

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER

CAROLINAS-VIRGINIA EDITION
A Farm and Home Weekly for
North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia

"You can tell by a man's farm whether he reads it or not."

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY BY

The Progressive Farmer Company,
(Incorporated under the laws of North Carolina)

CLARENCE POE, President and Editor
T. A. BUTLER, Vice-President and Editor
H. O. PATE, Managing Editor
W. C. LASSETTER, G. H. ALFORD, Associate Editors
W. F. MASSEY, Contributing Editor
MRS. W. N. HUTT, (Jackson Spgs., N. C.), Editor Woman's Department
JOHN S. PEARSON, Secretary-Treasurer
L. A. NIVEN, Advertising Manager
J. L. MOGFORD, Subscription Manager
P. T. HINES, Assistant Advertising Manager

WE ESPECIALLY urge every landowner to send The Progressive Farmer TO ALL HIS TENANTS next year. A year's subscription, in fact, is not only the best possible Christmas gift for any tenant or farmer friend, but will be welcomed by anyone who owns a farm and takes an interest in it.

Make up your minds now to use Progressive Farmer subscriptions as CHRISTMAS PRESENTS for all such friends. Then just before Christmas we will send each one a beautiful card announcing the subscription, as a gift from you.

THE cost of repairs and rebuilding is almost prohibitive nowadays and there is every reason why our buildings should be protected from the weather by paint. A house, barn, tenant house or outbuilding kept painted with good paint will last several times as long as unpainted buildings. The buildings not only last much longer, but look much better. Let us use more paint on our farms.

NO FARMER can afford not to insure his houses, barns, cotton, etc., against fire. There is no question about its being much more economical to insure in a mutual fire insurance company, and every county should have such an organization. At the same time, where there is no mutual organization in the county, the farmers should by all means insure in a regular company until a mutual company is worked up.

THE farmers are showing more interest in the problems of marketing than ever before. Our experiences during the war taught us the lesson that we can get results when we pull together and the farmers are rapidly organizing in order to get a fairer deal on the markets. The farmer has a right to say what he ought to receive for his crops and livestock, just the same as the manufacturer. Of course, the fair-minded farmers will be satisfied with a just and fair return.

A VIRGINIA reader writes us, "Your paper got us interested in doing away with one-teacher schools in this section of our county and getting a modern consolidated high school instead. Now I want you to tell us where to buy the truck for transporting the pupils to the new school." We are always glad to tell any reader where to buy anything in which he is interested, but doubly glad to be helpful in a case like this. May other communities go and do likewise!

THE Virginia Farmers' Short Course, February 1-16, like the North Carolina Short Course, January 20-February 3, will be very inexpensive. As Dean H. L. Price of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, writes us:

"The only expense connected with this course is transportation from student's home to the Institute, a \$2 matriculation fee and \$1 per day for board at the college dining hall. The college is not prepared to furnish rooms to short course students, but these can be had at reasonable rates at the hotel in town or at private residences."

WE HAVE by no means reached the point we ought to reach in educational matters in North Carolina, but the change in the attitude of the people these last twenty years has been almost revolutionary. A Cabarrus County man who was in our office last week gave this interesting illustration. "When I moved into my township in 1899," he said, "there were only four teachers employed in the whole township and there was not one college graduate. Now the township employs forty teachers, has two high schools, and it is thought almost a disgrace for a young man or a young woman to grow up without going to college."

THREE meetings of great interest to North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia readers will be held week after next. The South Carolina State Cotton Association will hold its annual meeting in Columbia Wednesday, December 8. The Virginia State Farmers' Union meets in Lynchburg, December 8, 9, and 10. On the same three days the North Carolina State Livestock Association meets in Salisbury. It is now expected that the North Carolina Cotton Association and the North Carolina Tobacco Association will meet in Raleigh early in January. Meanwhile, the state officials of both organizations are actively at work to develop practicable plans for cooperative marketing.

Let's Seize the Opportunity Before It Passes

THE Ancients pictured Opportunity as a running god with a long forelock, but bald behind. You might seize him as he came toward you; but once past, you could never lay hold on him.

This is precisely the situation that confronts Southern cotton growers today. Farmers in nearly every Southern state are now ready to do just what Oklahoma is doing, as reported on page 10. But if cotton prices climb upward again, it may take ten times as much work to get a great proportion of growers enrolled in such another scientific selling organization.

The opportunity is now with us. What are the leaders in each state going to do about it? What will the Cotton Association, the extension division, agricultural departments, and organization leaders do about it? Such an opportunity for putting Southern agriculture on a genuine business basis may not come again for a decade. Let us act quickly.

What Crops Should Be Increased as the Cotton Acreage Is Decreased

WITH the price of cotton much below the present cost of production, the growing of other crops and livestock is certain to receive much more attention. In the Southeastern states the boll weevil is giving an additional reason for attention to other crops than cotton.

In practically all cotton growing sections there is likely to be much casting about for other crops and other lines of farming to occupy a part of the acreage recently planted to cotton. The general inclination and attitude of mind will be to seek a substitute for cotton instead of a supplement to that crop. No greater mistake could be made than an attempt to make a radical change in our farming in one year. Such radical changes or revolutions, nearly always spell disaster. Surely we should have learned by this time that we cannot jump from one crop into another, or from one system or line of farming to another, from one season to the next, to meet fluctuations in prices. The man who attempts this sort of thing is nearly always one or two years behind the game and finds that instead of meeting the best prices with the largest production he hits the lowest prices when he has most to market.

The cotton acreage must be reduced. Even if disastrously low prices for cotton had not come this year, they were sure to come before long if the tendency to put every possible acre into cotton had been continued. We have been putting too large a proportion of our cultivated lands into cotton on too many farms. Decreasing soil fertility and a lack of feed and food crops were bound to cause decreased returns from cotton, even if the price had not fallen below present cost of production.

A reduction in the cotton acreage would, therefore, be advisable, even if prices were now satisfactory. But with the double reason for reducing the cotton acreage for 1921, thousands will be asking the question, What crops should be grown on these released cotton lands?

First, let us answer that if these lands are de-

voted to crops, or to lines of farming with which the farmer is not entirely familiar it should be done only on a small scale for the first year or two. In other words, if a radical change in crops is to be made, or if a large acreage formerly planted to cotton is to be put into other crops, which should probably be done on some farms, these crops should only be those with which we are entirely familiar.

Corn is a crop with which we are more or less familiar and the acreage now planted is large. Shall we plant the released cotton lands to corn? There can be no reason for not planting enough land to corn to supply all the possible feed and food needs of the farm for corn. It is perhaps safe to plant even more than this, if there is likely to be a fairly good local demand or an extra lot of hogs to feed, under conditions which give a fair chance for profit. But poor lands should not be planted to corn, for there is no disguising the fact that corn is not a good money crop in the South. Our lands are too poor and the Negro tenant, even if closely supervised, cannot make a living for himself and the landlord growing corn, so long as our average yields are twenty bushels to the acre or less. But we can safely put enough of the cotton lands into corn to supply the needs of the farm, which we have not done in the past on the farms where the proportion of the land planted to cotton has been largest.

In every section there is some hay crop which does reasonably well, but there are few sections in the South where hay is produced in sufficient quantities to supply local demands, and still less where hay is produced as a money crop.

Certainly hay can be safely produced to supply the needs of the farm and such other local demands as generally exist; but the man who has not produced hay as a sales crop should go slowly into the business, until he has canvassed carefully the cost of the machinery equipment, his transportation facilities, his markets and his own fitness for this special line of farming.

Again, many of our acres planted to cotton need to be made richer. A crop of legumes plowed under will do this. Therefore, if there is an old cotton field, which has not been profitably productive and we can get along without the small crop from it, let it be put into some legume and the crop plowed under, or grazed off by livestock, if good livestock are available.

In short, let us reduce our cotton acreage, but let us use judgment and caution in launching into other lines of farming and other crops with which we are not familiar.

Go to Salisbury, December 8, 9, 10

THE North Carolina Livestock Meeting to be held in Salisbury, December 8, 9, 10, will attract a large attendance of some of the best and most progressive folks in North Carolina.

Everybody admits that it takes just a little more skill and knowledge to succeed with livestock than it does just to raise crops. It is worth while to go to a state livestock meeting, therefore, just to meet and talk with the progressive citizenship there assembled.

It will also be worth going to Salisbury to hear the speakers. Dr. E. V. McCollum's experiments have made the world realize as never before that milk is the indispensable food—that nothing else can take its place, especially for growing children. Professor C. S. Plumb's career has also made him a man every stockman wants to hear. And all over North Carolina, stockmen who knew Dr. Tait Butler as state veterinarian but have not seen him often since he located at the Memphis office of The Progressive Farmer will welcome the opportunity to hear him again.

The sales of cattle, hogs, and poultry will also attract many visitors. Altogether we look for a big meeting at Salisbury, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, December 8, 9, 10.