

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA NEWS LETTER

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

SEPTEMBER 21, 1921

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VOL. VII, NO. 44

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.

STUDYING NORTH CAROLINA

HOME STATE STUDIES

During the college year just closed the following studies of the state have been made by various students in the University of North Carolina, mainly in the department of Rural Social Science. Where possible, the facts for each county were worked out and the counties of the state ranked accordingly from high to low, or for each state and North Carolina ranked accordingly. During the last seven years more than eight hundred such studies have been made in the University of North Carolina. The University News Letter has carried briefs of them week by week since November 1914.

County Studies

1. Historical Background of Robeson County.—Robert W. Proctor, Lumberton.
2. Cherokee Indians of Robeson County.—Robert W. Proctor, Lumberton.
3. A Historical Sketch of Harnett County.—Edwin M. Holt, Duke.
4. Natural Resources, Industries, and Opportunities of Harnett County.—Edwin M. Holt, Duke.
5. A Brief History of Vance County.—H. B. Cooper, Henderson.
6. Natural Resources of Vance County.—H. B. Cooper, Henderson.
7. Industries in Vance County.—H. B. Cooper, Henderson.
8. A Brief History of Edgecombe County.—Katherine Galloway Batts, Tarboro.
9. A Brief History of Wayne County.—Phillip Hettleman, Goldsboro.
10. Natural Resources of Wayne County.—Phillip Hettleman, Goldsboro.
11. Wayne County Industries.—Phillip Hettleman, Goldsboro.
12. Wealth and Taxation in Wayne County.—Phillip Hettleman, Goldsboro.
13. Farm Conditions and Practices in Wayne County.—Phillip Hettleman, Goldsboro.
14. Facts About the Folks in Wayne County.—Phillip Hettleman, Goldsboro.
15. Historical Background of Davidson County.—Julius R. Raper, Jr., Linwood.
16. Natural Resources of Davidson County.—Julius R. Raper, Jr., Linwood.
17. Facts About the Folks in Davidson County.—Julius R. Raper, Jr., Linwood.
18. Farm Conditions and Practices in Davidson County.—J. R. Raper, Jr., Linwood.
19. Wealth and Taxation in Davidson County.—J. R. Raper, Jr., Linwood.
20. Historical Background of Alamance County.—P. K. Holt, Burlington.
21. Natural Resources of Alamance County.—L. L. Hodge, Burlington.
22. Industries of Alamance County.—P. K. Holt, Burlington.
23. Alamance County in 1860 and 1910.—Ogden F. Crowson, Jr., Burlington.
24. Where Alamance Lags and the Way Out.—O. F. Crowson, Burlington.
25. Farm Conditions and Practices in Alamance County.—C. B. Ellis, Jr., Burlington.
26. Wealth and Taxation in Alamance County.—C. B. Ellis, Jr., Burlington.
27. Historical Background of Pasquotank County.—W. O. McMullan, Elizabeth City.
28. Natural Resources of Pasquotank County.—W. O. McMullan, Elizabeth City.
29. Industries and Opportunities of Pasquotank.—W. O. McMullan, Elizabeth City.

State Studies

1. Welfare Agencies in North Carolina.—Jonathan Daniels, Raleigh.
2. North Carolina as a Tobacco State.—C. O. H. Laughinghouse, Greenville.
3. Cooperative Marketing of Truck Crops in Eastern Carolina.—William G. Clark, Jr., Tarboro.
4. Ten-year Gains in Local School Tax Districts, 1911-1920.—William G. Clark, Jr., Tarboro.
5. School Expenditures per \$1,000 of Taxable Property, 1919-20.—H. H.

Doggett, Forest City.

6. Average Salaries Paid County Superintendents in the United States in 1920.—H. H. Doggett, Forest City.
7. Who Pays Federal Income Taxes in North Carolina.—H. B. Cooper, Henderson.
8. Cooperative Marketing of Tobacco.—Edgar Frank Hooker, Kinston.
9. Ten-year Increase in Farms, by Counties.—E. F. Hooker, Kinston.
10. Cotton Production per Acre in North Carolina, 1920.—E. F. Hooker, Kinston.
11. Cotton production in North Carolina in 1920.—E. F. Hooker, Kinston.
12. The State Board of Charities and Welfare, 1919-1920.—L. deR. MacMillan, Wilmington.
13. Investment in Automobiles and Schools in North Carolina in 1920.—L. deR. MacMillan, Wilmington. University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 14.
14. Size of the Counties in North Carolina.—M. B. deRosset, Wilmington.
15. Dogs Versus Sheep.—Rufus A. Hunter, Raleigh.
16. State Income Taxes, 1919.—Rufus A. Hunter, Raleigh.
17. State and County Tax Costs per Capita in 1919.—C. P. Savage, Wallace.
18. Professional Taxes Paid in North Carolina in 1919.—C. P. Savage, Wallace.
19. Ten-year Increase in Real Estate Values, 1911-1920.—C. P. Savage, Wallace.
20. Inheritance Taxes—State and Federal.—R. L. LeGrand, Wilmington.
21. Per Capita School Expenditures in North Carolina in 1919-20.—P. D. Herring, Clinton.
22. Local School Tax Districts, 1919-20.—P. D. Herring, Clinton.
23. Average Annual Salary Paid White Teachers in North Carolina, 1919-1920.—P. D. Herring, Clinton.
24. White School Population in Average Daily Attendance in North Carolina in 1918-1919.—Howard Holderness, Tarboro.
25. Colored School Population in Average Attendance in North Carolina in 1918-1919.—Howard Holderness, Tarboro.
26. Per Capita Expenditures on Schools in North Carolina in 1919-20.—Howard Holderness, Tarboro.
27. Small-Town Development in North Carolina.—H. B. Cooper, Henderson.
28. Revaluation and the Year Before.—L. deR. MacMillan, Wilmington. University News Letter, Vol. VII, Nos. 1 and 5.
29. The Cityward Drift in Carolina.—C. J. Williams, Concord.
30. The Small Town in North Carolina.—L. D. Martin, Virginia.
31. Rural White School Property in North Carolina in 1918.—D. C. Sinclair, Wilmington.
32. Rural Population Density in North Carolina in 1920.—M. M. Jernigan, Dunn.
33. Per Capita Cost of State Governments in 1919.—University News Letter, Vol. VI, No. 44.
34. Carolina Church Wealth.—University News Letter, Vol. VI, No. 46.
35. The Lumber Cut, by States, 1918.—University News Letter, Vol. VI, No. 50.
36. Population Increases and Decreases in North Carolina Counties, 1910-20.—Miss A. B. Pruitt, University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 2.
37. Countryside Populations in Carolina.—J. B. Douglass, Winston-Salem. University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 4.
38. Farm Land Values per Acre in the United States, 1920, by States.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 6.
39. Farm Land Tax Values per Acre in Carolina, 1920, by Counties.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 7.
40. College Attendance in 1917-18, by States.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 21.
41. Local School Bonds in North Carolina, Voted Since January 1, 1921.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 31.
42. Increases and Decreases in Number of Farms in North Carolina, by Counties.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 34.

HOME-BRED CITIZENSHIP

National progress is the sum total of local progress in the United States, says Mr. Hoover. When local democracies, town and country, function effectively, the whole of America moves up to higher levels—and not otherwise. When private citizens develop a robust sense of social and civic responsibility, the home communities move up to higher levels—and not otherwise. The man who is a poor citizen at home is bound to make a poor town or county official, or a poor legislator, or a poor state-house official, or a poor representative or senator at Washington. How could it be otherwise? The home problems are first in importance. Progress in the home community and the home state are dependent upon competent citizenship and a generous will to serve the common good. An acre in Middlesex is worth a whole township in Utopia, said Macaulay. Moving into better public conditions in every square mile of North Carolina is an energizing vision for every lover of the Old North State.—E. C. Branson.

43. Farm Tenancy in North Carolina—Gains and Losses, by Counties, 1910-20.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, Nos. 36 and 38.

44. Negro Farm Operators in North Carolina—Increases and Decreases in Number, by Counties, 1910-20.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 41.

45. State Finances in North Carolina in 1919.—University News Letter, Vol. VI, No. 44.

46. Carolina Public Libraries.—University News Letter, Vol. VI, No. 45.

47. The Colleges of North Carolina.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, Nos. 3, 8, and 9.

48. The New Day in Carolina.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 13.

49. Federal Taxes in North Carolina in 1920.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 15.

50. Personal Income Taxes in North Carolina in 1918.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 16.

Special Studies

1. Education and Expenditures in the United States, 1920.—University News Letter, Vol. VII, No. 25.

2. Gastonia the Natural Textile Center of the South.—A. C. Lineberger, Jr., Belmont.

3. The Future Possibilities of Wilmington as a Port.—M. B. deRosset, Wilmington.

4. History of Cotton Production in South Carolina.—R. E. James, Darlington, S. C.

TOWN AND CITY STUDIES

The programs of the North Carolina Club at the University were concentrated in 1920-21 upon studies of North Carolina: Industrial and Urban. These studies are being edited by Messrs. Odum, Saville, and Branson of the faculty, and will be given to the public in the next Year Book of the Club in the early fall.

1. The Cityward Drift in Carolina: The extent, causes, consequences. Is it well or ill for the state-at-large? The Outlook.—C. J. Williams, Cabarrus county.

2. Small Town Development in Carolina: (1) The increase of small towns in number and population since 1900, (a) in the Tidewater and Coastal Plain mainly as market towns, and (b) in the Hill country mainly as mill villages, (2) Small-town Problems, inventory, analysis and discussion.—L. D. Martin, Nansmond county, Va., and H. B. Cooper, Vance county.

3. The Developing Industries of Carolina: (1) Extent and variety, (2) Why more rapid than in other southern states. (3) The significance. (4) The Outlook.—M. M. Jernigan, Sampson county.

4. The Mill and Factory Centers of Carolina: Advantages and disadvantages, problems, and social activities.—B. W. Sipe, Gaston county.

5. The Future of our Small Towns: (1) Town Planning for our Mill Villages. (2) Noteworthy leaders and achievements.—Miss. Beulah Martin, Georgia.

6. Town and Country Interdependencies: Board of Trade Policies and Activities.—Roy M. Brown, Watauga county.

7. City Problems in Carolina: Economic, Social, Civic; Inventory, Analysis, Discussion.—T. R. Buchanan, Virginia.

8. City Planning in Carolina, in view of ascertained Common Deficiencies.—N. P. Hayes, Warren county.

9. City Government in Carolina: Forms of, Efficiencies and Deficiencies.—P. A. Reavis, Franklin county.

10. City Finance and Financial Methods in Carolina.—J. G. Gullick, Gaston county.

11. Public Utilities in Carolina Cities: Common Utilities, Utilities that are Commonly Owned, Franchise Policies, etc.—W. E. Wolfe, Buncombe County.

12. Home Ownership and the Housing Problem: The Facts, their Social Significance, Constructive Suggestions.—Annie Pruitt, Franklin county.

13. Community Life and Organization in Carolina: (1) The Rarity of Country Communities and why; the Consequent Social Problems, (2) The most Promising Agency of Social Integration in Rural Areas and why.—C. E. Cowan, Bertie county.

14. Training for Public Service in Carolina: Agencies and Activities, public and private.—H. W. Odum, University Faculty.

15. Municipal Accounting and Auditing.—P. Hettleman, Wayne county.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT REFORMS

We are here giving to students in the state-at-large a syllabus of the studies in county government, in the department of Rural Social Science at the University of North Carolina during the year 1920-21. The legislature of Louisiana is this fall considering county government. Our own legislature can consider no more important subject. What Dr. E. C. Brooks, our state school commissioner, has been talking about lately ought to wake up the state.

1. The Importance. Due (1) to the number of people involved, which is everybody in the United States. It is almost the only government that nearly two-fifths of the people in the United States are directly interested in. In North Carolina the ratio rises to more than seven-tenths of the total population. These are the open-country dwellers living outside all incorporated towns. (2) To the enormous cost of county government. In North Carolina in 1913 it was twice the cost of our state government and in 1921 this ratio is greatly increased. The bonded debt of our counties is now well over 40 million dollars. (3) To wide-spread unbusinesslikeness and waste in handling county revenues—not to dishonesty so much as inefficiency. See North Carolina County Government and County Affairs, pp 7-11, 69-79. Also bulletins of the Alameda County Tax Association, and Gilbertson's The County, p 189-90. And (4) to the tendency of county government to rise above the Big Policeman idea and to become a service agency, in highways, schools, public health, etc.; which means greatly increased taxes. It must also mean greatly increased efficiency; else a collapse of public spirit, as in Oregon. See Municipal Quarterly Review, Feb. 1921.

2. Why County Government is the Weakest Link in American Democracy. (1) Country people are individualistic; their sense of civic and social responsibility is apt to be lacking, or to be feeble. They are private and local in mood, humor, and temper. (2) They dwell too far away from the county seat to be acquainted with county affairs, or be intelligently aware of deficiencies and delinquencies in county offices. Ignorance, indifference, and inertia are everywhere the deadliest enemies of democracy. (3) Thus courthouse officers and county bosses are licensed to do as they please, and if only they are clever, good fellows they last a long time. The value of well balanced parties is a county.

3. Constructive Suggestions: (1) Unified county government under responsible headship. Our present commissioner plan recommended but strengthened as follows: (a) The commissioners locally elected as before, with the right to choose one of their number as a whole-time chairman and to vote an adequate salary to him as the county commission-manager having full authority to manage county affairs with the advice and counsel of his fellow commissioners; or the board may appoint a competent outside expert as its county-manager. (b) The board to have adequate authority over the four constitutional county officers, and the right to appoint and dismiss all other county officers whatsoever. (c) Clothed with complete authority over county finances under state laws, but under a county budget plan. (d) With authority to establish and maintain uniform accounting and reporting of all public moneys handled by all county officers. (e) Required under penalty to publish annually in compact form a statement of county finances showing— assets what and where; liabilities and forms of the same; classified receipts and disbursements in every office and summary of the same; fees and commissions due and collected in each office and summary of same; or if a salary county, the fees and commissions subject to collection, actually collected, and turned over to the county treasurer, along with the fee-and-salary account of the county in detail. (f) All reports so rendered as to show unit costs or expenditures. Here is the commissioner-plan based on the short ballot in county government, with the fewest possible changes in the present plan. Open discussion.

(2) A State Auditing Bureau in the State Auditor's Office charged (a) with devising and prescribing simple forms of account-keeping and reporting in state departments, state institutions, county and municipal offices, (b) with installing proper forms and methods of public and institutional accounting and reporting by all public officers handling public moneys, (c) with instructing and guiding such officers, to the end that unit costs and expenditures may be available for purposes of comparison. (d) The State Auditing Bureau to have a field force of public accountants busy auditing public accounts—upon the plan of our state bank examiners, their chief duty being to prescribe, instruct and guide, and where necessary to warn public officials—not to serve as detectives solely but as friendly counselors mainly. In general, such a bureau was established by the legislature of 1921.

(3) The enactment of such organic and statute laws as may be necessary (a) to establish county government of the type suggested, or something better than we have in any state at present, and (b) to place such government under sympathetic guidance at the capital; the end being the largest possible measure of local self-determination, and the least possible interference on part of state officials in county affairs, the general public good considered. At present our counties are subject to state legislation without any proper state counsel, direction, or supervision.

4. Reading References. Gilbertson's The County. Fairlie's Local Government in Counties, Towns, and Villages. Branson's County Government and County Affairs in North Carolina. Maxey's Plan of Unified County Government. Bulletins of the Alameda County Tax Association, 823 Bank of Savings Building, Oakland, California. Bulletins of Cook County Bureau of Public Efficiency, 315 Plymouth Court, Chicago. Bulletins of the Westchester County Research Bureau, White Plains, New York. James's County Government in Texas, bulletin of the University of Texas, Austin. County and Local Government in Illinois, Bulletin No. 12, Legislative Reference Bureau, Springfield, Illinois.

5. The Future of our Small Towns: (1) Town Planning for our Mill Villages. (2) Noteworthy leaders and achievements.—Miss. Beulah Martin, Georgia.

6. Town and Country Interdependencies: Board of Trade Policies and Activities.—Roy M. Brown, Watauga county.

7. City Problems in Carolina: Economic, Social, Civic; Inventory, Analysis, Discussion.—T. R. Buchanan, Virginia.

8. City Planning in Carolina, in view of ascertained Common Deficiencies.—N. P. Hayes, Warren county.

9. City Government in Carolina: Forms of, Efficiencies and Deficiencies.—P. A. Reavis, Franklin county.

10. City Finance and Financial Methods in Carolina.—J. G. Gullick, Gaston county.

11. Public Utilities in Carolina Cities: Common Utilities, Utilities that are Commonly Owned, Franchise Policies, etc.—W. E. Wolfe, Buncombe County.

12. Home Ownership and the Housing Problem: The Facts, their Social Significance, Constructive Suggestions.—Annie Pruitt, Franklin county.

13. Community Life and Organization in Carolina: (1) The Rarity of Country Communities and why; the Consequent Social Problems, (2) The most Promising Agency of Social Integration in Rural Areas and why.—C. E. Cowan, Bertie county.

14. Training for Public Service in Carolina: Agencies and Activities, public and private.—H. W. Odum, University Faculty.

15. Municipal Accounting and Auditing.—P. Hettleman, Wayne county.

We are here giving to students in the state-at-large a syllabus of the studies in county government, in the department of Rural Social Science at the University of North Carolina during the year 1920-21. The legislature of Louisiana is this fall considering county government. Our own legislature can consider no more important subject. What Dr. E. C. Brooks, our state school commissioner, has been talking about lately ought to wake up the state.

1. The Importance. Due (1) to the number of people involved, which is everybody in the United States. It is almost the only government that nearly two-fifths of the people in the United States are directly interested in. In North Carolina the ratio rises to more than seven-tenths of the total population. These are the open-country dwellers living outside all incorporated towns. (2) To the enormous cost of county government. In North Carolina in 1913 it was twice the cost of our state government and in 1921 this ratio is greatly increased. The bonded debt of our counties is now well over 40 million dollars. (3) To wide-spread unbusinesslikeness and waste in handling county revenues—not to dishonesty so much as inefficiency. See North Carolina County Government and County Affairs, pp 7-11, 69-79. Also bulletins of the Alameda County Tax Association, and Gilbertson's The County, p 189-90. And (4) to the tendency of county government to rise above the Big Policeman idea and to become a service agency, in highways, schools, public health, etc.; which means greatly increased taxes. It must also mean greatly increased efficiency; else a collapse of public spirit, as in Oregon. See Municipal Quarterly Review, Feb. 1921.

2. Why County Government is the Weakest Link in American Democracy. (1) Country people are individualistic; their sense of civic and social responsibility is apt to be lacking, or to be feeble. They are private and local in mood, humor, and temper. (2) They dwell too far away from the county seat to be acquainted with county affairs, or be intelligently aware of deficiencies and delinquencies in county offices. Ignorance, indifference, and inertia are everywhere the deadliest enemies of democracy. (3) Thus courthouse officers and county bosses are licensed to do as they please, and if only they are clever, good fellows they last a long time. The value of well balanced parties is a county.

3. Constructive Suggestions: (1) Unified county government under responsible headship. Our present commissioner plan recommended but strengthened as follows: (a) The commissioners locally elected as before, with the right to choose one of their number as a whole-time chairman and to vote an adequate salary to him as the county commission-manager having full authority to manage county affairs with the advice and counsel of his fellow commissioners; or the board may appoint a competent outside expert as its county-manager. (b) The board to have adequate authority over the four constitutional county officers, and the right to appoint and dismiss all other county officers whatsoever. (c) Clothed with complete authority over county finances under state laws, but under a county budget plan. (d) With authority to establish and maintain uniform accounting and reporting of all public moneys handled by all county officers. (e) Required under penalty to publish annually in compact form a statement of county finances showing— assets what and where; liabilities and forms of the same; classified receipts and disbursements in every office and summary of the same; fees and commissions due and collected in each office and summary of same; or if a salary county, the fees and commissions subject to collection, actually collected, and turned over to the county treasurer, along with the fee-and-salary account of the county in detail. (f) All reports so rendered as to show unit costs or expenditures. Here is the commissioner-plan based on the short ballot in county government, with the fewest possible changes in the present plan. Open discussion.

(2) A State Auditing Bureau in the State Auditor's Office charged (a) with devising and prescribing simple forms of account-keeping and reporting in state departments, state institutions, county and municipal offices, (b) with installing proper forms and methods of public and institutional accounting and reporting by all public officers handling public moneys, (c) with instructing and guiding such officers, to the end that unit costs and expenditures may be available for purposes of comparison. (d) The State Auditing Bureau to have a field force of public accountants busy auditing public accounts—upon the plan of our state bank examiners, their chief duty being to prescribe, instruct and guide, and where necessary to warn public officials—not to serve as detectives solely but as friendly counselors mainly. In general, such a bureau was established by the legislature of 1921.

(3) The enactment of such organic and statute laws as may be necessary (a) to establish county government of the type suggested, or something better than we have in any state at present, and (b) to place such government under sympathetic guidance at the capital; the end being the largest possible measure of local self-determination, and the least possible interference on part of state officials in county affairs, the general public good considered. At present our counties are subject to state legislation without any proper state counsel, direction, or supervision.

4. Reading References. Gilbertson's The County. Fairlie's Local Government in Counties, Towns, and Villages. Branson's County Government and County Affairs in North Carolina. Maxey's Plan of Unified County Government. Bulletins of the Alameda County Tax Association, 823 Bank of Savings Building, Oakland, California. Bulletins of Cook County Bureau of Public Efficiency, 315 Plymouth Court, Chicago. Bulletins of the Westchester County Research Bureau, White Plains, New York. James's County Government in Texas, bulletin of the University of Texas, Austin. County and Local Government in Illinois, Bulletin No. 12, Legislative Reference Bureau, Springfield, Illinois.

5. The Future of our Small Towns: (1) Town Planning for our Mill Villages. (2) Noteworthy leaders and achievements.—Miss. Beulah Martin, Georgia.

6. Town and Country Interdependencies: Board of Trade Policies and Activities.—Roy M. Brown, Watauga county.

7. City Problems in Carolina: Economic, Social, Civic; Inventory, Analysis, Discussion.—T. R. Buchanan, Virginia.