

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

NEWS LETTER

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

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

JANUARY 24, 1923

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL. IX, NO. 10

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, S. H. Hobbs, Jr., L. B. 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.

BUSINESS IN CAROLINA IN 1922

A BILLION OF NEW WEALTH

First and fundamentally, the volume of brand new wealth created in North Carolina in 1922 amounted all told to nearly one and one third billion dollars, at farm and factory prices, as follows: Manufactured products, \$832,000,000; crops, livestock, and livestock products, \$410,000,000; woodlot and forest products, \$70,200,000; mines and quarries, \$2,500,000; fish and oysters; \$2,000,000. The total is more than three times that of 1915—1317 million against 402 million dollars. In a single year we created more than a third as much wealth as we have accumulated on our tax books in two hundred and fifty years. It averaged nearly five hundred dollars per inhabitant in 1922, counting men, women, and children of both races, or \$2,600 per family. No other state in the South begins to approach North Carolina in her per capita production of new wealth, and in the total annual output only seven states of the Union stand above her.

Second. Despite the drop in market prices, the total farm wealth produced in the state in 1922 is more than twice the total of 1910—\$410,000,000 against \$175,000,000. We produced 75,000 bales of cotton more than in 1921, and climbed to the fourth place in the cotton-belt South. The average advance of cotton and tobacco prices throughout the season gave to the farmers, the merchants, and bankers of the state sixty-seven million dollars in cash more than the year before. As a result, North Carolina is paying back the eight-million dollar agricultural loan of the War Finance Corporation faster than any other state in the Union.

Third. Our mills and factories have been running on full time almost without exception. Factory prices are less, but the volume of manufactured goods is greatly increased and the volume of wages is scarcely lessened. New mills are being built all over the state. The new spindles to be set going in North Carolina in 1923 number 550,000, which is more than two-thirds of the new spindles of the entire South. The demand for labor in our factory and building trades and in highway construction has been steady throughout the year just closed, and at no time has unemployment been a serious problem in North Carolina, as in the Great Industrial area north and east and in the boll-weevil states south.

Fourth. These are the fundamental facts that explain our four hundred eighteen millions of bank resources, our one hundred sixteen millions of bank account savings, our investment of an additional twenty-seven millions in motor cars in 1922, our ability to own one hundred forty-six million dollars' worth of automobiles and trucks, and to buy seventy-five million gallons of gasoline in twelve months. They explain the greatly increased activity of our building and loan associations, and the erection of residences, warehouses, factories, hotels, and office buildings everywhere. They also explain our ability to pay one hundred twenty-two million dollars into the federal treasury in 1922 as taxes on profits, incomes, and inheritances, and only seven states paid more. These are large figures, and they have given the state a large place in the mind of the tradespeople and credit institutions the country over. The traveling men talk them far and wide, and the bankers of America do not hesitate to take our public bonds at a premium.

Fifth. But even more significant is the deep and abiding impression these facts have made upon North Carolina herself. Not natural resources but, we make a state. The abounding natural resources and possibilities of North Carolina were all here in Governor Drummond's day; but only within the last forty years has the state begun to cash them in—mainly within the last four years. The best evidence that a state believes in herself lies in her willingness to invest in public education, public health, and public highways as indispensable foundations of commonwealth progress and prosperity. In public health work we rank among the twelve foremost states of the Union, and we have moved forward in this field faster than any other American state. In public highway building we are sur-

passed by Pennsylvania alone. During the last eighteen months we have built 1377 miles of hard-surfaced and other types of dependable roads, and have spent for this purpose nineteen million dollars in round numbers. In public school support we have moved up from six million to twenty million dollars in ten years. In twenty years we have moved up from one to twenty million dollars in public school maintenance money.

At last North Carolina is establishing her state institutions of charities and corrections, liberal learning and technical training, on a basis of adequacy. Which is to say, North Carolina is at last minded to base her future on the intelligence, the skill, and the character of her people. It is these alone that can make a state great. The steadfast belief of North Carolina in herself is far more important than the applause of listening multitudes in other states. It makes history faster.

OUR FEDERAL TAXES 1922

One hundred twenty-two million four hundred thirteen thousand dollars is the total collected in North Carolina in 1921-22 by the Internal Revenue Bureau, mainly as taxes on profits, incomes, capital stock and inheritances.

Only seven states of the Union paid more federal taxes, namely, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, Massachusetts, Ohio, and California. Since 1919, we have moved ahead of New Jersey and Missouri, and our rank is now eighth instead of tenth.

Fifth in crop-producing power, and eighth in federal tax-paying power—that's the record of North Carolina in 1922.

As for the South, our rank is first. The table is as follows for the year ending June 30, 1922:

1 North Carolina.....	\$122,413,000
2 Texas	52,348,000
3 Virginia	46,596,000
4 Kentucky	33,122,000
5 Louisiana	22,754,000
6 Tennessee	21,795,000
7 Georgia	20,989,000
8 Oklahoma	18,402,000
9 Florida	14,320,000
10 Alabama	11,464,000
11 South Carolina	11,447,000
12 Arkansas	6,979,000
13 Mississippi	4,640,000

Texas and Virginia are our nearest competitors in the South in federal tax totals paid in 1922, but North Carolina paid more than both of them together—twenty-three million dollars more.

We paid more than the rest of the South Atlantic states combined—Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida—twenty-nine million dollars more.

We paid more than the five Gulf states all put together, Texas included—seventeen million dollars more.

We paid enough taxes to the federal government in one year to keep our state government going for ten years.

And the people who are paying the bulk of these tremendous federal taxes are the people who are bearing the burden of state taxes. They pay more state taxes to the state at present than all the rest of us put together; and, as Governor Morrison says, they are doing it without a kick or a whine anywhere.

JOHN SMITH—TENANT

How John Smith—Tenant lives, what he has to live on in a mid-state Carolina county, his ideals and hopes and level of life, the chances of helping him into farm ownership, and the feasible ways of help, make a bulletin of fifty pages and charts, by J. A. Dickey of Alamance county and E. C. Branson, Kenan Professor of Rural Social Economics at the University of North Carolina.

It will be ready for the mails within the next ten days, and it will be sent free of charge to any North Carolinian who writes for it. The charge for people outside the state is fifty cents. The edition is small, and thoughtful students of a fundamental problem in the South will need to apply for it promptly.

It reports and interprets the results of a field study in the three summer months of 1922. The chapters are as follows:

1. The Money They Live on.

GASOLINE AND CULTURE

The total value of church and school property in North Carolina after two and a half centuries of history is \$80,000,000, as follows:

Church property, all denominations	\$40,000,000
Public school property....	25,000,000
College property, church and state	15,000,000

Total church and school property

Motor cars and trucks,

on Jan. 1, 1923

Which is to say, in two hundred and fifty years the people of North Carolina have been willing to invest in church and school properties eighty million dollars. But in the last ten years we have invested nearly twice as many millions in motor cars and trucks.

Last year our automobiles and trucks moved up from 148,639 to 182,400 in number—an increase of nearly 34,000. Reckoned at the average authorized by the state automobile bureau the new cars we bought last year cost us twenty-seven million dollars. Which is to say, in a single year we spent nearly twice as much on motor cars as we have been willing to invest in college properties, church and state, in two and a half centuries.

Here are comparisons that are odorous or odious—Shakespeare's famous phrase reads both ways, and both apply to the comparisons we are offering.

The point is, whichever phrase we choose, there is manifestly a lot of loose change in North Carolina—far more than anywhere else in the South, barring only the oil-well states in the south-west; and we are spending it in multiplied millions year by year in North Carolina.

We even had twenty-five millions for Blue Sky artists selling fake oil stocks and other wild-cat paper during the last three years, says Hon. Stacy Wade, our State Insurance Commissioner.—E. C. Branson.

2. A Close-up Study of John Smith, Tenant.
3. The Tenancy Area Surveyed.
4. Living on Twenty-three cents a day.
5. Farm Classes: Owners, Renters, and Croppers.
6. What They Own and the Money They Handle.
7. Property Levels—Chart.
8. Cash Income Levels—Chart.
9. The Social Estate of Tenant Classes.
10. The Homes They Live in.
11. Health Conditions.
12. Schools and School Influences: Chart of Renter Levels, Chart of Cropper Levels.
13. Churches and Church Influences: Church Attendance and Membership, Sunday School Attendance—Chart.
14. What Farm Tenants Read.
15. Social Occasions and Contacts.
16. Helping Tenants into Farm Ownership: Who Can and Who Cannot be helped.
17. State-Aid to Landless Farmers.
18. Self-Help Agencies and Qualities.
19. The Place of Legislation.
20. Obstacles to Home and Farm Ownership.
21. Constructive Suggestions.

HOME AND FARM OWNERS

Home and farm ownership in the state, the nation, and other countries of the world, the rapidly increasing multitude of landless, homeless men in every country of Christendom, the causes and consequences of tenancy town and country, the attack upon this problem in other states and countries—in particular in California, and a

proposed solution of the problem in North Carolina, make a bulletin of 220 pages, issued by the Extension Division of the University of North Carolina, under the editorship of E. C. Branson, Kenan Professor of Rural Social Economics.

It is the 1921-22 Year-Book of the North Carolina Club at the University. It is now in the hands of the printers, and will be mailed out within the next three weeks.

It will be sent free of charge to any North Carolinian who writes for it, and to others for \$1.00.

As usual the edition is small and the thoughtful students who want it will need to apply at once to C. D. Snell, Extension Director, or to E. C. Branson, Chapel Hill, N. C.

- The chapters are as follows:
1. Foreword.—E. C. Branson.
 2. Farm Tenancy in the United States.—S. H. Hobbs, Jr.
 3. The Landless Farmer in North Carolina.—A. M. Moser.
 4. The Homeless Multitude in Urban Areas.—J. G. Gullick.
 5. Home Ownership in Industrial Communities.—S. O. Bondurant.
 6. Causes of Tenancy—Town and Country.—C. R. Edney.
 7. The Status of the Farm Tenant:

In Europe and the United States. Living Standards in North Carolina.—Miss Eugenia Bryant.

8. How Farm Tenants Live in Mid-State Carolina.—J. A. Dickey and E. C. Branson.
9. The Effects of Home and Farm Ownership.—F. A. Grissette.
10. Farm Tenantry in North Carolina.—Hon. J. W. Bailey.
11. Bank Account Savings in North Carolina.—R. F. Marshburn.
12. Cooperative Credit Unions.—Miss Bertha Austin.
13. Cooperative Marketing.—J. Osler Bailey.
14. Building and Loan Associations.—J. P. Trotter.
15. The Church and Landless Men.—L. G. Wilson and E. C. Branson.
16. Federal Aid for Landless Men.—P. A. Peavis, Jr.
17. State-Aid to Farm Ownership.—S. H. Hobbs, Jr.
18. Promoting Home and Farm Ownership in the British Isles.—Miss Katherine Woodrow.
19. State-Aid to Farm Ownership in Australia.—W. E. White.
20. Helping Men to Own Farms in America.—Miss A. O. Cato.
21. The California Way and a Proposed Plan for North Carolina.—J. A. Dickey.

FARM PROPERTY IN NORTH CAROLINA

Average Per Farm in 1920

Based on the 1920 Census of Agriculture, and covering (1) farm lands and buildings, (2) livestock, and (3) farm machinery, tools, and implements.

The values are greatly decreased since 1920, but the decreases are fairly uniform the state and the nation over, and therefore the rank of the counties remains practically unchanged.

North Carolina average \$4,634; United States average \$12,084. Forty-two states make a better showing in the value of farm property per farm. Only four states have more farms than North Carolina, but twenty states have a greater total of farm property. The South is at a disadvantage in this comparison because small areas cultivated by renters and croppers are recorded as farms in the census.

The differences in rank of the counties lie mainly (1) in the farm population per square mile, (2) in the richness of soil and its adaptability to cash-crop farming, (3) in the percent of farm land under cultivation, (4) in the presence of large nearby market towns, good transportation and the like, (5) in the value of farm buildings, (6) in the quantity and quality of livestock, and (7) in the amount and value of farm implements and machinery.

S. H. Hobbs, Jr.

Department of Rural Social Economics, University of North Carolina

Rank	Counties	Property Per Farm	Rank	Counties	Property Per Farm
1	Wayne	\$8,296	51	Rockingham	\$4,657
2	Scotland	7,966	52	Davie	4,656
3	Greene	7,616	53	Gates	4,600
4	Pitt	7,569	54	Surry	4,609
5	Lenoir	7,435	55	Moore	4,605
6	Nash	7,406	56	Lee	4,590
7	Edgecombe	7,113	57	Watauga	4,566
8	Wilson	7,003	58	Anderson	4,550
9	Forsyth	6,153	59	Bertie	4,546
10	Robeson	5,884	60	Durham	4,531
11	Johnston	5,800	61	Union	4,522
12	Martin	5,729	62	Orange	4,514
13	Hoke	5,680	63	Stokes	4,511
14	New Hanover	5,673	64	Randolph	4,512
15	Guilford	5,575	65	Alamance	4,504
16	Gaston	5,524	66	Caswell	4,504
17	Sampson	5,499	67	Northampton	4,500
18	Beaufort	5,440	68	Camden	4,494
19	Hertford	5,417	69	Stanly	4,492
20	Jones	5,363	70	Columbus	4,485
21	Rowan	5,341	71	Caldwell	4,485
22	Buncombe	5,117	72	Bladen	4,485
23	Allegany	5,180	73	Carter	4,480
24	Harnett	5,127	74	Swain	4,480
25	Cleveland	5,107	75	Madison	4,474
26	Halifax	5,088	76	Warren	4,464
27	Wake	5,059	77	Transylvania	4,460
28	Mecklenburg	5,049	78	Chatham	4,450
29	Cumberland	5,031	79	Ashe	4,450
30	Haywood	4,962	80	Chatham	4,448
31	Vance	4,913	81	Burke	4,445
32	Pasquotank	4,906	82	Clay	4,445
33	Chowan	4,882	83	Polk	4,447
34	Iredell	4,799	84	Wilder	4,445
35	Cabarrus	4,700	85	Forsyth	4,435
36	Richmond	4,664	86	Warren	4,435
37	Hyde	4,624	87	Montgomery	4,435
38	Craven	4,581	88	Yancey	4,432
39	Washington	4,549	89	Madison	4,432
40	Watauga	4,466	90	Brunswick	4,429
41	Currituck	4,433	91	Avery	4,429
42	Catawba	4,414	92	McDowell	4,427
43	Duplin	4,403	93	Mitchell	4,428
44	Davidson	4,326	94	Wayne	4,401
45	Granville	4,301	95	Johnston	4,389
46	Yadkin	4,289	96	Wilkes	4,236
47	Ashe	4,204	97	Macon	4,222
48	Lincoln	4,192	98	Swain	4,103
49	Person	4,147	99	Graham	4,164
50	Franklin	4,114	100	Cherokee	1,766