

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 the University Extension Division.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1927

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

VOL. XIII, No. 43

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.

## FARM TENANCY IN N. C.

### FARM TENANCY

Tables pertaining to farm tenancy have appeared in this publication from time to time but the one which appears in this issue is the first time an attempt has been made to show trends over the fifteen-year interval 1910 to 1925. The interval reaches far enough before and after the war to register a general movement rather than a war fluctuation.

In this fifteen-year period North Carolina's tenant farmers increased in number from 107,287 to 128,254, an increase of 19.5 percent. In the same period the total number of farms increased only 11.7 percent, while farms cultivated by owners increased only 6.5 percent. Stated differently, the ratio of tenants to all farmers was 42.3 in 1910 and 46.2 in 1925. At this rate of increase the state will soon have more farm tenants than owner cultivators.

### Increase in Numbers

It will be noticed by the table that forty-one counties witnessed a reduction in the number of tenant farmers in the fifteen-year period and fifty-nine counties had increases. Three of the counties in which tenancy decreased owe part of the reduction to loss of territory, Mitchell, Watauga, and Caldwell each surrendering some territory to form Avery. Since Avery did not exist in 1910 it is credited with the average rate of decrease of the three counties from which it was created.

Henderson, rather than Mitchell, is thus probably entitled to the distinction of having the most rapid reduction in farm tenancy. Buncombe follows closely, and all of the first ten places are held by counties beyond the Blue Ridge. Of the forty-one counties which saw a decrease in tenancy only six—Brunswick, Carteret, Hyde, New Hanover, Tyrrell, and Jones—are eastern counties, and they are tidewater counties which do not engage extensively in cash-crop farming.

Some of the piedmont counties lost tenants; others made slight gains; only Cleveland and Alamance witnessed substantial increases—and of these Cleveland is a big producer of cotton.

### Large Gains in East

In nearly all of the eastern counties there were big increases in farm tenancy. Probably no other area in the nation experienced such an increase in farm tenants as eastern North Carolina. In thirty-six counties there were increases in excess of twenty-five percent, and in eighteen counties in excess of fifty percent. Practically all of the counties in the cash-crop belt had increases of from twenty to seventy percent. It is rather significant that the greatest increases of all were in the northeast tidewater counties—Chowan, Washington, Martin, and Beaufort. Dare's five-hundred-percent increase loses its significance when it is observed that its tenants increased in number from one to six. Hoke county, like Avery, was not in existence in 1910. It is credited with an increase equivalent to that which took place in the parent counties, Robeson and Cumberland.

The parallel column gives the percentage of farm tenants in each county in 1925. Edgecombe leads with 83.3 percent and Greene ranks second with 82.0 percent. In thirty-seven counties more than fifty percent of the farmers are tenants. On the other hand, there are eight mountain counties and two tidewater counties (Dare and Brunswick) with a farm tenancy ratio of less than fifteen percent. Fifty-six counties have less than the state average of 45.2 percent of farms operated by tenants, and forty-four counties are above the state average. Fifty counties had a higher tenancy ratio in 1925 than in 1910, and fifty counties had a lower ratio.

### Remedies All Fail

Even though farm tenancy of the sort which prevails in North Carolina is generally acknowledged to be undesirable, it is not decreasing. In fifty-nine counties of the state it is increasing. Consolidated rural high schools have not solved the problem, or even turned the tide. A compulsory school law has not changed the situation. The industrial development of western North

Carolina is responsible for the loss of farm tenants in that part of the state. The elimination of the state property tax, the coming of the county agricultural agents with their gospel of diversification, the ravages of the boll weevil, the organization of the cotton cooperative association, the federal farm loan system and intermediate credit banks—all of these things have failed to check the trend toward increasing tenancy. Possibly these influences will begin to operate in time but they have not begun to register yet. What remains to be done? Who is giving thought to the problem, or are we satisfied to let tenancy increase, and, if so, how far? Who is there that believes that agriculture can be efficient, satisfying, and wholesome except where farmers own their homes and the land they cultivate?—Paul W. Wager.

### DAVIDSON'S HISTORY

There is an increasing interest in local history in North Carolina and many counties have recently appointed county historians. This is altogether desirable and will result, no doubt, in the preservation of valuable historical data that might otherwise be lost. It will also stimulate the writing of county histories which will be immensely useful in the schools.

Davidson county has had a volunteer historian for many years in the person of Rev. Jacob Calvin Leonard, D. D., and the fruit of his labor is a Centennial History of Davidson County just off the press. Dr. Leonard is pastor of the First Reformed Church of Lexington. He has spent many years gathering the material for this volume and its publication gives the county a historical record of which it may feel justly proud.

The book is a handsomely bound volume of over 600 pages and consists of eighteen chapters, all of which contain a wealth of valuable historical facts. The story of Davidson's development and of the places filled by its more conspicuous sons is simply and interestingly related. The narrative is supplemented by 50 full-page illustrations. Among the subjects treated rather comprehensively are county officers, banks, county newspapers, schools, churches, and farms and farm products. There is an entire chapter devoted to Lexington, and another to Thomasville and its industrial development. A separate chapter is devoted to Daniel Boone, also, who once lived in Davidson county; and to General Nathaniel Greene, who traversed Davidson county in his historic march. Another interesting and instructive chapter deals with racial origins of Davidson county citizens. The final chapter upholds Davidson as a unique county in a great state.

Dr. Leonard's volume is a valuable contribution to the field of local history, a field that has not yet received the attention it deserves. It is hoped that the historians of other counties will emulate Dr. Leonard's example.

### HIGHWAYS HELP FARMERS

Crops, total value of which in North Carolina last year was \$320,000,000, and roads go hand in hand.

The good roads in this part of the state have made it possible to supply the manufacturing cities from farms located as many as 40 miles away or farther.

Prior to the advent of good roads the farmer who lives as much as ten miles from town rarely took produce to market unless his roads were in what he would call prime condition, and then it took him an entire day to make the trip.

The town was then forced to get its supplies from sources outside the state, as it could hardly draw on more than 75 square miles of territory for local production.

With the coming of good roads the market gardens of the cities have grown from the former area of 50 to 75 square miles to 1,000 to 1,200 square miles or more.

Here we find diversified farming—cotton, corn, tobacco, potatoes, wheat, oats, and vegetables—all growing on the same farm the same year.—A. P. report of speech by W. A. Graham before Farmers' Convention.

### AN AGRICULTURAL POLICY

The time has come in the life of the American people, as it has come before in the history of all great nations, when we must deliberately and wisely formulate a national agricultural policy. We must make up our minds as a people whether we are going to continue to sacrifice our agricultural development to our temporary industrial growth, as we have been doing, or whether we are going to adopt the safer and wiser course of bringing our agricultural, industrial and commercial life into a well balanced and cooperative relationship.

This issue is inescapable, even though it may be postponed. It is forced upon us by the indisputable facts regarding the present situation and tendencies of our agriculture. The agricultural situation today is not merely the result of the war. There is strong evidence that our agriculture has been increasingly lagging behind the rest of our economic life since the beginning of the century, which marked the commencement of our rapid industrial development. Whether you look at agriculture as an industry, as a business, as an occupation or as a way of living, it is no longer possible to ignore the great economic and social problems which its situation presents.—Virgil Jordan, in The Fertilizer Review.

### EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT

The city managerial councilmanic form of government is the most efficient and business-like method of administration of the affairs of a municipality.

This opinion was expressed Saturday morning by C. O. Sherrill, city manager of Cincinnati, where the new form has met with decided success during the two years it has been in use.

"Naturally", Colonel Sherrill said, "I am prejudiced in favor of the city manager plan but I can say without bias that it has proved a great success in Cincinnati and that it has attained great popularity there."

### Most Business-Like

"It stands to reason that form of government is most efficient because it is most business-like. It operates like the administrative organization of any large business firm."

"In any business organization of any size you have a board of directors and a general manager at the head. The directors are named by the stockholders and the general manager is employed because of his training as the most logical man for the particular position he holds. In the city manager form of government, the residents are the stockholders, the councilmen are the directors, and the city manager is the general manager."

"Centralization of authority is the biggest advantage of the city manager form. That means facility of administration, and efficiency of government."—News and Observer.

### ANOTHER FIRST

North Carolina will be the first state in the Union to be free from bovine tuberculosis, it has been announced at the State Department of Agriculture. Commissioner William A. Graham authorized the statement that Ashe County had agreed to cooperate in the work of eradication. This, he said, completes the list, that is, Ashe County is the one-hundredth county to join in, and by some time in 1928 the work ought to be concluded. This will mean that North Carolina will be the first of all the states to complete the work. Our state already has been freed from the cattle tick, and this present forward movement ought to give us a fine showing throughout the country.

"Work already has been completed in eighty-five of the counties," continued Commissioner Graham, "and is in progress in twelve. In the remaining three, it will begin very shortly. I am extremely gratified at this showing."

"The highest number of infested cows found was 785 in 1922, according to figures furnished me by Dr. William Moore, veterinarian for the Department."—Agricultural Review.

## NOTES ON PUBLIC EDUCATION

### 6. AN EFFECTIVE COUNTY ORGANIZATION

Practice in good systems already established indicates that a county organization to be most effective should make provision for a well-centralized business and professional administration, without depriving the people in each section of local initiative in school matters. The county board and the county superintendent should administer the general school affairs and expend the county school funds to equalize educational advantages among all the children of the county. Each school community should have a representative appointed by the county board or, if desired, elected at an annual school meeting, to represent the school before the county board. Support should come principally from county funds. The school funds of the county should be expended by the county board of education for the general maintenance of all the schools. The local school community should usually be given the right to levy taxes and issue bonds for extraordinary school purposes, such as acquiring additional land sites or erecting new buildings. This gives a measure of local autonomy. This should be permitted only after a county-wide tax sufficient for all ordinary school purposes for the entire county has been levied and collected.

A good county system has an organization for the management and support of its schools similar to that of the best

city systems. The county board of education is elected from the county at large in the same manner as the best city boards are elected. It should have practically the same powers and duties. It determines the general educational policies of the county. It familiarizes itself with the educational needs of the entire county and locates schools where needed. It employs the county superintendent of schools and authorizes the employment of assistants. The county superintendent is its executive officer in exactly the same way that the city superintendent is the executive officer of the city board of education. In selecting a superintendent the board should have authority to employ the best person obtainable regardless of whether he is or is not a citizen of the county or even of the state. The board should be free, within reasonable limitations, to pay whatever salary may be necessary to obtain the most efficient person. The county superintendency requires as much ability and professional experience as that of a city of the same population. It presents difficulties in size of territory, placement of teachers, organization of supervisory staff, school financing, location of buildings, and the like which are even greater than city superintendents must meet. The salary should be commensurate with the responsibility.—U. S. Bureau of Education.

### TENANCY GAINS AND LOSSES

#### Percent Increase in Tenants 1910 to 1925

In the following table the counties of the state are ranked according to the decrease or increase in number of farm tenants between 1910 and 1925. The county with the largest decrease comes first, and the county with the largest increase appears last. The percentage of farms operated by tenants in each county in 1925 is given in the parallel column. The state average is 45.2. The net state increase for the fifteen-year period was 19.5 percent. Forty-two counties had a tenancy increase in excess of this rate, seventeen counties had an increase at a lower rate, and forty-one counties witnessed a decrease in the number of tenants.

The counties losing tenants are almost all in the western part of the state. The counties showing increases in farm tenancy are generally in the eastern half of the state.

Edgecombe and Greene have the highest tenancy ratios, 83.3 and 82.0 respectively. Dare is lowest with a percentage of 7.6.

Paul W. Wager

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

Rank	County	Percent of farms occupied by tenants 1925	Percent decrease and increase of farm tenants 1910-1925
1	Mitchell	10.2	64.8*
2	Henderson	9.0	62.0
3	Buncombe	12.3	58.1
4	Watauga	10.2	47.1*
5	Haywood	20.7	44.9
6	Macon	16.3	42.6
7	Transylvania	12.4	38.9
8	Madison	29.1	37.9
9	Avery	9.6	35.4†
10	Alleghany	10.2	33.8
11	Brunswick	14.3	33.2
12	Cherokee	20.6	31.9
13	Alexander	15.3	31.5
14	McDowell	22.6	31.1
15	Caldwell	20.5	27.8*
16	Gaston	41.3	27.7
17	Graham	23.7	27.3
18	Wilkes	18.3	27.2
19	Swain	22.6	26.2
20	Polk	30.5	24.1
21	Ashe	11.3	22.1
22	Mecklenburg	56.3	20.8
23	Catawba	23.2	18.3
24	Chatham	33.5	17.2
25	Yancey	25.7	15.8
26	Carteret	19.5	15.7
27	Jackson	19.2	12.1
28	Hyde	49.4	11.4
29	New Hanover	23.6	10.3
30	Lincoln	36.7	7.6
31	Burke	22.9	7.6
32	Guilford	23.6	7.1
33	Tyrrell	28.0	6.4
34	Stanly	32.4	5.5
35	Rowan	32.6	5.4
36	Jones	60.1	4.8
37	Randolph	18.8	4.8
38	Union	53.6	3.0
39	Davie	40.2	2.7
40	Orange	34.1	2.6
41	Stokes	45.1	2.2
42	Rutherford	46.0	1.7
43	Clay	30.5	1.9
44	Durham	55.7	3.7
45	Iredell	39.6	4.7
46	Cabarrus	52.3	5.2
47	Davidson	20.4	6.8
48	Montgomery	36.5	8.3
49	Yadkin	25.7	10.3
50	Rockingham	50.6	12.0
51	Forsyth	23.8	12.4
52	Caswell	56.0	13.2
53	Cumberland	48.9	13.5**
54	Anson	67.9	14.3
55	Onslow	37.4	15.2
56	Vance	61.8	16.9
57	Wake	53.1	17.0
58	Surry	33.2	17.1
59	Perquimans	51.9	19.7
60	Warren	56.6	20.7
61	Person	61.4	21.6
62	Currituck	47.3	22.5
63	Halifax	70.3	23.8
64	Craven	46.5	25.1
65	Hertford	69.5	25.2
66	Cleveland	55.5	27.0
67	Franklin	69.1	28.6
68	Lee	38.4	28.8
69	Pasquotank	52.3	31.5
70	Northampton	68.2	32.3
71	Robeson	65.8	32.6**
72	Granville	62.5	35.3
73	Camden	62.5	35.6
74	Moore	30.1	38.3
75	Duplin	44.6	40.5
76	Alamance	31.6	41.0
77	Pender	23.0	41.5
78	Pamlico	30.7	43.0
79	Wayne	72.1	43.4
80	Bertie	61.1	44.0
81	Greene	82.0	46.6
82	Johnston	56.7	48.9
83	Lenoir	71.6	50.6
84	Gates	38.8	51.2
84	Wilson	77.1	51.2
86	Edgecombe	83.3	54.4
87	Hoke	63.2	54.9†
88	Harnett	46.8	56.3
89	Pitt	76.9	57.3
90	Scotland	80.7	60.3
91	Nash	70.3	62.2
92	Sampson	42.5	65.1
93	Bladen	27.7	65.7
94	Richmond	64.3	65.8
95	Columbus	23.9	67.3
96	Beaufort	39.4	74.7
97	Martin	59.8	80.6
98	Washington	65.9	117.4
99	Chowan	63.0	117.8
100	Dare	7.6	500.0

\*Decrease partly due to reduced territory.

†Average decrease of the counties from which Avery was formed.

\*\*Increase in spite of reduced territory.

††Average increase of the counties from which Hoke was formed.