

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.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1926

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

VOL. XII, NO. 45

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, 1914

VALUE OF FARM PRODUCTS

VALUE OF FARM PRODUCTS

In the table which appears elsewhere the states are ranked according to the gross value of all farm products per farm for the year 1925. The data are not strictly comparable as crops fed to livestock are not deducted from crop values, and therefore there is some duplication; more in some states than in others. The gross value of products per farm as given in the table is above the amount that would appear if crops fed to livestock had been deducted from total crops produced. It is impossible to arrive at data that are strictly comparable, due to differences in agricultural practices in different states. An Iowa farmer feeds corn to hogs and sells the hogs. A North Carolina farmer feeds corn to mules and horses with which he raises cotton and tobacco. Indirectly we feed corn to cotton and tobacco. For all practical purposes the accompanying gross values just about show the true position of the states agriculturally on a per farm basis.

The gross value of all farm products for North Carolina was \$1,560 per farm for the year 1925, and our rank was fortieth among the states. That is, there are thirty-nine states in which the value of farm output per farm averaged above North Carolina's. This may be rather surprising to those who have so often heard North Carolina referred to as one of the leading crop states. We do rank high in total crop values, but there is something to agriculture besides crops. Livestock, milk, butter, canned goods and so on are a part of agriculture just as much as cotton and tobacco, but most people in our state seem to have lost sight of this point.

Crops vs. Livestock

Our crops in 1925 were valued at \$58 million dollars and our rank was seventh in gross value of all crops.

Our livestock and animal products were valued by the federal Department of Agriculture at \$4 million dollars, and our rank was 22nd in gross value.

But North Carolina ranks second in farms, so that when we divide our gross values by our 233,482 farms the product per farm is small and our rank on the only fair basis of comparison is very low. Our rank on an agricultural worker basis would be still lower, due to the fact that North Carolina families are so large, probably the largest in the United States.

North Carolina is a great crop state. We do not rank so well as an agricultural state. Fourteen states rank ahead of North Carolina in gross value of agricultural products. Yet only one state has more farms.

A study of the accompanying table will give some idea of the small place of livestock in North Carolina's agriculture. There are ten states in which animal products are more valuable than all crops. There are several states in which crops are not much ahead of livestock. There are only three states in which livestock is relatively less important in the scheme of agriculture than in North Carolina. Livestock and animal products make up only 19 percent of the gross value of farm output in North Carolina. Eighty-one percent is contributed by crops, mainly the non-food crops of cotton and tobacco. In no state are non-food crops relatively more important than in North Carolina. In Florida, for instance, the crop ratio is very high, but the crops are fruits and vegetables, which are edible.

On a per farm basis North Carolina ranks last in the United States in animal products,—in meat and milk production.

We have a great deal of diversity in North Carolina, but it is not diversity on a commercial basis. Cotton and tobacco are our only farm products of any great commercial value. We raise a great variety of fruits and vegetables, but the volume that enters the channels of trade is negligible compared with cotton and tobacco, and compared with the importance fruits and vegetables ought to assume in this state. And as for livestock of the food and milk variety, North Carolina simply has no standing at all, neither in quantity nor in quality. The fact that we have a few gold medals

Jerseys up in Catawba county is no proof that North Carolina is a dairy state.

State of Small Farms

The main reason for our small output per farm is that our farms are small. In cultivated acres per farm we rank last of all the states. The main reason why our farms are so small is our excessive cultivation of intensive hand-made crops. Only 19 percent of the land area of the state was in crops last year. If our agriculture was properly balanced we would have more land under cultivation. Cultivated acres to the farm would be higher and output per worker or per farm would be larger. But as long as we concentrate on hand-made cash crops to the practical exclusion of other forms of agriculture we may expect to see our state near the bottom in output per farm. We need more variety in North Carolina agriculture; variety on a commercial basis; more food and feed crops, more fruits and vegetables, more livestock and animal products.

Our Local Market

In conclusion we would like to call attention to our immense local market for diversified agricultural products that as yet has scarcely been tapped. The million urban dwellers of North Carolina are being fed largely by the North and West. They could easily be fed by North Carolina farmers, and will be when our farmers get ready to supply the local markets. The million urban dwellers of the state consume in the neighborhood of two hundred million dollars' worth of food annually. This food is supplied mainly from outside the state. An inventory of the shelves of any grocery store will prove that we are fed by distant states. Our local market for food and feed products in North Carolina equals the combined value of our cotton and tobacco crops. We will never be a rich agricultural state until we largely feed ourselves. We can feed ourselves and continue to produce our splendid non-food cash crops, and when we do we will have a farm output that will cause the state to rank high on a per farm basis. An agriculture whose gross product per farm averages only \$1560 per year cannot possibly afford a fair standard of living. Our gross and net income per farm must be raised; farms must become larger; and the only answer is diversity on a commercial basis. A great opportunity is right here at hand, the opportunity to supply our million urban dwellers with home-grown food.

APPLES GALORE

Apples are selling for fifty cents a bushel in the mountains of North Carolina and sixty cents a dozen in Chapel Hill and hundreds of other places in North Carolina! The papers are daily telling of the state's bumper apple crop and of the hundreds of thousands of bushels that are going to waste, that will rot on the ground. And people in Chapel Hill and elsewhere in the state are eating apples from Oregon, Washington, New York and other distant states! Fifty cents a bushel in the mountains, sixty cents a dozen over the counter in Chapel Hill. A bumper crop, with apples rotting in the mountains while a hundred and fifty miles to the east they are selling for five cents each! And they are not North Carolina apples at all. They are from the Far West, three thousand miles away, and have passed through the hands of a large number of middlemen, each of whom has taken his due profits. That is why they are five cents apiece.

Peaches

Sand Hill peaches have been selling for about a dollar and a half a basket in New York, and when you can get them at all you have to pay from two dollars to two and a half dollars in Chapel Hill. The writer has been reading the daily articles telling of the bumper peach crop and of how the farmers are having to turn to brandy-making in order to save the surplus from rotting. For more than two weeks he has daily enquired for peaches at the local stores and has kept a strict watch for street vendors, but he has been unable to find any peaches at any price, except occasionally by the dozen over the counter, and the price usually is fifty cents a dozen. A

A PRIME NECESSITY

It is only as the farmer comes to think of himself as in business and to use business methods in his daily tasks that the people as a whole, in industry, trade, or the professions, will remotely approach a proper use of and profit from our state's richest endowments. A prosperous agricultural industry is the prime necessity not only in North Carolina but in America today.—Gov. A. W. McLean.

bumper crop in the Sand Hills, and going begging,—fifty cents a dozen fifty miles away in Chapel Hill, and often none at that price.

The local merchants say that they cannot get apples from western North Carolina. They do not know who has apples for sale, nor what they would receive should they order a barrel of them. So they order apples from the Hood River Apple Growers in Oregon, and other farmer-associations which stand ready to supply the market in steady quantities and standard grades. You order a barrel of Hood River apples and you know what you will get. You order a barrel of apples from a western North Carolina farmer and you know what you have gotten only after the last apple has been taken from the barrel.

The Solution

The only solution is for the farmers to perfect cooperative marketing association, adopt standard grades, and stand ready to supply the market with apples in steady and reliable quantities, just as the commercial apple growers of the North and West have done. The individual farmer has little or no chance to find a market for his apples.

Solving the local market problem is one of the biggest problems facing the state. Something must be done to bring the producer and the consumer closer together. It is to the interests of both to work out the solution. The North Carolina consumer is closer to the Oregon and California producer than to the North Carolina producer of the same products.

Oregon apples are sixty cents a dozen in Chapel Hill. Apples equally as good are being peddled by individual farmers for fifty cents a bushel in western North Carolina. The mountain farmer can reach only the local consumer.

The farmers of North Carolina must learn the trick of merchandising their products. The hope of the farmer lies largely in group effort. We can produce individually, but only through group effort can markets be developed and supplied in any quantity demanded, and in reliable and standard grades.

OUT IN WASHINGTON

Out in the state of Washington there are 125 apple growers who make up the membership of the Yakima Fruit Exchange, which has just finished its second successful shipping season. The first year the exchange shipped 175 carloads of apples, and last year 250 cars, which brought a total of \$230,000. The Yakima Exchange distributes its fruit under three brands, and the merchants who order a brand know in advance what they will get. Very likely this association is marketing apples in North Carolina, while western North Carolina is complaining of a bumper crop and no market. It would be a very simple thing for 125 mountain farmers to form an association for marketing apples,—just as simple as for Washington farmers. Later on other associations would develop. Finally these could federate into Western North Carolina Apple Growers, Inc., or some such name, and possibly we would develop into America's leading commercial apple region. We have the natural resources. It is up to us to cash in on them.

AN EXPRESS TOWN

Setting out from Statesville for Charlotte one night recently, on Captain Claude Morrison's June Bug Special, The Observer noted a delay of several minutes at the Mooresville depot. After we got under way the captain was asked about it. "Oh," was his response, "nothing but creamery butter. We have just loaded 3,000

pounds from the Mooresville Creamery, but that happens three or four times a week." The Mooresville Creamery was one of the pioneer establishments in this section and it has been managed in a manner markedly successful. It operates its own ice plant for refrigerating express cars and ships its butter to points widely separated. Express shipments of butter from the Mooresville depot have become in recent months a material factor in increased freight revenues from the Old A. T. & O. Farmers organized the business there and farmers and business men carry it on.—Charlotte Observer.

ELECTRICITY ON FARMS

Electricity has had a magic effect as a factor in the development of industry. No other single agency perhaps has been such a potent factor in the building up of an industrial empire here in the piedmont region of the Carolinas. It has revolutionized industry in many localities in other parts of the country.

In urban life it has been a tremendous factor in promotion of the comfort and convenience of the people. Its use in lighting streets and residences, offices and business places, and in the operation of urban transportation facilities has been followed by its introduction and general use in the home for cooking, for the operation of sewing machines, washing machines, and for numerous other purposes.

The next step in the development in the utility of electricity is the extension of its use in rural communities, not only for domestic use in the country homes, including lighting, but as a factor in farm operations. New uses of electric power are already beginning to lighten farm work in field and home. Experiments indicate tremendous expansion of electrification in many rural districts in many states. Increasing use of electricity on farms of the United States is bringing about manifold benefits, it was reported by Dr. E. A. White, director of the committee on the relation of electricity to agriculture, at its third annual meeting in Chicago the other day. A dispatch to The Christian Science Monitor reports Doctor White as saying that electricity is releasing farm men and women from drudgery in much of their long day of activity. In homes it is used not only for light, but to speed up many household tasks and decrease physical toil in connection with them. For the poultry farmer electricity is being used increasingly for stimulation of egg growth, brooders, incubators, and in food preparations. Investigations of the committee show that

great good is being accomplished by use of electricity for the dairy farmer. Some uses involve water supply, ventilation, sterilization of equipment, feeding, milking and separation, it was reported. East of the Rocky Mountains and particularly in truck farming districts much interest is being directed toward use of electricity in development of overhead irrigation.

There is every prospect that within a few years development of electricity in rural America will make tremendous strides, Doctor White said, in an interview. He has travelled almost constantly during the past year, investigating, directing and observing for the committee, and he reported that there is noticeable a great improvement in rural homes, much of which may be attributed to the use of electricity.—Charlotte Observer.

CONSOLIDATION

In the Biblical Recorder of last week there is a brief article by C. H. Dickey on the necessity of consolidating weak churches, that is packed full of common sense.

The amazing statement is made from an investigation by Mr. Middleton, secretary of our Sunday school board, that since the year 1916 no less than seventy-eight churches in existence then cannot be found now, and he adds that he has marked off from the census list 25 churches that he knows to be dead, and makes the further statement that we are carrying at least 76 more churches that have not reported to their associations for the last five years.

This is a distressing situation and should be remedied. We have been putting money in rat holes for years trying to save weak and inefficient churches that are doomed to death. In fact they are dead already having only a name to live.

We are living in the day of mergers, in business, in education and along other lines. Why is not this same principle a sound one in the religious realm? Good roads and swift transportation have changed everything. In the days of slow movement and rough roads there was some excuse for churches organized near each other, but it is different now.

Churches organized within two or three miles of each other that are barely able to live ought to combine and merge their strength so as to support a capable pastor and maintain an orderly and effective organization. ***

Consolidation is the word, and it is to be hoped that sentiment in favor of church mergers will grow, and thus out of weakness we may be made strong.—Charity and Children.

GROSS VALUE OF FARM PRODUCTS PER FARM, 1925

Value of Crops and Value of Animal Products

In the following table, based on U. S. Department of Agriculture data, the states are ranked according to the gross value of all farm products per farm for the year 1925. The parallel columns give the value of crops and the value of livestock and animal products separately. The table presents gross values, as crops fed to livestock have not been deducted, and therefore the data are not strictly comparable.

North Carolina ranks fortieth in gross value of all farm products per farm. We rank seventh in total crop values and twenty-second in total value of animal products. But we rank second in total number of farms, which explains our low rank per farm. The ratio of animal products to total farm output is lower in North Carolina than in any other state except three,—Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida.

U. S. average gross value of farm products per farm \$2,663.

S. H. Hobbs, Jr.

Department of Rural Social-Economics, University of North Carolina.

Rank	States	Value crops (millions)	Value animal products (millions)	Gross value per farm	Rank	States	Value crops (millions)	Value animal products (millions)	Gross value per farm
1	Nevada	\$ 12	\$ 13	\$6,410	25	Massachusetts	\$ 52	\$ 48	\$2,990
2	Iowa	516	596	5,205	26	Pennsylvania	330	267	2,980
3	California	518	186	5,181	27	Indiana	273	293	2,891
4	Nebraska	343	285	4,919	28	Missouri	339	408	2,866
5	North Dakota	302	71	4,905	29	Delaware	20	9	2,825
6	Wyoming	34	41	4,844	30	Ohio	337	341	2,770
7	Arizona	32	19	4,722	31	Maryland	85	46	2,676
8	Colorado	159	106	4,570	32	Florida	117	17	2,616
9	Idaho	125	67	4,481	33	Michigan	292	202	2,568
10	Montana	128	77	4,372	34	Oklahoma	300	167	2,370
11	Illinois	498	451	4,208	35	N. Hampshire	23	24	2,231
12	South Dakota	208	108	3,985	36	New Mexico	29	37	2,082
13	Kansas	327	315	3,870	37	Texas	637	308	2,027
14	New Jersey	68	44	3,776	38	Louisiana	215	28	1,833
15	Wisconsin	363	343	3,653	39	W. Virginia	80	66	1,616
16	New York	350	321	3,577	40	North Carolina	358	84	1,560
17	Washington	186	74	3,547	41	Virginia	178	116	1,517
18	Minnesota	414	235	3,448	42	Tennessee	212	165	1,495
19	Vermont	46	49	3,418	43	Mississippi	311	62	1,450
20	Oregon	111	77	3,364	44	Kentucky	212	160	1,438
21	Utah	62	32	2,230	45	Arkansas	243	75	1,432
22	Maine	112	45	3,125	46	Alabama	250	65	1,337
23	Rhode Island	5	7	3,070	47	Georgia	250	82	1,331
24	Connecticut	40	30	3,610	48	South Carolina	177	42	1,267