

MEAT AND MILK ANIMALS

MEAT AND MILK ANIMALS

The table which appears elsewhere ranks the counties of North Carolina on the basis of meat and milk animal units per farm. In this study horses and mules have been omitted, attention being given only to food-producing animals—cattle, sheep, swine and poultry. In order to determine whether one county is more heavily stocked than another, it is necessary to reduce the different kinds of livestock to some unit basis. Agricultural economists have adopted the term animal unit to mean one mature head of cattle, or a horse, and have reduced other kinds of livestock to their equivalent, based on feed consumed. On the basis of the amount of feed required to maintain stock it is generally agreed that the following are the equivalents of an animal unit.

- 1 steer or cow.....1 animal unit
- 2 calves or heifers.....1 animal unit
- 7 sheep.....1 animal unit
- 14 lambs.....1 animal unit
- 5 hogs.....1 animal unit
- 10 pigs.....1 animal unit
- 100 chickens.....1 animal unit

In our interpretation we have followed this schedule except, to save work, we have considered nine sheep and lambs combined equivalent to one animal unit, and seven hogs and pigs combined equal to one animal unit.

The figures from which this table was prepared are those of the United States Census of Agriculture, 1925.

Ashe, Buncombe and Haywood counties lead in the total number of meat and milk animal units and likewise rank among the best five on the basis of such animal units per farm. Other counties with a relatively large total of livestock (exclusive of work animals) are Mecklenburg, Union, Wilkes, Johnston, Guilford, Madison and Wake. Five of these ten counties are in the beef cattle area; Mecklenburg and Guilford owe their position to dairy and poultry farms which supply the nearby city markets; Union has developed both dairying and poultry raising to an unusual degree.

West Leads, East Lags

Far more significant than the total number of animal units is the number per farm, and the counties are ranked on this score. The reader will observe that there is a very pronounced geographical distribution of livestock. All of the eleven counties which rank highest, with more than four meat and milk animal units per farm, are the cattle grazing counties of the mountains. On the other hand all of the twenty-three counties which rank lowest are coastal plain counties where a cash-crop, farm-tenancy system prevails, the great cotton and tobacco counties ranking at the bottom in livestock.

The state average is 2.38 meat and milk animal units per farm.

Fifty-two counties rank above the average and forty-eight below. Not a single coastal plain county ranks above the state average in meat and milk animal units per farm, although several tidewater-counties rank well. Thirty-seven counties have less than two animal units per farm, and all of these are cotton or tobacco producing counties, or both.

These thirty-seven counties have 140,067 farms. Thus there are 140,067 farm families which do not have, on the average, a cow, 3 pigs and a flock of 60 chickens.

The cow-pig-hen program is being urged in season and out by the county agents, the agricultural colleges and all who are interested in the prosperity of the farmer, and the health of his family. Such a program is being adopted on a wide scale in Georgia to the great advantage of the farmers. The banks and railroads are pushing the campaign with vigor, because it will mean a general diffusion of prosperity and will mitigate the periodic depressions resulting from low prices for non-food cash crops.

North Carolina is making some progress toward diversification, but these livestock figures reveal how far she has to go. If two animal units is the minimum for the cash-crop belt it should not be the minimum for the piedmont. To be even moderately stocked piedmont farms should average

not less than five animal units (exclusive of work stock), and there are only three counties in the state that have attained that minimum.

Our Low Status

We believe that few people realize the low position North Carolina occupies as a meat and milk livestock state. The 1920 census showed that counting mules and horses only one state had less livestock value per farm than North Carolina, and excluding mules and horses North Carolina ranked last of all the states in livestock values per farm. No other region in America has so few meat and milk animals per farm as the coastal plains area of North Carolina, and few spots are so deficient as even the western half of the state.

And we do not make up in quality what we lack in quantity. The last census showed that in quality of livestock, measured by percent of all farms having some form of pure-bred livestock, only two states ranked below North Carolina.

Cattle are the most important form of livestock, and on the basis of cattle per farm North Carolina comes last of the states. Some idea of our low status as a cattle state, dairy and beef, can be obtained from considering the fact that we rank second in number of farms but thirty-seventh in total number of cattle!

North Carolina farmers, upon an average, drink less milk and eat less butter than farmers anywhere else in the United States. Our farmers' consumption of home-raised beef is almost negligible. More than one hundred thousand farms in the state do not have a milk cow. These farms are mainly in the cotton and tobacco belt.

We do not rank high in poultry and egg production as can be seen from the fact that we rank second in farms but nineteenth in total value of poultry.

We do not rank high in sheep as can be seen from the fact that we rank second in number of farms but thirty-fifth in total number of sheep.

We do not rank well in swine as can be seen from the fact that, although we are second in farms, we are nineteenth in number of swine. In swine per farm we are near the bottom. The hog, however, is North Carolina's main source of meat, and on thousands of eastern North Carolina farms the hog is the only meat animal raised. There are also thousands of farms with no meat or milk animals of any sort. North Carolina more than any other state needs a cow-hog-hen week, many such weeks, in fact.

COW-HOG-HEN WEEK

In Georgia, recently, a week was devoted by agricultural leaders, business men and railroad representatives, with the cooperation of the press, in giving publicity to what was termed Cow-Hog-Hen Week and a direct appeal was made to business interest to Help Make Georgia Prosperous.

The purpose of this movement was:

1. To help communities to the best methods of financing the purchase and handling of dairy cows, hogs, and poultry.
2. To help work out plans whereby every county in Georgia at the earliest possible date may have the services of a county agent and home demonstration agent, without which Cow-Hog-Hen farming cannot be successful, and
3. To bring about a general understanding of fundamental methods by which the business forces of every community may give most effective help to their farmers, both in livestock farming and co-operative marketing.

It is said that thousands of Georgia farmers, convinced by the successes of their Cow-Hog-Hen farm neighbors, are eager to buy dairy cows, brood sows and poultry, and to grow the feed necessary for them, but that many farmers have been unable to make this change in farming operations because:

1. The local bank may be unable or unwilling to extend the initial credit needed.
2. Landowners may be unable to build fences, construct farm buildings, buy modern machinery, purchase livestock necessary to help themselves or their tenants to start. Hence they can do nothing but get cotton credit and continue to gamble with fate.
3. Pressure of old debts or one of a dozen other things and especially in many cases lack of efficient and intelligent community and county organization may be the chief bar

DENMARK AND AMERICA

Yesterday I told how the farmers of Denmark have lifted themselves from peasantry and poverty to prosperity and independence, not by government subsidy, not by legislation, not by the grace of an economic Messiah, but by their own capable creation and efficient management of a system of scientific production and co-operative marketing.

I commended the Danish system to the farmers of America, but suggested the danger of trying to import the system without full recognition of the fact that there are many differences between Denmark and the United States, differences that go so deep that they would doubtless make many changes and adaptations of the system necessary.

Let me list five of these differences that have been recognized by all the more careful students of the problem.

First, America has more tenant farmers than Denmark has, and the farm tenant can never be made the effective factor in co-operative organization that the farm owner can be made.

Second, American farmers do not live together in such compact rural communities as do the farmers of Denmark, and physical separateness is always a handicap to co-operative action.

Third, many American agricultural sections are not as favorably located in relation to their markets as Denmark is in relation to its markets. Denmark stands at the center of a trade area that contains one hundred million consumers to whom the Danish farmers have quick and easy access.

Fourth, America is not wholly agricultural as Denmark is. Because Denmark is a purely agricultural state the Danish farmers have been able to do three sweeping things:

1. They have lifted agriculture, as I said yesterday, from the level of a domestic vocation to the level of a successful commercial enterprise.

2. They have taken the commerce of Denmark into their own hands.

3. They have taken the state into their own hands and organized it in the specific interest of permanent farm prosperity.

All this is right and reasonable in a purely agricultural state. The farmers of America could not and should not expect completely to duplicate this program in a nation like the United States that is both agricultural and industrial. They must, however, furnish a statesmanship far-sighted enough to insure our farms while our factories increase.

Fifth, America, with her great open spaces, does not have the pressure of population forcing us into ever greater efficiency that Denmark has had, and the human animal is naturally so lazy that it takes the pressure of necessity to drive him into anything as creative and as challenging as co-operative action.

These differences give our farmers a different and more difficult problem, but the farmers of America must somehow manage to achieve the results that the farmers of Denmark have achieved or resign themselves to the fate of farm hands, working for wages, while the major profits of their enterprise go elsewhere.

But the biggest story that has come out of Denmark is not the story of the scientific agricultural production, amazingly successful as both have been, but the story of a nation-wide educational movement that made all this possible. I shall tell that story tomorrow.—Dr. Glenn Frank, by permission The McClure Newspaper Syndicate.

to the start of the individual along a safe road.

4. Failure to appreciate that there is in Georgia now a profitable market for dairy, hog, and poultry products.

The following remedies were suggested:

1. In some counties local banks have made loans on dairy cows, poultry

and hogs to tenants as well as farm owners. One banker says such loans have proved self-liquidating. Not an instance has been reported to the Georgia association where a bank has lost a penny on a dairy cow loan.

2. In some counties chambers of commerce or civic organizations have financed the purchase of dairy cows, poultry and hogs (Athens Chamber of Commerce, nearly one hundred heifer calves for Boys' Clubs; Fitzgerald Chamber of Commerce traded bales of cotton for pure-bred bull calves; Bainbridge Kiwanis Club financed carload purchases of dairy cows; many other similar examples; special committees in rural counties have raised revolving funds and bought cattle and hogs for distribution.)—Guy A. Cardwell, Agril. Agent, A. C. L. R. R.

TAKES FORWARD STEP

By a series of three laws passed at the recent session of the legislature, North Carolina places herself in the van of the states which are doing something about county government. It is now possible for counties in that state to choose between two forms of government—the regular form now existing and the county manager plan. It is possible for the county commissioners themselves to install the latter plan on their own motion, but if the county board does not exercise its discretion to appoint a manager the electors may by petition bring the matter to a vote. If the majority of the votes cast at the election are in favor of the manager plan, the board must proceed to appoint a manager.

The manager is empowered to appoint, with the approval of the commissioners, such subordinate officers as the board may consider necessary, except such officers as are required to be elected by the people or whose appointment is otherwise provided by law. But inasmuch as the act does not disturb existing elective or appointive offices, the appointive power of the manager will have a narrow range inconsistent with his position as

"the administrative head of the county government" and his responsibility "to see that all orders, resolutions and regulations of the board of commissioners are faithfully executed."

A novel feature is the creation of a county government advisory commission, the secretary of which is to act as county adviser. In this capacity he will visit the counties of the state to advise and assist the county officers in providing competent and economical administration. The development of this office will be watched with interest in other states.

A second bill relates to county fiscal control. The county auditor becomes the county accountant, and as such, the chief accounting, auditing and budget officer of the county. The budget estimate of all department heads and officers in charge of spending money are filed with him and he thereupon prepares his own estimates of necessary appropriations for the fiscal year. The county board then determines the appropriations for the next year, but no appropriation recommended by the county accountant for debt services shall be reduced, nor can the county commissioners make any appropriation which will infringe upon the powers of the county board of education. It is also compulsory upon the commissioners to appropriate the full amount of all deficits reported in the estimates which have not been funded as provided by law.

The third act relates to the issuance of county bonds and notes. It specifies the purpose for which bonds can be issued and limits the term of the bonds to the estimated life of the improvements as set forth in the act. All bonds are to be serial in form and no annual installment shall be more than two and one-half times as great in amount as the smallest prior installment.

The new county bond law is more comprehensive than any which has come to our attention, and applies to counties the sound principles which should govern borrowings and which have been adopted for municipalities in a few states, notably North Carolina and New Jersey.—National Municipal Review

MEAT AND MILK ANIMAL UNITS PER FARM In North Carolina in 1925

In the following table, based on the 1925 Census of Agriculture, the counties are ranked according to meat and milk animal units per farm. Horses and mules are omitted because they are work stock and should not be confused with consumptive livestock. The parallel column gives the total meat and milk animal units—cattle, hogs, poultry, and sheep—for each county.

An animal unit equals one cow or steer, or two calves, or two heifers, or seven sheep, or fourteen lambs, or five hogs, or ten pigs, or one hundred chickens, based on the amount of feed consumed.

State total meat and milk animal units 676,702. State average meat and milk animal units per farm 2.38. North Carolina ranked last of all the states in meat and milk animal units per farm in 1920, and forty-sixth in percent of farms having pure-bred livestock.

Paul W. Wager
Department of Rural Social-Economics, University of North Carolina.

Rank	County	Meat and milk animal units	Meat and milk animal units per farm	Rank	County	Meat and milk animal units	Meat and milk animal units per farm
1	Alleghany	10,299	7.16	51	Pamlico	2,878	2.42
2	Haywood	16,483	7.12	52	Alexander	4,475	2.41
3	Ashe	19,182	5.08	53	Cleveland	10,970	2.35
4	Henderson	9,403	4.80	54	Burke	5,527	2.24
5	Buncombe	18,129	4.77	55	Martin	6,127	2.22
6	Jackson	9,674	4.47	56	Brunswick	3,002	2.21
7	Clay	3,888	4.46	57	Jones	3,058	2.17
8	Macon	8,307	4.45	58	Moore	4,693	2.15
9	Watauga	9,324	4.37	59	Craven	4,530	2.13
10	Madison	12,785	4.16	60	Warren	6,522	2.08
11	Avery	5,984	4.09	60	Yadkin	6,048	2.08
12	New Hanover	1,429	3.88	62	Polk	2,525	2.06
13	Transylvania	3,342	3.75	63	Carteret	1,892	2.01
13	Currituck	3,271	3.75	64	Montgomery	7,114	1.99
15	Chatham	8,245	3.70	64	Montgomery	3,822	1.99
16	Pasquotank	5,648	3.69	66	Surry	8,936	1.96
17	Dare	291	3.68	66	Bladen	5,394	1.96
18	Tyrrell	2,451	3.63	68	Lee	3,109	1.95
19	Graham	2,325	3.63	69	Onslow	4,199	1.94
20	Mecklenburg	14,167	3.53	70	Bertie	6,565	1.91
21	Swain	4,538	3.31	71	Wake	12,510	1.89
22	Gaston	8,142	3.26	72	Caswell	4,305	1.88
23	Davie	6,069	3.25	73	Duplin	3,371	1.86
24	Rowan	11,174	3.14	73	Rockingham	7,166	1.86
25	Guilford	12,903	3.12	73	Person	5,220	1.86
25	Yancey	7,394	3.12	76	Pender	3,739	1.85
27	Cabarrus	8,232	3.08	77	Stokes	6,383	1.84
28	Hyde	3,660	2.93	78	Hertford	3,992	1.80
29	Gates	4,607	2.91	79	Sampson	10,591	1.79
30	Perquimans	4,305	2.88	80	Granville	7,239	1.78
31	Mitchell	4,626	2.85	81	Cumberland	5,578	1.77
31	Camden	2,675	2.85	82	Harnett	5,644	1.75
33	Washington	3,584	2.81	83	Johnston	12,967	1.73
34	Union	13,979	2.80	83	Beaufort	6,418	1.73
34	Orange	5,839	2.80	85	Halifax	8,393	1.72
36	Caldwell	6,066	2.79	86	Vance	4,064	1.69
37	Iredell	11,472	2.77	87	Richmond	3,903	1.64
38	Catawba	8,515	2.76	88	Lenoir	5,486	1.63
39	Stanly	6,607	2.66	89	Wayne	8,038	1.62
40	Alamance	8,311	2.63	90	Columbus	5,946	1.51
41	Wilkes	13,613	2.61	90	Hoke	3,219	1.51
41	McDowell	3,987	2.61	92	Edgecombe	5,916	1.50
43	Davidson	10,399	2.58	93	Franklin	6,228	1.45
44	Durham	4,376	2.57	94	Greene	3,967	1.40
44	Porsyth	8,320	2.57	95	Robeson	9,753	1.38
46	Chowan	3,213	2.55	96	Northampton	6,156	1.36
47	Chatham	8,948	2.53	97	Pitt	8,364	1.34
48	Lincoln	5,907	2.52	98	Nash	6,634	1.10
49	Randolph	10,384	2.47	99	Scotland	2,272	1.03
50	Rutherford	8,510	2.42	100	Wilson	4,356	.94