

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA NEWS LETTER

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

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

JANUARY 20, 1926

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL. XII, NO. 10

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

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

FARM INCREASES AND DECREASES

HEALTHY FARM INCREASES

The table which appears elsewhere ranks the counties of North Carolina according to gains and losses in number of farms during the five-year period from January 1920 to January 1925. The parallel column shows the number of farms in each county in 1925.

Hoke with an increase of 43.5 percent in the number of farms ranks first in the state, while Craven with a loss of 18.1 percent comes last.

Johnston county with 7,515 farms ranks first in number, while Dare with only 79 farms has fewer than any other county in the state.

Seventy-eight counties had more farms in 1925 than they had in 1920, which is an excellent showing in view of the fact that the United States suffered a net loss of farms during this same period. Only 22 counties in North Carolina show decreases in farms, in none of which was the loss a very large one.

Makes Splendid Showing

Volume XII, number 2, of the News Letter carried a study on farm gains and losses by states, 1920-25, in which it was shown that North Carolina was surpassed by only two states in the number of new farms brought under cultivation during this period, and that in 1925 only one state in the Union, Texas, had more farms under cultivation. North Carolina's total was 233,495, which is 23,000 more farms than our nearest rival possesses, aside from Texas.

If growth in number of farms is any indication, the agricultural situation in North Carolina is far better than in any of our neighboring states. The increase in farms in Virginia was only about half the increase in North Carolina. The other states bordering on North Carolina suffered losses in farms. In South Carolina all the counties except five have fewer farms than they had in 1920, the net decreases for the state being 19,927. Georgia suffered the heaviest loss of any state, with 60 thousand fewer farms in 1925 than in 1920. Tennessee also suffered a slight decrease in farms. In percent of counties showing increases in farms North Carolina ranks near the top among the states of the Union, which means that the entire state is sharing whatever prosperity exists on the farms of the state.

Interesting Changes

The study brings out some rather interesting facts with regard to changed conditions that have taken place since 1920. During the decade from 1910 to 1920 the counties showing the largest increases in the number of farms were the twenty or so combination cotton and tobacco counties centering around Wilson, Wayne, and Johnston, resulting from high prices for cotton and tobacco during the War period. During the last five years this same group of counties made the poorest showing in farm increases of any large area in the state. The western half of the state, whose counties with few exceptions lost farms between 1910 and 1920, shows up slightly better than the eastern half in farm increases for the period since 1920.

Mountain Counties

Perhaps the most outstanding fact is the change for the better in the mountain counties. From 1910 to 1920 all of the mountain counties except three lost farms. During the last five years all of the mountain counties except three have increased their farms, many of them ranking well up in the percent increase column.

During the decade preceding 1920 there were 38 counties in the state losing farms, against only 22 counties losing during the last five years. Of the 38 counties which lost farms during the census decade, only six continued to decrease following 1920. Sixteen counties which increased during the census decade show losses during the last five years. For the most part these are counties in which cotton or tobacco or both are important crops.

The Boll Weevil Counties

It is rather interesting to note that the counties which have suffered most from boll weevil ravages—Columbus, Bladen, Robeson, Scotland, Richmond, and Hoke—make the best showing in farm increases of any solid group of counties in the state. Trucking and

diversified farming have made much headway in this area.

Aside from this group, the north-eastern Tidewater region, the west-central Piedmont counties, and the mountain region in general lead in new farms during the last five years. None of these groups ranked high in farm increases during the decade preceding 1920.

A Main Explanation

The nation over, the farm population is static or decreasing. The wholesome increase in farms in North Carolina since 1920, a period during which agriculture has not been very profitable, is to be attributed, we believe, more to the state-wide system of public highways and improved county roads than to any other factor. This is especially true in the remote regions of the state—the Tidewater counties and the mountain country. Improved roads and the motor car have done wonders in reducing the loneliness and monotony of country life, in enabling the farmer to get his produce to market, in shortening distances, in making possible the improvement of rural schools through consolidation, and in many other ways. The country regions of North Carolina, with our splendid highways and easy communication, are far more attractive residence and business areas than they were before the day of highways. The fact that every section of the state shows growth in farms is accounted for largely because every county in the state is sharing in the highway construction program.

To quote briefly from the Manufacturers Record, "Wherever good highways are constructed, prosperity and progress follow as surely as day follows night. Wherever intolerably bad roads exist, whether consisting of bottomless mud holes or equally bottomless sand piles, there stagnation takes place, along with gradual deterioration of the moral and educational condition of the people, and there poverty exists in direct contrast with the prosperity to be found where modern highways are built."—S. H. H., Jr.

TOWN-COUNTY GOVERNMENT

At a recent meeting of the North Carolina Club Mr. J. J. Rhyne, a graduate student and member of the Institute for Research in Social Science, presented a paper on Town and Country-side under One Local Government. The following is a brief of Mr. Rhyne's paper:

Owing to the increased number of contacts made possible by improved highways, the automobile, consolidation of schools in rural areas and the inclusion of rural areas in city school districts as well as a number of minor factors, town and country people are being brought to a position where each better understands the other. On the other hand, trade relations are and have been a main factor in creating mutual distrust on part of both town and country populations and a refusal to cooperate.

The farmer is awakening to a need of civic improvement and is setting about to find a remedy. As a consequence interest in the incorporation of rural areas has grown apace and a number of states or sections of different states have passed laws enabling rural areas to incorporate. North Carolina and Wisconsin are examples of states making such provisions. North Carolina in 1917 passed a rural municipal incorporation law, while Wisconsin has made provision whereby farmers may tax themselves for the construction of community houses. Sections of New Jersey and California have also taken the lead in the new movement.

Due to better relations developing between town and country areas, interest in the incorporation of rural areas by towns is now being carefully considered. This interest is tending to center in a plan whereby town and countryside may be incorporated under one local government, each being provided with the facilities appropriate to its needs. Something of the form of the proposed plan may be had from the New England Town which actually includes the country areas as well. The state of Utah also has a system of government for town and country some-

COOPERATION

The most distinct and significant movement in American agriculture in this decade is the almost universal trend toward cooperation in the marketing and distribution of farm products. It is in no sense a regional or sectional movement, for it exists in all sections and is participated in to some extent by producers of practically all kinds of farm products.

There has been some cooperation by farmers in the United States for many years, but within the last two decades, and particularly during the last decade, the movement has assumed proportions which indicate that it is a response to a fundamental and universal need of present-day American agriculture. It is highly significant from all points of view that the best minds in agriculture, without regard to region or commodity, are unanimous in the opinion that group action in marketing must be added to individual efficiency in production if the high standards of American farm life are to be preserved and agriculture is to maintain its proper place in our national life.—W. M. Jardine, Secretary of Agriculture.

what similar to the plan proposed, but aside from these two instances the plan is a novel one and would differ in some of its essential features from either of the two mentioned instances.

By the proposed arrangement the area to be incorporated would be divided into three zones. Zone No. 1 would comprise the bulk of the original town or city. Zone No. 2 would roughly correspond to the suburban area, while zone No. 3 would be the area from the bounds of zone No. 2 out to the final incorporate limits and would include the county area generally.

As indicated already each zone would be provided with facilities appropriate for its needs and taxed accordingly. In general the municipal government would be extended to cover the entire area, thus affording police protection for rural districts. The school district should also be extended to include the entire area. A unified system of highways could be instituted while water, lights, and fire protection would in general tend to coincide with the built-up portion of the town. Each of these facilities in turn would be extended as desired and the costs involved for their installation could be met without undue financial burden on the families involved.

It is believed that the plan suggested would produce the desired results wherever there is manifested the proper interest. Only the bare outline of the plan has been given but it should be understood at the start that no one plan could be made to fit all localities, but would have to be fashioned to suit the needs and peculiarities of each territory. Still the essential features of the plan need not be changed in any area.

Finally, due to the increasing complexity of modern life and inter-dependency of town and country the time has arrived when our municipal areas should be extended so as to include the rural areas and thus forge another link in the chain of progress toward making the country a more desirable place in which to live.

Students interested in the practical details of town and country consolidation might study town and country government in Denver county, Colorado, and the plans submitted to the voters in Alameda county, California, Baltimore county, Maryland, and Butte and Silver Bow county, Montana.

The plan applies in North Carolina to Durham city and county, Wilmington and New Hanover, and perhaps to one or two other counties where town and country interests are nearly identical.

Pamphlets on all these plans are in the files of the Department of Rural Social-Economics at the University of North Carolina, and may be had for use in brief-time loans.

SCHOOLS FOR ADULTS

Adult education is a term which has taken on a peculiar meaning in Denmark, a meaning which is without exact parallel elsewhere. The "adult" in Denmark, as the word is used in educational matters, is the young person between the ages of 18 and 25; and, therefore, "adult education" is an education specially organized to effect cer-

tain ends in the lives of these young people.

The most thorough development of this Danish "adult education" has taken place in the country districts, all over the kingdom. It is centered in certain distinctive schools, which have a peculiar character—the so-called "high schools." These schools, about 60 in number, are to be found in the rural regions. They have had a history of nearly a century, now, though most of them have been founded since 1864; and they have won a secure place in the Danish rural civilization.

According to some writers, they have been responsible for the distinctive forms which Danish rural life has developed: its cooperative economic organizations, its communal social life and all the other specific functions that have made Danish rural life the admiration of all observers. According to other writers, they have been merely one of the effects of this distinctive Danish civilization. But questions of the priority of cause and effect are likely to become academic. The most intelligent Danes believe that these schools are both cause and result.

In the troubled times of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the Danes felt all the evils that can come to a small nation not able to defend itself. And it is certain that in the first half of the nineteenth century Danish life, especially Danish rural life, had sunk to a rather low level—a sort of sordid pessimism.

From 1865 on, these high schools were opened over the whole land. In most cases, each school was the expression of an outstanding leader in the community. Each school, therefore, had, and has, its own distinctive qualities, though all stand together for the maintenance of a genuine spiritual life in Denmark's rural and village areas.

Small and Homelike

These schools are all small and homelike in their organization and conduct. They take no more than 150 students at any one time. They have no more than

three or four teachers. They use few books in classrooms, though there are many books in their libraries. The students come from all parts of Denmark. They stay no more than five months. In that time, they come into contact with a number of real men and women; they attend lectures three or four times a day; they take part in endless discussions among themselves and with their teachers; they live together, eat together, sing together, and study civilization, Danish and world-wide civilization, together; and at the end of the term they go home—without an examination but with a new inner life, with a new sense of the significance of life, with an interest in the world's problems and with some great leading ideas, by means of which they hope to be able to find their way through the crowded corridors of the world. They take some books home with them—some real books. They expect to spend their lives intelligently. They will take part in cooperative organizations of their communities; they will help to defend their rural civilization against the disintegrating factors of the world in cities and of competitive ambitions.

Something has happened in Denmark that has not happened elsewhere in the world—except, maybe, in another land still less well known, namely, Finland. It is not true that Denmark has no problems. It is not true that Denmark is an idealistic world of the latest political follies. It is true that the rural civilization of Denmark is one of the most prosperous rural civilizations in the world, today. And, in so far as that is true, the result can be, at least in great part, credited to the work of these "adult schools" which take young people in their most hopeful years, help them to see the world's life and the life of Denmark in large perspective, and so enable them to choose, wisely and well, their place in the life and work of their own nation and of the world. That seems to be a pretty good sort of an "adult education."—Christian Science Monitor.

PERCENT INCREASES AND DECREASES IN FARMS

In North Carolina by Counties, 1920-1925

The following table, based on the U. S. Census of Agriculture, ranks the counties of the state according to percent increases and decreases in the number of farms from 1920 to 1925. The accompanying column shows the number of farms in each county in 1925.

Hoke county ranks first with a gain in number of farms of 43.5 percent over the year 1920. Craven county ranks last with 18.1 percent fewer farms than she had five years ago.

During the five-year period 78 counties increased in the number of farms, while 22 counties suffered losses.

The state increase in number of farms was 13,729, or 5.1 percent, and only two states showed a larger numerical gain. With 233,495 farms North Carolina now ranks next to Texas in total number.

S. H. Hobbs, Jr.

Department of Rural Social-Economics University of North Carolina

Rank	Counties	No. Farms 1925	Percent Increase 1920-25	Rank	Counties	No. Farms 1925	Percent Increase 1920-25
1	Hoke	2,127	43.5	50	Tyrrell	675	6.0
2	Nash	6,007	37.0	52	Haywood	2,175	4.9
3	Richmond	2,384	32.6	52	Pitt.	6,228	4.9
4	Transylvania	1,023	28.0	52	Rockingham	3,846	4.9
5	Scotland	2,210	20.8	55	Wilkes	5,208	4.8
6	Chowan	1,261	18.1	56	Madison	3,072	4.7
7	Cherokee	2,227	17.1	57	Halifax	4,858	4.0
8	Alamance	3,161	16.8	57	Wilson	4,616	4.0
9	Jackson	2,162	16.7	59	Union	4,991	3.5
10	Cleveland	4,670	16.3	60	Bertie	3,444	3.1
11	Granville	4,065	16.0	60	Greene	2,825	3.1
12	Beaufort	3,711	14.9	62	Stokes	3,473	3.0
13	Washington	1,273	14.7	63	Edgecombe	3,953	2.9
14	New Hanover	368	13.9	63	Wake	6,604	2.9
15	Forsyth	3,239	13.7	65	Buncombe	3,798	2.6
16	Burke	2,474	12.8	65	Dare	79	2.6
17	Pasquotank	1,530	12.5	67	Alleghany	1,438	2.5
18	Bladen	2,749	12.3	68	Rowan	3,587	2.4
19	Surry	4,563	12.2	69	Perquimans	1,496	2.3
20	Avery	1,472	11.9	69	Sampson	5,906	2.3
21	Vance	2,263	11.1	71	Polk	1,225	2.1
22	Cabarrus	2,672	10.1	72	Cumberland	3,151	1.6
23	Caldwell	2,170	10.0	73	Franklin	4,290	1.5
23	Yadkin	2,910	10.0	74	Guilford	4,021	1.1
25	Martin	2,763	9.9	75	Person	2,804	0.6
26	Montgomery	1,817	9.7	76	Iredell	4,135	0.5
27	Columbus	3,924	9.6	76	Warren	3,180	0.5
28	Randolph	4,241	9.5	78	Gates	1,584	0.0
29	Carteret	934	8.9	Decreases			
30	Hyde	1,248	8.7	79	Onslow	2,165	0.6
30	Lee	1,593	8.7	80	Wayne	4,995	0.7
30	Lincoln	2,343	8.7	81	Henderson	1,957	0.8
33	Northampton	3,793	8.4	82	Stanly	2,485	1.3
33	Swain	1,370	8.4	83	Moore	2,135	1.9
35	Robeson	7,048	7.4	84	Macon	1,865	3.1
36	Camden	938	7.2	85	Alexander	1,860	3.2
37	Pender	2,020	7.1	85	Rutherford	3,510	3.2
38	Johnston	7,515	7.0	87	Anson	3,567	3.7
39	Davidson	4,022	6.7	88	Durham	1,700	3.9
40	Gaston	2,493	6.6	89	Brunswick	1,358	4.1
41	Yancey	2,367	6.5	89	Duplin	4,495	4.1
42	Clay	859	6.3	91	Orange	2,082	4.6
42	McDowell	1,526	6.3	92	Harnett	3,219	4.7
44	Hertford	2,213	6.2	93	Chatham	3,539	5.4
45	Lenoir	3,353	6.0	94	Mecklenburg	4,013	7.6
46	Catawba	3,086	5.8	95	Jones	1,408	8.6
47	Davie	1,869	5.7	96	Pamlico	1,191	9.5
48	Watauga	2,133	5.6	97	Caswell	2,274	11.1
49	Mitchell	1,622	5.1	98	Currituck	873	11.4
50	Ashe	3,576	5.0	99	Graham	642	13.9
				100	Craven	2,124	18.1