

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

JANUARY 25, 1928

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

VOL. XIV, No. 11

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, S. H. Hobbs, Jr., P. W. Wager, L. R. Wilson, E. W. Knight, D. D. Carroll, 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.

ORGANIZED RURAL COMMUNITIES

DIRECTED FARM COLONIES

The Bureau of Reclamation of the Interior Department (the Home-Making Department of our Government) has proposed a very definite and practical plan for assisting southern agriculture. After a somewhat exhaustive study of certain tracts of land in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, by a commission appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, this commission recommended that these tracts be further studied to ascertain the nature of engineering work to be done on such selected tracts to formulate detailed plans and programs for the contemplated reclamation settlements and prepare estimates of costs of launching and guiding such settlements.

They recommended further that the plans for the creation of an organized farming community of at least 100 farms in each of the states mentioned should include the following features:

Expert and experienced planning and supervision;

Provision of money to be advanced to settlers to help complete improvement and equipment of farms;

Centralized responsibility and control in launching and guiding the undertaking;

Cooperation among the private, local, State, and Federal government agencies having related functions.

Of National Benefit

While present plans embrace only southern reclamation or rural home-making the movement is really national in its scope as the prosperity of southern agriculture is vital to the nation. The industrial East and the agricultural West suffer alike from decreased buying power in the South.

The writer believes that many of those who are expressing opposition to this movement, which should result in benefits to all, are doing so because of a lack of knowledge of just what is proposed. Without entering into a discussion of the matter at this time, we feel that the response of Dr. W. W. Long, Director of Agricultural Extension Service, South Carolina, to the address of welcome delivered by Secretary Work of the Interior Department at the Southern Reclamation Conference held in Washington, December 14th and 15th, 1927, should be of interest to all concerned:

"There are occasions when to reply to an address of welcome is of little interest. There are other occasions when to reply to an address of welcome is a great pleasure and privilege. Such is this occasion, Mr. Secretary. First, because it gives me the opportunity as a humble representative of the South, a part of our common country, to express our appreciation of your interest in our agricultural development. We are not unmindful, Sir, that you are the first Secretary of the Interior to advocate that the reclamation policy of the country should be national rather than sectional. The intelligent solution of reclamation in the South, briefly speaking, is in part, taking water off the lands, while in parts of the west it is placing water on the lands. Therefore, the welfare of the country is closely identified with the constructive solution of this question. It was the statesmanship of yourself and your able Commissioner, Dr. Elwood Mead, for whom the South entertains warm affection, that envisioned the interdependence of engineering, agriculture, and the human factor.

Criticism Ill-Founded

"The statesmanship that takes original lines frequently brings upon itself criticism growing out of ignorance and misunderstanding. You, Sir, and your honored Commissioner have suffered this fate. The criticism of this movement you have originated in the South is that it is a movement to settle the cut-over and swampy lands and thereby increase the farming population of the country. This criticism was emphasized in a resolution recently passed (without naming you or your department) by that distinguished body of scientists and educators of the agricultural colleges at their meeting in Chicago. Likewise, this idea prevails among many of the agricultural workers of

the United States Department of Agriculture. Familiarity and close contact with this movement since its inception have convinced me that it was your purpose to aid in developing six communities in the South where every phase of community life could be demonstrated, such as community creameries, community abattoirs, community hatcheries, community cotton gins, community seed improvement, community schools, community libraries, and such other community activities as will best serve the people.

"Fortunately for the South, twenty-five or more years ago Dr. Seaman A. Knapp came from the West with a great vision to aid southern agriculture. His idea was to touch the individual farmer on his farm by practical demonstrations, better cultural methods, the use of better seed; soil improvement, more and better livestock, and likewise to teach through demonstration methods the rural boy and the farm woman in her home. Criticism came to him from the same sources as are visiting it upon you, Mr. Secretary, and your able Commissioner. Fortunately Dr. Knapp lived to see his critics shamed and the entire South rise up and call him blessed. And now you come from the West, Sir, with a vision to demonstrate organized community life. If the people are given the opportunity to catch your vision, demonstrated through your six community developments, your critics will be shamed and you, too, will be hailed as one of the South's great benefactors.

Organized Communities

"We are told on all sides how necessary it is for the farmers to organize, how our surpluses and other factors pertaining to the welfare of the farmer can be controlled through organization; but I have yet to see one line that suggests the character of organization that the farmer should perfect other than cooperative marketing, which is simply one phase of organized agriculture—an important one, I admit. What is the unit of this proposed organization? If it is the state, it is doomed to failure; if it is the county, success is doubtful; but, if it is the community, its success is assured. This Sir, as I understand it, is your conception of the first step in an organized agriculture.

"Then follows a federation of the communities in each county; likewise in the state. With such an organization in each state reaching down to the individual community, there would be little difficulty on the part of our legislators and agricultural leaders to understand readily the needs of the rural class. With good roads prevailing throughout the country, with rapid and better transportation because of the automobile, the farmer could reach his community center as readily as the business man can reach his chamber of commerce, or the laborer his union.

Demonstrations Needed

"It is claimed that this is a stupendous task. I grant it. To organize the farmer by communities is a stupendous task, but the foundation is already laid in the South. Many communities are groping in the dark, but these demonstrations would be the beacon light to definitely point the way. It must be remembered that farmers show their greatest interest in organizations in which they play a personal part and are constantly coming in contact with the beneficial effects of their organizations. An organized agricultural community is a little world somewhat to itself, but with every man, woman and child cooperating not only in producing the best possible from the individual farm for living at home but contributing in like manner to the nonproducer of food while living under the best rural conditions with modern facilities for comfortable living. The standard of what we call today civilization is a city standard and only through organized rural communities can we break down the differentiation between the country home and the city home, between the country woman and the city woman, between the country boy and girl and the city boy and girl. The organized rural community brings to the country home the city advantages. Nothing less will keep the

ISSUES OF FARM LIFE

For ten years Dr. Kenyon L. Butterfield has delivered the presidential address before the American Country Life Association. This year his theme was "The Issues of Farm Life." He presented three issues: (1) How can we retain a body of farmers economically efficient and free, who can compete with industry and commerce for capital, labor and income? (2) How can we maintain the quality of the people on the land, in view of the enormous and alluring urban resources for education and social development? (3) How can character-building be advanced in a world dominated largely by economic activity? He believes that the latter issue applies to urban as well as rural life.

Among the suggestions made by Dr. Butterfield were these: that the urban population must help to pay for rural education, that agriculture must be treated by the government and industrial leaders as "a most favored industry," that farmers must organize more efficiently for their own protection, and that relations between urban and rural populations must be given increasing attention by those who are concerned about the nation's welfare.—Federal Council Bulletin.

intelligent, ambitious rural boys and girls in the country districts.

"We need a positive, direct and intelligent leadership that deals with specific and definite details and not in glittering generalities. What we want to know is how, and you have furnished the answer."—G. A. Cardwell.

THEATRE ADMISSIONS

One of our current federal taxes is a tax of ten percent on theatre and concert admissions in excess of fifty cents. During the last fiscal year the government collected \$17,068,035 from this source. The amount of revenue raised from this source is relatively insignificant, but a study of the treasury report is interesting for the light it sheds on the habits of the people. It is interesting to know, for instance, that out of an estimated expenditure of \$950,000,000 for theatres and movies only \$170,000,000 was paid for tickets that cost more than fifty cents. This indicates the extent to which the movies have encroached upon the legitimate stage. This is nothing to be deplored. The movie has brought dramatic art within the reach of the humblest wage-earner, and through the medium of the screen unlettered people may become acquainted with the great characters of literature. The motion picture is perhaps the most powerful influence in America today—partly good, partly bad. Whatever its influence, it is at least a democratic institution, furnishing rest and entertainment to millions of people every day in every walk of life. Nevertheless, it is undoubtedly robbing music and drama of some of the patronage to which they are entitled. An annual expenditure of \$1.43 per capita for the support of all high-priced entertainments, anything costing over fifty cents being considered high-priced, is indeed a meagre showing.

Rural Entertainment

A study of the treasury report is interesting, too, for the light it throws on the location of these theatres and concert halls. The table which appears elsewhere in this issue ranks the states according to per capita expenditures for admissions subject to the federal tax, that is admissions in excess of fifty cents. It does not include admissions to athletic contests, cabarets, and social clubs.

New York, quite naturally, leads the states in volume of theatre admissions. In fact, its receipts amount to three-eighths of the total for the United States. If these were all paid by the people of New York state they would average \$5.61 per capita. Of course,

much of the total is paid by people from other states while visiting in New York City. Most of the other high-ranking states are states with large urban populations or states which enjoy a large tourist trade. Nevada's rank in second place is surprising. Nevada has, however, a large amount of wealth per capita and its wealth is widely distributed. Apparently the people are liberal supporters of the higher-priced entertainment. Only seven states exceed the United States average of \$1.43 per capita.

The rural states show relatively small expenditures for theatre admissions. The people do not have the opportunity to attend good shows even if they have the inclination. Some rural states make a far better showing than others, however. Oregon, Utah, Washington, Colorado, and Wyoming are sparsely inhabited, yet rank relatively high in theatre support. The Middle West does not do so well. Of course it has few cities and its farms are widely scattered. All the Southern states except Florida and Louisiana rank low. The explanation is found partly in the presence of the Negroes, partly in high rural ratios and high tenancy ratios, and partly in the cultural level of the people.

N. C. at the Bottom

More surprising than the generally low rank of the South is the unenviable position of North Carolina at the foot of the list. North Carolinians are paying on the average nine cents a year for shows and entertainments other than movies. Of course, we can offer many excuses, such as lack of cities, high negro and tenancy ratios, and lack of theatres and auditoriums. But why should North Carolina rank below any other Southern state? Is it content to remain so?

In these days of automobiles and good roads there is no reason why every county seat cannot support a few high-class theatrical and musical productions each year. Every county seat ought to have a good auditorium and stage. Most of the new rural high schools have auditoriums and should put on a series of first-class entertainments each season. The fact that North Carolinians are largely farmers is no reason why their entertainment should be limited to movies, circuses and carnivals. To assume that they have no taste for high-quality productions is ungenerous, and were it true there is the more reason why they should be given a chance to develop a taste. It may be that North Carolina's artistic appreciation is on a par with its reading habits, but both can be greatly

elevated, and must be if we hope to be accepted as a cultured state.

It would be unfair to imply that North Carolina is making no progress in this direction. Several first-class theatres have been built in the state within the last two years. Some of them are in comparatively small towns, as in the cases of Elizabeth City and Lumberton. But more encouraging than the appearance of comfortable and attractive show houses is the developing interest in high-class productions. Witness the excellent glee clubs, the inter-collegiate dramatic contests, the North Carolina Playmakers, and an increasing interest in and support of community bands, choral societies, and dramatic organizations. May their number increase. A high state of culture is reached only when people have learned to play together as well as to work together.—Paul W. Wager.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

The number of volumes in each of the leading university libraries of the country in 1926 is indicated below:

1	Harvard	2,622,400
2	Yale	1,838,009
3	Columbia	1,192,343
4	Cornell	787,127
5	Chicago	768,559
6	Illinois	708,850
7	California	665,680
8	Michigan	649,912
9	Pennsylvania	635,070
10	Princeton	594,195
11	Minnesota	501,507
12	Stanford	420,516
13	Texas	388,016
14	Wisconsin	359,067
15	Brown	351,202
16	Ohio	305,905
17	Johns Hopkins	293,067
18	Oberlin	285,417
19	Northwestern	280,425
20	Washington (St. Louis)	277,885
21	Iowa	266,132
22	Missouri	240,784
23	Dartmouth	235,000
24	Nebraska	209,048
25	Kansas	191,907
26	Indiana	188,199
27	Colorado	182,655
28	North Carolina	180,032
29	Washington (Seattle)	174,563
30	Oregon	167,335
31	Rochester	163,700
32	Vassar	150,800
33	Smith	145,866
34	Virginia	140,000
35	Wellesley	119,913
36	Bryn Mawr	116,492
37	North Dakota	91,313
38	Including the libraries of Barnard and Teachers' College.	
15.	Not including John Carter Brown Library.	
22.	Including Missouri Botanical Gardens Library.	
29.	Not including 43,883 volumes in law library.	
31.	Includes 18,750 medical sets in use but not accessioned.	

THEATRE ADMISSIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

States Ranked According to Expenditures per Capita

In the following table the states are ranked according to per capita expenditures for theatre admissions in 1926-27. The gross figures are obtained by multiplying the amount paid in federal taxes by ten, the tax being ten percent of the admission price. The tax applies only to admissions in excess of fifty cents, hence movie patrons are not often subject to it.

During the last fiscal year the federal government collected \$17,068,035 from this source. This indicates that admissions paid amounted to approximately \$170,680,350, or \$1.43 per capita.

New York paid \$64,052,283 in such admissions, or \$5.61 per capita. North Carolina paid \$262,805, or \$.09 per capita, and thus has the unenviable distinction of being at the foot of the list.

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

Rank	State	Theatre admissions per capita	Rank	State	Theatre admissions per capita
1	New York	\$5.61	25	Louisiana	.55
2	Nevada	4.52	26	Vermont	.50
3	Maryland	3.24	27	Montana	.46
4	California	2.92	28	Wisconsin	.45
5	Illinois	2.59	29	Iowa	.38
6	Massachusetts	1.86	30	Idaho	.34
7	Pennsylvania	1.56	31	Oklahoma	.33
8	Florida	1.25	32	Texas	.31
9	New Jersey	1.23	33	Arizona	.30
10	Missouri	1.17	34	Maine	.28
11	Rhode Island	1.07	35	Virginia	.27
12	Michigan	1.06	36	Kansas	.26
13	Ohio	1.05	37	Nebraska	.25
14	Oregon	.95	38	Georgia	.24
15	Connecticut	.93	39	South Dakota	.22
16	Utah	.90	40	Tennessee	.216
17	Washington	.89	41	North Dakota	.214
18	Colorado	.84	42	West Virginia	.17
19	New Hampshire	.80	43	Mississippi	.13
20	Kentucky	.76	44	Arkansas	.11
21	Wyoming	.73	45	New Mexico	.10
22	Indiana	.71	46	Alabama	.099
23	Minnesota	.61	47	South Carolina	.095
24	Delaware	.56	48	North Carolina	.091