the farm family. Better ready-cash market facilities in the nearby towns. And so on and on.

These are the fundamental economic needs of agriculture in North Carolina, if we are ever to accumulate wealth in our country regions.

Social values wait on wealth in the countryside, and the welfare of the

state waits on the efficiency, the prosperity, the satisfaction, and the wholesomeness of the farmers.

The man who is too stupid to see this foundational fact in commonwealth development is too stupid to see anything but the predatory concerns of private enterprise.

THEY LIVE AT HOME

It is interesting to note that some of our farmers are bringing in their cotton right now since the price has touched the 22-cent mark, but it is significant also to note that these farmers without a single exception are in one of two classes, either possessed of wealth and credit sufficient to borrow money or else they are in the class of those who live at home and board at the same place.

One farmer who yesterday sold his cotton, told of how he had enough feed for his teams to last another year; while we heard another farmer who was at that time holding his cotton and probably still has it explain that his hog and hominy were raised at home and that he had enough hams, chickens, and eggs to feed himself and family and those dependent upon him for another winter and that, his ready needs for money had been taken care of by the family poultry and the cows. That's successful farming.—Rocky Mount Telegram.

GIVE THE FOLKS THE FACTS

Not long since, a popular speaker enjoined an audience of college students substantially as follows:

"The world is growing stale and its people are becoming commonplace from sheer lack of ideas. Wherefore, get ideas. It does not matter so much how or where you get them, or whether indeed they are correct; the great thing is to have ideas."

Now that is passing strange. Our observation is that the world is suffering more from lack of knowledge of facts than from paucity of ideas. Our conviction is that instead of suffering from too few ideas, we are suffering from too many that will not work because they have little or no relation to the facts of life. Our experience is that it is exceedingly difficult to find facts enough on which to base a new idea so that it will square with what is really going to happen. Wherefore let us have more facts, even to the curbing of some ideas that, however entertaining, might prove dangerous to the individual and the public, who perforce must in the long run deal with facts and not fancies.

Bad advice to the students that. They would better even follow history and precedent than that form of fiction

which leads only to the drifting sands; and the same is true of farmers.—The Country Gentleman.

HOMES AND THE COMMUNITY

The home is the unit around which any community must be built. Wherever there is a plenitude of homes, there you will find a prosperous, contented, and happy people. No great city was ever constructed upon an itinerant population. There must be a nucleus of homes upon which to build. Nobody can have a real abiding interest in a community who is not anchored to that community. A man will fight for his home, but he can very readily find another place in which to live.

A community that makes it easy for an individual to own his home need have no qualms upon the approach of the census taker. Every community has in it hundreds of houses that are not and never will be homes. It requires the element of possession and a lot of living to make a home. Where there are homes there are likely to be children, and where there are children there must of necessity be growth.

It is the ambition of every man to own some small fraction of the surface of the earth. Because some men try to hog it all does not alter the instinct which is inherent in every normal human being. In the heart of every man there is a dream of the time when he can sit at his ease beneath his own vine and fig tree. It is good to own a little piece of land—even if it is nothing more than a lot in a cemetery.

A man who owns his own home is a kinder neighbor and a better citizen. He has a very direct and personal interest in the well-being of the community in which he lives. He stands for good government because it is only a good government that can give him protection for his property. He wants churches and schools in order that his children may be educated and trained. He is interested in the beautification of his city and the improvement of his streets, because these things tend to enhance the value and the beauty of his own holdings. He becomes rooted in the soil of that community and a part and parcel thereof.

A city that makes it easy for a man to own his own home is on the high road to prosperity. A city that would encourage home building with financial assistance to responsible prospects would soon be a community of homes. One property owner is worth ten finely dressed strangers who are here today and gone tomorrow. Birds of passage seldom build nests. It takes a lot of living to make a home. A city of plenty of small homes is a delightful community. There are too few of them.—Charlotte Observer.

FARM WEALTH PRODUCED IN THE UNITED STATES Per Farm Worker in 1920

Based on (1) the farm value of all farm wealth produced: farm crops, farm animals raised, and animal products—milk, butter, poultry, eggs, honey and wax, and the like, as exhibited in Weather, Crops, and Markets, July 1, 1922, and (2) on the federal census of agricultural workers—farm owners, tenants, wage laborers, ten years old and over.

Grand total of 1920 crops and animal products in North Carolina, \$470,000,000. Fifteen states made a better showing. Production per farm worker in North Carolina, \$984. Forty states made a better showing.

Miss Henrietta R. Smedes Department of Rural Social Economics, University of North Carolina					
Rank	State	Per Farm Worker	Rank	State	Per Farm Worker
1	Iowa	\$3,554	25	Utah	\$1,956
2	Nebraska	3,400	26	Minnesota	1,924
3	Kansas	3,285	27	Michigan	1,917
4	Wyoming	3,206	28	New Hampshire	1,742
5	Nevada	3,062	29	Arizona	1,735
6	South Dakota	2,809	30	Delaware	1,712
7	Colorado	2,786	31	Rhode Island	1,700
8	California	2,729	32	Oklahoma	1,629
9	Illinois	2,680	33	Maine	1,625
10	North Dakota	2,672	34	Maryland	1,530
11	Wisconsin	2,577	35	New Mexico	1,485
12	New York	2,562	36	West Virginia	1,389
13	Vermont	2,535	37	Texas	1,386
14	Idaho	2,347	38	Virginia	1,236
15	Oregon	2,289	39	Kentucky	1,117
16	Connecticut	2,234	40	Tennessee	1,067
17	Indiana	2,207	41	North Carolina	984
18	Montana	2,207	42	Arkansas	781
19	Ohio	2,172	43	Florida	780
20	New Jersey	2,153	44	South Carolina	745
21	Missouri	2,093	45	Georgia	652
22	Washington	2,061	46	Louisiana	616
23	Pennsylvania	2,040	47	Alabama	525
24	Massachusetts	2,013	48	Mississippi	499