

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.

APRIL 4, 1928

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

VOL. XIV, No. 21

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.

COWLESS FARMS IN N. C.

DAIRY COWS IN THE U. S.

In the table which appears elsewhere in this issue the states are ranked according to the ratio of dairy cows to population, the state with the most cows in proportion to population ranking highest.

The twelve North Central states have more than half of the Nation's dairy cows, while sixteen Southern states have only 25 percent of them. Wisconsin, Minnesota and New York lead, in the order named, in the number of dairy cows, but the Dakotas lead in the ratio of cows to population.

It is not surprising that small states with large urban centers should have few cows in proportion to population. Hence Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New Jersey rank lowest in the table. It is surprising and disappointing that large Southern states, mainly rural, should rank but little better. Florida, South Carolina, Louisiana, Georgia, and North Carolina, all are deficient in dairying.

N. C. Ranks Low

Although North Carolina is predominantly a rural state it falls far short of possessing its quota of dairy cows. Taking the United States as a whole there is one dairy cow for each 5.4 people, or slightly less than a cow per family. North Carolina lacks 180,000 cows of measuring up to this average. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates the number of milk cows and heifers in North Carolina on January 1, 1923, as 321,000. To equal the average for the United States there should be 503,000.

North Carolina has one cow for each 9.02 people, and only a few Southern states make a poorer showing. Kentucky, Arkansas, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Alabama, and West Virginia all surpass North Carolina in the ratio of dairy cows to population. Oklahoma, Mississippi, Kentucky and Arkansas even exceed the United States average.

Result of Tenancy

Why does the South rank so low in the number of dairy cows and why does North Carolina rank below many of the other Southern states? It is partly due, of course, to the lack of natural pastures, but more to the cash-crop, tenancy type of agriculture. North Carolina is buying much of its butter and most of its cheese from the North. It ought to be supplying the local markets with home-grown dairy products. Even worse than the practice of sending money out of the state for dairy products that might be locally produced is the absence of milk and butter from the diet of the people. Thousands of Eastern Carolina people hardly know the taste of butter and thousands of children are reared without milk. It is not alone urban children that are denied milk. The 1925 census of agriculture shows just half of the farms of North Carolina reporting dairy cows. Think of it, 140,000 farms in North Carolina without a single cow! North Carolina is making some gains in dairying; here and there we find a fancy herd; a few creameries are being established. There are 30,000 more dairy cows in the state than there were in 1910, but located on 20,000 fewer farms.

Can we call it progress so long as 140,000 farm families do not possess a cow? With 400,000 rural children in the state growing up without milk, and with 22 million idle acres, can we boast of our rural civilization? It is not civilization; it is not even humane; it is a great moral and physical blight. We cannot build a great state on such a foundation. We cannot build a great state on the shifting sands of tenancy, an institution which leaves 140,000 farms without a cow, 110,000 without a pig, 40,000 without a chicken, and 45,000 without a garden.—Paul W. Wager.

WISCONSIN'S FOREST TAX

The Wisconsin forest crop law which will come into full force and effect during 1928 is proclaimed by many as the best law of its kind in any state. This act authorizes:

1. The encouragement of forest development by private enterprise.

2. Over a period of years, the automatic classification of lands best suited for forestry purpose.

3. The exemption of growing and unmerchantable timber from taxes, on forest crop lands, until harvested.

4. A flat tax of \$.10 per acre per year from the owner on all forest crop land.

5. State participation in the development of forestry by a contribution of \$.10 per acre per year on all forest crop lands to the town in which such lands are located.

6. A yield tax of 10 percent of the stumpage value when forest products are removed from crop lands.

For years it has been pointed out by interested people that the highly desirable work of forest restoration was hampered by the ad valorem plan of taxation. To have to pay a tax on a growing crop of trees year after year until the trees were of saleable size proved an effective barrier to private land owners in forestry activities. We of this generation stand between the days of forest supplies in great abundance in all parts of the country and the time when the forests will be considered as a crop from the soil to be grown in an orderly and organized way and compatible with our land, industrial and social requirements. Fire and taxes have been the great enemies of forestry everywhere and we are now just beginning to overpower these enemies.

Constitutional Amendment

The forest crop law was made possible by the constitutional amendment approved in the spring election of 1927. The rule that all taxation must be uniform as to values and methods in the same taxing jurisdiction was amended so that a classification could be made by the legislature as to forests and forest land. Following the passage of this amendment the first draft of the forest law was prepared and the final draft was drawn by the special legislative committee on forestry and recommended for passage and subsequently fully approved.

The main intent of the law is that lands suited only for forest growth shall be in effect isolated and used for such purposes. The official county records will show such lands classified as forest crop lands. No lands having a value for agricultural, recreational, mineral or other uses are eligible for entry.

A Flat Acre Tax

Forest crop lands are not assessed for taxation purposes but the assessor enters such lands by acreages in a special column on his tax roll. The owner pays a flat tax to the town treasurer of \$.10 per acre per year. The state also contributes \$.10 per acre per year from the general fund to the town treasurer to compensate the town for what it might lose in bringing this law into effect. In many cases the town in which such lands are located will be better off immediately through the working of this law as the total amount received under the forest crop law, namely \$.80 per forty acres, will be more than they received under the ad valorem system. Each town is guaranteed \$.80 per forty acres under the forest crop law; that is, \$.40 from the owner and \$.40 from the state. As the law now stands, no land bearing merchantable timber is eligible for entry. The law also specifies a minimum of 160 acres that can be entered but special hearings may be had on forest land of less than that acreage in the nature of farm woodlots. The owner of land accepted as forest crop lands waives his right to post his land against hunting and trapping and this right rests entirely in the public, unless the Conservation Commission, after a hearing, officially closes the area to hunting and trapping.

Method of Listing

The owner of any land who believes his land best suited to forestry petitions the Conservation Commission for the entry of such lands as forest crop lands. The blanks for such petitions are furnished by the Commission. A hearing is subsequently held at the county seat and report is made to the Conservation Commission. The Commission then passes on the petition. If the petition

WHAT AILS OUR TOWNS

The worst thing that ails our American country towns is their myopia, their proneness to see only to the end of Main Street, and to think that a town grows of itself and from its stores and shops outward. A city has the Main Street point of view when it looks down from the height of its own size to sneer at or to feel sorry for the little town with but one important thoroughfare; a town has the Main Street point of view when it thinks of its one important thoroughfare as a road to the city instead of a way to the country. And many a little town has this point of view. Cure the country towns of this defect of vision and understanding, and both material and spiritual development beyond the dreams of most dwellers becomes possible for them.—E. E. Miller, in Town and Country.

is granted, the owner and interested state and county officials are notified and the transaction then takes the form of a contract running between the state and the owner for a period of fifty years.

The owner obligates himself to bring about, either through artificial or natural methods, a growth of trees that in due time will become a commercially valuable forest. To do this he may plant trees. He must protect the area from fire. He may encourage the natural growth. He may scatter tree seeds to encourage reproduction. He may put on fire patrols during dry times or purchase forest fire pumps or hand tools for the protection of the property, but through his actions in one way or another he must bring about a growth of forest trees on his forest crop land. It is to his interest to do so, for it is only from the forest crop that he can retrieve the annual minimum expense he incurs of \$.10 per acre per year paid as taxes.

Good Faith Necessary

It should be borne in mind that essentially the forest crop law is not a law to reduce taxes on any land. The tax on such land is adjusted by the law so that it is compatible with the returns from a sustained forest enterprise. The owner of any land will gain nothing from the forest crop law if he does not have a good faithful intent to actually practice forestry on the lands he petitions to enter. The law compels the Conservation Commission to make an examination of all forest crop lands once every five years to determine whether the intent of the law is being carried out and if the report is negative, the lands may be ordered back on the regular tax rolls and the owner is compelled to pay all taxes that would ordinarily have been levied under the ad valorem system, plus simple interest at 5 percent. The town board or the tax or conservation commissions may also at any time enter a complaint that the intent of the law is not being carried out and, after hearing, the lands may be ordered back onto the regular tax rolls and all back taxes that would ordinarily have been levied are assessed and must be paid or the land becomes delinquent and subject to the regular laws regarding delinquency.

Of course the owner may also withdraw his lands voluntarily after petition to, and hearing by, the Conservation Commission and in case the lands are withdrawn voluntarily he must again pay back all taxes that would ordinarily have been levied as determined by the tax commission, and the lands are then released from their character as forest crop lands. An owner of land, therefore, should not deceive himself into believing that the forest crop law will be of advantage to him in reducing taxes unless he is at the same time serious in his effort to establish a forest that eventually becomes of commercial value. Lands entered under the forest crop law should, in fact, be lands primarily valuable and suitable only for the production of new and commercially valuable forests and for such areas the forest crop law is of great value.

FEWER LYNCHINGS

Forty-one states were free from lynching during 1927, states the Roll of Honor prepared by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America through its commission on the Church and Race Relations. The 16 lynchings which occurred last year took place in seven states. These states are Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas. The number of victims was 14 less than in 1926, one less than in 1925, and the same number as in 1924.

The high mark of states free of the evil was reached last year. In 1926 there were 88 states without a lynching; in 1925 there were 88; in 1924 there were 88, and in 1923 there were 89.

Georgia and Florida for the first time since records have been kept now appear on the Roll of Honor. Connecticut has been added to the list of states that never had a lynching because recent investigations of the Commission on Race Relations indicate that the case in 1886 recorded as a lynching by the Chicago Tribune, the accepted authority for early records of the evil, was probably a suicide of a murderer hunted by a posse and not a lynching. Other states that have never had a lynching are Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont.

All except one of the seven states that had lynchings in 1927 have been on the Honor Roll at least for one year since 1922. Now only one state in the country has an unbroken yearly record of the crime of mob murder.

The gain in territory free from mob murder is attributed by Dr. George E. Haynes, Secretary of the Commission, to the pressure of public opinion, stimulated by the white and Negro newspapers of the Nation. He states that it is significant that ten of the sixteen lynchings last year occurred in two states in the Mississippi Valley, and he adds that the pressure of public opinion against mob violence should continue and increase until every person in America regardless of race or color is safe and secure in any state.

There were 42 instances in 1927, according to Professor Monroe N. Work of Tuskegee Institute, in which officers of the law prevented lynchings, 8 of them in northern states and 34 in southern states. The Commission on Interracial Cooperation has designed and is awarding to officers of the law a medal for prevention of lynching. Five such medals were given to officers in Texas in 1926, and two were given in Florida, two in Louisiana and one in Kentucky in 1927. Virginia, through the leadership of Governor Byrd, has

just enacted a law making lynching an offense to be prosecuted by the attorney general and other prosecutors designated by the governor in addition to local authorities.

SAVE THE TREES

J. S. Holmes, State forester, says in a study of forest trees of the state: "Two-thirds of the area of our state is still classed as forest land. Most of this has had the greater part or all of the merchantable timber cut from it; and through destructive lumbering, turpentine, roving live-stock and forest fires, this timber has been replacing itself very slowly or not at all.

"It should also be remembered that a happy change is taking place. Landowners are cutting more carefully; cattle and hogs have been controlled in nearly all our counties, and protection from the fires is being extended as rapidly as county, state and federal funds become available.

"The chief thing lacking now is the interest and cooperation of the people of the towns as well as of the country in growing and protecting our trees and forests."—Morganton News Herald.

IN ONE MONTH

Fifty-five people were killed in automobile accidents in North Carolina in February, and 33 people were burned to death, according to the report of the Bureau of Vital Statistics of the State Board of Health.

There were in all 144 violent deaths in the state last month, the report shows. Nineteen of this number were homicides while seven committed suicide.

From accidental gun-shot wounds eight lost their lives. Seven died from gun-shot wounds of a doubtful nature, the authorities being unable to determine whether these deaths were homicides or accidents.

Of the 55 deaths in automobile accidents, five occurred at grade crossings. In addition to these, there were 11 people killed in straight railroad accidents.

Four people were drowned. The report shows no deaths by lightning.

BEST MANAGED COUNTY

Forsyth county, which more than two years ago adopted a modern and accurate system of book-keeping and was operating under an orderly, thorough and systematic plan of accounting for a year before the County Government Advisory Commission was organized by the state has just received another commendation in the form of a letter of approval from Charles M. Johnson, executive secretary of the State Commission, who says he regards Forsyth as the best governed county in the State.—News and Observer.

DAIRY COWS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1928

States Ranked According to People Per Cow

In the following table the states are ranked according to the number of people for each dairy cow. The table is based on the estimates of the United States Department of Agriculture for January 1, 1928.

The estimated number of dairy cows in the United States is 21,948,000, or one for 5.40 people. Nearly half of this total are in the twelve North Central states. New York is also a great dairy state, being exceeded only by Wisconsin and Minnesota in total number of cows.

South Dakota leads the state in ratio of cows to population. Rhode Island, with its large population and limited farm area, quite naturally ranks lowest. Many of the Southern states make a poor showing when compared with other rural states.

North Carolina is estimated to have 321,000 dairy cows, or one for 9.02 people. It ranks thirty-seventh among the states.

Paul W. Wager

Department of Rural Social-Economics, University of North Carolina

Rank	State	Persons per dairy cow	Rank	State	Persons per dairy cow
1	South Dakota	1.34	25	Washington	5.79
2	North Dakota	1.40	26	New Hampshire	5.91
3	Wisconsin	1.46	27	New Mexico	6.03
4	Minnesota	1.76	28	Delaware	6.75
5	Iowa	1.84	29	Virginia	7.00
6	Nebraska	2.28	30	Alabama	7.28
7	Kansas	2.61	31	Ohio	7.32
8	Idaho	3.14	32	California	7.37
9	Wyoming	3.35	33	Illinois	7.54
10	Oklahoma	3.71	34	West Virginia	7.75
11	Nevada	3.87	35	Arizona	7.91
12	Montana	4.08	36	New York	8.58
13	Oregon	4.12	37	North Carolina	9.02
14	Missouri	4.25	38	Georgia	9.17
15	Colorado	4.44	39	Louisiana	9.48
16	Indiana	4.55	40	Pennsylvania	11.25
17	Mississippi	4.59	41	South Carolina	11.53
18	Kentucky	4.97	42	Maryland	11.54
19	Arkansas	5.08	43	Vermont	12.39
20	Michigan	5.29	44	Connecticut	15.02
21	Maine	5.54	45	Florida	17.48
22	Tennessee	5.57	46	New York	30.70
23	Utah	5.68	47	Massachusetts	31.65
24	Texas	5.76	48	Rhode Island	35.20