

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 19, 1927

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

VOL. XIII, No. 10

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.

STATE HIGHWAY EXPENDITURES

LANDLESSNESS AND CRIME

If the founders of the Republic could have looked forward to a time when the owners and tillers of the soil should form an ever-dwindling percentage of the population, they would probably have given up the nation for lost. In our early days the landowner was the foundation of society. His property made him a defender of law and order; and since he stayed in one community, he was subject to the beneficent effect of a continuous public opinion. Even the tenant or laborer rarely moved, so that he too was subject to social pressure.

But with transportation easy, jobs plentiful, and places to live rentable nearly everywhere, we can go through life without really belonging anywhere or being subject to any community's opinion. The economic revolution through which we have been passing, which has added so much well-being to the general mass of the population, has at the same time produced flat-bred floaters in the cities and wanderers in the country. These men are free from most of the restraints of organized society except penalties of the law—and fairly oblivious of them. The good in this economic revolution has vastly outweighed the evil, but the evil is nevertheless large and worth most careful study.

Dr. E. C. Branson, whose article on *The Forgotten Women* appears elsewhere in this magazine, has made a study of the relation of the landless man to crime, a part of which he reports in these words:

"The ownership of land tethers a man to law and order better than all the laws on the statute books. It breeds in him a sense of personal worth and family pride. It identifies him with the community he lives in and gives him a proprietary interest in the church, the school, and other organizations and enterprises of his home town or home community. It enables him to hold his family together, makes him a better father, a better neighbor, and a better citizen, mainly because it makes him a stable, responsible member of society. Landless men, white or black, in town or country, tend to be restless, roving, and irresponsible; and the restless, roving, irresponsible multitudes of America are a fundamental menace to society.

"These are some of the things we had in mind the other day as we journeyed into a mid-state county of North Carolina to study the criminal dockets of the two court sessions of the last twelve months. . . . Of the eighty criminals convicted in Chatham, the county we studied, sixty-six were tenants, owning not an inch of the soil they cultivated or a single shingle in the roof over their heads. The tenants are nearly one-third of the population, but they committed more than four-fifths of the crimes.

"All assaults with deadly weapons were made by tenants; all second-degree murders, all illegal disposals of mortgaged property, all crimes of false pretense, all injuries to property, all fornication and adultery, all prostitution, all cruelty to animals, all moonshining, and all reckless driving of cars. The tenants furnished three-fourths of the convictions for larceny and illegal receiving, four-fifths of the convictions for operating cars while intoxicated, four-fifths of the abandonment, and four-fifths of the bootlegging. . . .

"But landlessness is not merely a country problem. In towns of ten thousand inhabitants or more in North Carolina, from two-thirds to three-fourths of all the people live in rented homes; and they are forever moving from house to house, from city to city, under the pinch of necessity or the lure of opportunity. . . . The more populous and prosperous an area becomes, the fewer are the people who live in homes of their own. It is a penalty we pay for what we are pleased to call progress. And it is the cruellest paradox of Christendom. Eighty-nine percent of all the persons in greater New York live in rented homes—in the tenements, apartment houses, and family hotels of a cliff-dwelling civilization. Sooner or later America will have to reckon with her landless, homeless multitudes. Our landless are already nearly half the population of the nation—more than fifty million persons in the United States.

"Civilization is rooted and grounded in the home-owning, home-loving, home-defending instincts. Herein lies the

essential social significance of land-ownership."

In our agricultural days few men owned property who did not own land, so that practically speaking the term landowner embraced all those who had a financial stake in the country's success. A man now, however, may have a very large stake in the country and not be, directly at least, an owner of land. It may be that land owning has not the same significance it used to have. But a family that has no fixed position and no obligations to any particular community is not likely to contribute its share to the social and political activities which are necessary to civilization, even if it does not actually become a burden by its lawlessness or disregard of the rights of others.—*World's Work*, December, 1926.

THE NEW FACILITY

The Division of Markets of the North Carolina Department of Agriculture is rendering a fine service to the farmers, dealers, and consumers of the state. Through the efforts of the marketing specialists of this division, cooperating with dealers, and with the cooperation also of the county agricultural agents, literally hundreds of car loads of poultry and eggs have been sold by the farmers of remote sections at prices very considerably above prices that could have been secured on purely local markets. Invaluable assistance has been given by the marketing specialists in the handling of truck, fruit, timber, and other products of the soil. The result is, although this work is even yet in its early stages, that the agricultural section of our population is not only receiving tens of thousands of dollars a year above what they could have secured for products sold without this assistance, but new markets and new channels of distribution are constantly being opened for a greater volume of products from our land.

Mr. V. W. Lewis, senior marketing specialist of the Division of Markets, is urging, as the next step in the development of the marketing system which is so badly needed by both our agricultural classes and our food-consuming classes in cities, towns, and industrial communities, the establishment of cold storage plants at strategic points in the state, these plants to be owned and operated either cooperatively or by private enterprise and not only performing the functions of preserving eggs, poultry, fruit and vegetables and other products, but the same organization acting as the middleman between the producer on the one side and the retail dealers in these food products on the other side. This sort of a project is exactly what ex-Governor Cameron Morrison has been advocating for Mecklenburg and adjacent territory. The logic of the proposition is clear and convincing. One department of such an establishment as is advocated would be a well equipped abattoir for the proper butchering of hogs, sheep, cattle, and poultry.

"If it were not for cold storage," argues Mr. Lewis, "eggs would hardly have a market value in the spring months, and only the most wealthy could afford them in the winter. Butter, meats, and vegetables are offered the consuming public as needed, cold storage being the great stabilizing factor affecting prices." Further, Mr. Lewis points out that many cars of hogs, poultry, and cattle are being sent out of North Carolina, while more than this amount is sent back into the state from other sections to feed North Carolinians.

The advocacy of marketing establishments with cold storage facilities by Mr. Lewis, Governor Morrison and others, is also, as *The Observer* happens to know, in line with the ideas of Dr. E. C. Branson, head of the Department of Rural Economics at the State University. Doctor Branson has pointed out the fact that North Carolina is importing approximately \$232,000,000 worth of food and feed products, most of which could be produced at home, if facilities for the handling and distribution of these products were available. Doctor Branson declared in a conversation a few days ago that North Carolina will continue to import huge, ridiculous amounts of food and feed stuffs until just such facilities are provided at home as are being advocated by Mr. Lewis and as have been proposed for Mecklenburg and this section by Gov-

WHAT EDUCATION DOES

"I have listened with great interest to the men from Alabama and other Southern States who have told of the vastness of their mineral and timber and agricultural possibilities. I enjoyed the enthusiastic story about Colorado, its wonderful mountains, its great mineral wealth and its superb climate. I listened with rapt attention to what the spokesman from California had to say about that fortunate land. And yet, my friends, I have to tell you that in New England we have none of these natural advantages. We are without a fertile soil, we are without coal and iron ore; we are without the many natural advantages which all other States outside of New England have claimed. But we have taken the coal from Alabama and the Virginias, the pig-iron from Pittsburgh and Birmingham and cotton from the whole South down to Texas; we have taken the lumber and the timber from the South with which to build our factories; we have equipped them with machinery made out of the steel from other states; we have imported our foodstuffs from the West with which to feed our people. And yet on this artificial foundation we have developed a business interest which in proportion to population surpasses that of any other section of America. We have no natural advantages, but we have taken our brains and our brawn and we have technically trained them and made our man-power greater than the power of natural resources."—*Manufacturers Record*.

ernor Morrison.

The *Observer* cannot help but believe that the providing of such facilities would afford a profitable field for such capital and human endeavor as would be required. The economics of the situation demands it and the development must come. It is going to come, and it will come the quicker if our business men and bankers will cooperate with our marketing specialists and agricultural leaders. As a matter of fact our business-men and bankers should take the lead, because they are better trained by experience for the promotion and conduct of such establishments as are needed.—*The Charlotte Observer*.

URGED TO ORGANIZE

For years the farmers have been told what they need in organization on a large scale to bring about cooperative marketing of their products. Secretary Jardine again urges such organization in his annual report.

It is true this remedy would cure many of the ills now besetting the farmer. But it is exceedingly difficult to obtain.

By the very nature of their occupation, the farmers are hampered in efforts at organizing. They do not form a compact group, as do the workers in a particular branch of industry.

Then, many farmers are specialists. They raise corn, or wheat, or cotton, or fruit, or some other crop, often not merely because they choose but because other crops do not thrive in their locality. So they need organizations of wheat growers, corn growers, fruit growers, and the like, since the different farm products present different problems.

But the farmers are organizing in spite of the difficulties. Cooperative associations reporting to the department of agriculture at the end of 1925 had a total membership of 2,700,000—more than three times as many as in 1915. Some of these memberships were duplicated. But almost a third of the farmers are now engaged in cooperative marketing.

If these organizations continue the present rate of increase in members, they may soon stabilize agriculture. Then the farmers won't need aid.—*Hillsboro Record*.

SOUTH'S NEEDS

Frankly the South needs industrial prosperity, but not at the expense of the grace and charms of life. We need education for the masses and expert training for those who are to be leaders, but we should not like to have vocational and technical training entirely take the place of liberal culture.

We want all that modern science can bring us, but we do not want to become

scientific and nationalistic at the expense of the spiritual values of life.

We can get along without a literature that finds its material in the garbage can and without a theatre that ministers to the obscene snickerings of the audience. We have seen some of the effects of these things on the modern mind and we want to avoid them.

We need to know what critical scholarship and scientific hypothesis have done to make necessary a restatement of religious beliefs, but we do not wish to swing to the opposite extreme and exalt rationalism and scientific certainties above a reasonable and vital faith in the eternal virtues.

We of the South are too apt to indulge in a superficial optimism when a resolute facing of stubborn facts would be better.—*Dr. Edwin Mims*.

RANKS LOW IN SALARIES

In June of 1925 the United States Bureau of Education made a survey of the expenditures of the colleges and universities. Some of the results of this survey with regard to state institutions were recently published in *School and Society*.

The report shows that the composite expenditures of these schools were divided in the following fields: salaries and wages, 51 percent; materials and supplies, 23 percent; buildings and land, 14 percent; equipment, 4 percent; trust funds, 2 percent; not detailed in reports, 6 percent.

The University of California spent more for salaries and wages than any other state college or university, namely, over \$5,000,000 in a single year. The University of Michigan was second with expenditures in this field totaling more than four and a half million dollars. Three and a half million dollars were spent each by the University of Illinois, the University of Minnesota, and the University of Wisconsin. Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, the State University of Iowa, the University of Missouri, and Ohio State University, each spent more than \$2,000,000 for salaries and wages. Each of the following spent more than \$1,000,000 on salaries and wages: Indiana University, Purdue University (Indiana), University of Kansas, Kansas State Agricultural College, University of Kentucky, University of Maryland, Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, University of Nebraska, Oregon State Agricultural College, Pennsylvania State College, University of Texas, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, and University of Washington.

The report of the President to the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina for the school year 1924-25 records that for salaries and wages the sum of \$782,855.27 was spent. It is apparent from this report that the

University has not the money with which to compete with many of those state institutions with which it, in its position as the state university of one of the leading states of the Union, is forced to compete.—*Alumni Review*.

HIGHWAY EXPENDITURES

North Carolina stands at the top in the construction of state highways. She ranks fifth in total expenditures by state highway departments for the year 1925. The states that rank ahead of her are Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, and Michigan, all of which are far wealthier and more populous than North Carolina. In proportion to population, wealth, and area North Carolina leads in the United States in state construction and maintenance of highways.

The entire South shows up splendidly in state highway expenditures; better, in fact, in state highway expenditures than in any other matter in which the states have been ranked by this publication. A glance at the table which appears below shows that eleven southern states fall in the first column, and the other four near the top of the second column. The Southern states spent approximately two hundred million dollars on state highway construction and maintenance in 1925.

A significant fact revealed by the federal Department of Agriculture's report on state highway expenditures is the remarkable increase in percentage of total highway income derived from motor vehicle and gasoline taxes, and the falling off in the percentage representing real and personal property taxation. There has been a steady tendency in this direction since 1921. In that year the combined income from motor vehicle licenses and gasoline taxes amounted to 25.9 percent, the gas tax revenue amounting to less than one percent. In 1925 the income produced from these sources was 43.5 percent of the year's total, and the gas taxes alone amounted to 13.5 percent.

In the same period taxes on property specifically for road purposes have dropped from 11.2 percent to 3.3 percent of the year's total income. Including the income from appropriations and miscellaneous sources, most of which is raised by property taxation, the 1921 percentage was 20.7 and the 1925 percentage was 10.5.

Funds raised by the sale of bonds were also a smaller percentage of the total in 1925 than in 1921, being 21.3 percent in 1925 as compared with 27.8 percent in 1921.

EXPENDITURES BY STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

The following table, based on data compiled by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, ranks the states according to total expenditures by state highway departments for the year 1925.

North Carolina ranks fifth in total expenditures by state highway departments for the year. However, our area, population, and wealth considered, we really lead in the United States in state-construction of highways.

The Southern states rank better in this table than in any other table that has ever appeared in this publication. During the year 1925 the South spent approximately two hundred million dollars on state-constructed and state-maintained highways. All Southern states fall in the first column, or near the top of the second column.

These figures do not include expenditures by county and local authorities. Department of Rural Social-Economics, University of North Carolina

Rank	State	State highway expenditures	Rank	State	State highway expenditures
1	Pennsylvania	\$62,294,366	25	Connecticut	\$8,611,936
2	New York	49,368,770	26	Louisiana	8,610,624
3	Illinois	36,376,983	27	Florida	8,483,752
4	Michigan	36,138,549	28	Georgia	7,902,428
5	North Carolina	32,588,514	29	Washington	7,846,566
6	Missouri	31,593,937	30	Wisconsin	7,784,733
7	Ohio	24,086,289	31	Kansas	7,407,369
8	New Jersey	23,935,454	32	Maine	7,105,389
9	Texas	19,985,007	33	South Dakota	6,378,176
10	California	18,090,728	34	Colorado	5,564,590
11	Minnesota	17,962,567	35	Nebraska	5,563,752
12	West Virginia	16,138,729	36	Mississippi	4,795,192
13	Oregon	15,553,453	37	Utah	4,123,798
14	Kentucky	14,916,316	38	New Hampshire	4,027,242
15	Indiana	14,517,794	39	Wyoming	3,973,494
16	Tennessee	14,379,189	40	Idaho	3,636,681
17	Iowa	14,107,798	41	Vermont	3,618,327
18	Virginia	14,071,555	42	Delaware	3,492,841
19	Oklahoma	12,937,673	43	New Mexico	3,322,548
20	Massachusetts	12,880,700	44	Nevada	3,055,959
21	Maryland	12,024,781	45	Rhode Island	2,045,859
22	Arkansas	11,200,000	46	Arizona	2,442,947
23	Alabama	10,917,204	47	North Dakota	1,862,348
24	South Carolina	9,132,953	48	Montana	1,267,242