

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA NEWS LETTER

Published weekly by the
University of North Carolina
for its Bureau of Extension.

The news in this publica-
tion is released for the press on
receipt.

JANUARY 22, 1919

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL. V, NO. 9

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, J. G. de R. Hamilton, L. R. Wilson, D. D. Carroll, G. M. McKie

Entered as second-class matter November 14, 1914, at the Postoffice at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of August 24, 1912.

COUNTY AFFAIRS IN CAROLINA

THE NEW CLUB YEAR-BOOK

County Government and County Affairs in North Carolina is the title of the new 200-page Year-Book of the North Carolina Club at the University. It will be ready for the mails in a few days. The people of the state can have it free of charge, upon post card request. There is no general mailing list. It will go post-paid to the people in other states for 75 cents a copy.

It is a brand new contribution to a neglected field of political science. There is no end of books about federal, state, and municipal government, but strange to say only three books have been published so far on county government—Gilbertson's *The County*, Fairlie's *Local Government in Counties, Towns, and Villages*, and now the Year-Book of the North Carolina Club. A hundred million people in the United States live under county government, and yet Goodnow in his *Principles of Administrative Law* devotes only 30 pages to the County and Hart gives only 11 pages to this subject in his volume on *Actual Government*. So far as we know, not a college or university in the country offers courses on county government. The members of the North Carolina Club have therefore been obliged to blaze a trail of their own into an almost unexplored wilderness.

Their year-book gives to the public the studies and discussions of the club during the last college year. The twenty-six chapters are as follows:

1. The Jungle of County Government.—E. C. Branson, University of North Carolina.
2. The Origin, Place, and Functions of County Government in North Carolina.—J. G. de R. Hamilton, University of North Carolina.
3. The County Government System in North Carolina.—A. C. McIntosh, University of North Carolina.
4. County Offices in North Carolina.—Judge Gibert T. Stephenson, Winston-Salem.
5. Forms of County Government.—H. S. Gilbertson, Secretary National Short Ballot Organization.
6. Local Self-Government for Rural Communities.—Dr. Clarence Poe, Raleigh.
7. The County Tax List and its Equalization.—C. L. Raper, University of North Carolina.
8. A Township Tax List Study.—E. C. Branson, University of North Carolina.
6. The Fee and Salary Systems in North Carolina.—E. C. Branson, University of North Carolina.
10. County Accounting and Budgets.—George G. Scott, Chairman State Board of Accountancy.
11. County Finances in North Carolina.—M. S. Willard, formerly Chairman New Hanover County Commissioners.
12. Supervision of Rural Schools in Carolina Counties.—L. C. Brogden, State Agent of Rural Schools.
13. Evolution of County Health Work in North Carolina.—Dr. W. S. Rankin, Secretary, State Health Board.
14. County Health Work in North Carolina.—Dr. B. E. Washburn, State Director of County Health Work.
15. Public Health Nursing in North Carolina.—Dr. L. B. McBrayer, Superintendent State Sanatorium.
17. The County-Wide School System.—Washington Catlett, Superintendent New Hanover Schools.
17. The County High School.—N. W. Walker, State Director of Public High Schools, University of North Carolina.
18. The County Library System.—L. R. Wilson, University of North Carolina.
19. Farm Demonstration Work in North Carolina.—E. S. Millsaps, District Agent, Statesville.
20. Home Demonstration Work in North Carolina.—Mrs. J. S. McKimmon, State Agent Home Demonstration Work.
21. Bridge Building in North Carolina.—W. S. Fallis, State Highway Engineer.
22. County Responsibility for Public Welfare.—E. C. Branson, University of North Carolina.
23. County Homes and Outside Relief.—R. F. Beasley, Secretary State Board Public Welfare.

24. County Care of Children.—Dr. Hastings H. Hart, Director Child Helping Department, Russell Sage Foundation.
25. Our Feeble-minded, Epileptic and Insane.—Dr. Albert Anderson, Superintendent Central Hospital for the Insane.
26. Reference Library on County Government and County Affairs.—E. C. B.

UNIVERSITY RECOGNITION

American Ideals, a book of 326 pages, published in 1917 by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., and recently revised and enlarged by the editors, Drs. Norman Foerster and W. W. Pierson, Jr., of the faculty of the University of North Carolina, has recently been signally recognized by the French Government through a request by it for permission to translate the book into the French language. "The desire of the French Government in the matter is to disseminate the political ideals of America as formulated by Americans themselves."

Permission has been given by the publishers and editors for the translation, and it will soon be issued in French. It is interesting to note that the first edition was reprinted several times, and that a new edition considerably enlarged is now coming from the press.—The Tar Heel.

J. HENRY JOHNSTON

In the death of J. Henry Johnston, Associate Professor of Education in the University of North Carolina, this institution loses the first member of its faculty in service overseas and suffers a distinct loss in its teaching staff. The following editorial note taken from the Raleigh Times of November 12th happily estimates the value of his fine young life:

In the death of Lieutenant Henry Johnston, killed in action October 15th, North Carolina loses another of her fine, clean young men and the State University a member of its faculty who showed great promise.

Not yet thirty, Associate Professor of Education Johnston had begun to make his presence felt in education in his native State when the call came for him to go into training for the purpose of hammering home some of the vital truths of civilization into the head of the Hun. Henry Johnston was one of the first to apply for admittance to the officers training camp at Fort Oglethorpe.

There he made good—a habit of his this making good—although he was ever quiet about it. Modest always, even to diffidence if no principle were involved, and then as inflexible as steel, he was not of the sort to attract attention in a crowd; but those whose business it is to know would never overlook him anywhere.

Particulars concerning his death are lacking, but none who knew him need be told that he died as he had lived by the faith that was in him, the faith of a man full grown.—The N. C. Alumni Review.

DR. McNIDER'S RESEARCHES

The variety of the problems of modern war-making, together with the urgency of its call for all of a nation's abilities, is strikingly illustrated by the fact that the results of experiments conducted in a Chapel Hill laboratory have found their way into base-hospitals in France.

Without any thought of war—in fact, before the war opened—Dr. W. deB. McNider, Kenan Professor of Pharmacology in the Medical School of the State University, began his now widely recognized work on the kidney. His results have already become a part of the latest method of treating the kidney—the method, for instance, used in such an institution as the Johns Hopkins Hospital. Only one of Dr. McNider's results concern us here. In the course of his researches he discovered a means of protecting the kidney against the acute inflammation known as nephritis.

Now, it happens that war conditions breed an unusually large number of nephritis cases among the troops in active service. In the same account of this condition at the front is recorded the mitigation of the evil through the work of a modest doctor in a little town on a

THE MEN WHO BUILD

Walter H. Page

Washington was a farmer and gloried in it; Jefferson was a farmer and cared more for agriculture than for statesmanship. Most of the great men who build things live close to the earth.

Your civilization depends on this—whether the man behind the plow be a clod-hopper, or a sympathetic scholar of the soil.—Raleigh address, 1903.

branch line railroad three thousand miles away. For, according to an appreciative editorial on Dr. McNider's work, in a recent issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, two army surgeons, Messrs. Keith and Thompson, reported to the British Medical Research Committee from a base hospital in France that a treatment of nephritis based on McNider's work has been given an extensive trial. In one group of cases this treatment completely re-established the kidney's functions; in the other group—the more severe cases—it is of distinct service in improving them.

It probably took more inventions and discoveries than dollars to whip the Hun. The above is only another instance of the variety of this state's contributions to the great struggle now closing.—J. M. Booker.

WHY NOT?

In its editorial on December 19 on the teacher famine, the *New York Tribune* makes a point that walks right down the middle of the road with its tail up. You can't miss it.

What moved the *Tribune* was a statement by the United States Bureau of Education that thousands of schools across the country are closed for lack of teachers. This statement, the *Tribune* agrees, holds for rural New York. But in the metropolis itself conditions are strikingly otherwise. Nearly 2,000 teachers have started work, and still 440 eligibles are waiting for jobs. No dearth there.

Why? The *Tribune* knows why. In the cross-roads and village schools of New York State the salaries range from \$250 to \$500; in New York City the minimum is \$820 (including the war price bonus), with life-long employment, automatic salary increase each year, and a generous pension.

Same old story, after all.—J. M. Booker.

DEMOCRACY AND DOLLARS

6. The democracy of the people of North Carolina people has caused them in war times and for war purposes to use their dollars generously. While some of the citizens of North Carolina have failed to rise to the high level of really great patriotism in the use of their dollars, the record for North Carolina as a whole is a notably good one.

The nation, in order to overthrow the enemy, has called for loans—in the form of Liberty Bonds and Thrift Stamps—and democracy in North Carolina has promptly made the loans. The Red Cross and other organizations of war relief have called to the people of North Carolina, and the call has been answered with enthusiastic generosity. Active participation in the drive for the Red Cross second war fund, in the north-eastern quarter of North Carolina, revealed to me a willingness to use dollars for the aid of others that I had never dreamed we possessed. The people of many places subscribed to three, four, five times their quotas!

The war is over and the intense call to fight a cruel and masterful enemy comes to us no longer. Will North Carolina democracy use her dollars for her own future general interest and welfare so enthusiastically and generously as she has used them to conquer the German?

Will North Carolina democracy so gladly use her dollars to educate her citizens to the point of greatest efficiency? Will she so earnestly use them to eliminate much of the disease which takes a needlessly large toll from our life and its values? Will she so enthusiastically use them for the construction of highways of commerce and of social intercourse between all the communities within her borders?

North Carolina democracy in war times has lived the heroic life, for the cause of the nation and her Allies. Can she not in peace times live at least a high and noble life for her own cause?

Our soldier boys, when they come back to us from the camps and especially from overseas, will refuse to be really our comrades unless we can in times of peace generously spend our dollars for the aid and development of others. They have been eager to spend their richest blood for such a cause.

7. In time of war North Carolina democracy has used her dollars to bring fair dealings to men throughout Europe—to make the world a place of just relationship as between men and men. Will she not in time of peace put forth her greatest effort to bring fair dealings between her own citizens as they pay their taxes to the state and its local units of government?

Our national government has created, within a few months, a system of taxation for war purposes which in its yield of revenue has astonished the world. And there is in it much of fairness as to the burden which it places upon the different tax-payers. Will democracy in North Carolina ever again be satisfied with her system of taxation for state and local purposes—a system contradictory to the principle of fair dealings?

In war times North Carolina democracy has used her richest blood and her dollars to stamp out unfair dealings as between a government and the citizens of another nation. Will she not in peace times put her full strength of mind and body to the task of stamping out the unfair dealings which go on year after year in her own system of public revenue?

During the war North Carolina democracy has worked earnestly and heroically for a more just life among other peoples. Will she, now that the war is over, be content to go back to the old system of taxing one of her citizens only 10 percent of his capacity to pay taxes and another citizen 50 percent or even a 100 percent of his capacity to pay taxes to his government?—Charles L. Raper.

STATE UNIVERSITY STUDIES

Two cents per hundred dollars of assessed property values represents the burden laid by the University of North Carolina on the tax-payers of the state in 1917.

The rate was more in 30 states of the union. It was 14 cents per hundred in Nevada and 10 cents in Nebraska and Illinois.

It was larger in nine southern states—Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, Tennessee, Kentucky, Florida, and Georgia.

It was smaller in only four southern states—South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and Virginia.

State support of the University of North Carolina in 1917 was \$186,531.

The state support fund for the university was larger in 24 states; it was more than a half million dollars in seven states, more than one million dollars in five states, more than two million dollars in

Illinois, and more than three million dollars in California.

It was larger in five southern states—Texas, Oklahoma, Arizona, Kentucky, and Georgia.

Who Bears the Tax Burden?

The fund expended by the state for any public purpose is important; but even more important is the matter of who pays the taxes that furnish the fund.

Who bears the burden of university support? We do not have facts for the state at large, but we do have the facts for Chapel Hill township in which the University is located. They are as follows:

Nearly exactly half of the property taxpayers in 1917 paid for university support \$22.83 all told, in amounts ranging from one to ten cents each. More than three-fifths of all the property taxpayers paid altogether \$52.24 for university support. The richest taxpayer in the township paid \$100 or nearly exactly twice as much as 858 taxpayers all put together.

The 73 taxpayers who have \$5,000 or more on the tax list paid altogether \$258.97 or \$33.11 more than all the rest of the property taxpayers of the township—1312 in number. The University tax for the entire township was \$480.

And we dare to say that the distribution of the University tax burden in this typical township is approximately true of the state at large.

More than half of the general property tax for any purpose falls upon six taxpayers in the hundred. Here's a simple fact that the people of North Carolina do not seem to be able to see clearly. But it is fundamental and far reaching in its significance. Around six per cent of the property taxpayers own more than half of all the taxables of the state, and therefore pay more than half of all the taxes to support the civil establishment, the university and other state institutions of higher learning, the hospitals for the insane, the schools for the deaf and blind, the feeble-minded and wayward, and every other state institution and enterprise.

Nearly half of all our property taxpayers have less than \$500 on the tax list. And they pay less than one-twentieth of the taxes.

The full analysis of the Chapel Hill tax list will be found in the University Extension Bulletin No. 25, *Local Study Clubs: Essays at Citizenship*, which goes free of charge to any North Carolinian who writes for it.

Forthcoming Studies

The State University studies this fall have been made by Mr. H. M. Hopkins an alumnus of the Ohio Wesleyan University, who is now doing graduate work in the University of North Carolina. His six studies cover (1) the support of state universities in 1916-17, per thousand dollars of assessed property values, (2) university support per inhabitant, (3) the share of state universities in state school funds, (4) the value of university plants, (5) state appropriations for universities, and (6) university expenditures per student.

The first of these studies appears in this issue. The others will follow week by week.—E. C. B.

STATE UNIVERSITY SUPPORT IN 1916-17

Per thousand dollars of assessed property values.

Based on (1) the Federal Education Bureau Bulletin No. 55, 1917, and (2) the Federal Bureau of Census—the Financial Statistics of States, 1917.

H. M. HOPKINS, University of North Carolina, 1918-19.

Rank	State	University	Per \$1000	Rank	State	University	Per \$1000
1.	Nevada	\$1.48	21.	Louisiana	\$.028
2.	Illinois	1.03	21.	Texas28
3.	Nebraska	1.02	23.	Indiana27
4.	Minnesota88	24.	Colorado24
5.	Washington72	25.	New Mexico22
6.	Iowa68	25.	Tennessee22
7.	Wyoming64	27.	Kansas21
8.	Arizona53	27.	Kentucky21
9.	Oregon49	27.	Florida21
10.	Michigan47	27.	Georgia21
11.	Wisconsin44	31.	North Carolina20
11.	North Dakota44	31.	Ohio20
13.	Montana36	33.	South Carolina18
14.	Missouri33	34.	Vermont15
15.	Idaho32	35.	R. I. State College13
16.	Utah31	36.	South Dakota10
16.	West Virginia31	36.	Mississippi10
18.	Oklahoma30	38.	Alabama07
19.	Arkansas29	38.	New York—Cornell07
19.	Maine29	38.	Virginia07

California, Pennsylvania State College, and Delaware State College are omitted because general property in these states is not assessed for state taxes.

Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire are omitted because they have no universities supported by the state.