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Por the last inree or four years people have bean golg about talking about Unrest. It does no matter very much where one 1s, whether In the ofient or in Jurope or in this country, everywnere there is the same feeling in men's minds and they call it the spirit of Unrest.

If you ask 2 man to deline $1 t$, to tell what he means by tho spirit of Unrest, one can fet no two answers alike. Some persons w111 ascribe it to the discontent with the tariff, others to the systern of government, others to: the oppression of capital, others to the avakening and education of the labortnictasses and so forth and 30 on.

It is easy enough to get people to lay the blane on one particular condition or one purticular act but the trouble 18 that it is 1 mpossible to make any get of men agree upon just what that condition and just what that act 1s. In other vords poople seem to be grouning, not only for the remedy, but for the cause that underlies a condition.

Some poeple say that it is a dangerous matter to talk about, that the less sald about it the better, but after all one has to turm to nistory to prove conclusively that where a condition ex1sts and a free discussion on such condition is not had there will be almost inevitably an explosion of some kind, which could have been avolded by a fill and frank discussion.

In Economic conditions of this kind the same rule applies as in gmaller transactions between groups composed of a few individuals. If half a dozon men cannot agree by mail or througn agents over a business proposition or sotae other comparatively simple transaction those same men are, in 9 cases out of ten, able to settle their alfferences by sitting around a table and talking the matter out.

Bor this reason I have always neld that public discussions of large economic questions are not only the simpliest and nost efficaclous way of handling the sitmation but it is at the same time an effective check or safety valve, which may prevent an ultimate explosion.

Following out the same analogy organizations, such as this civic fomm, axe safety valves which prevent explosions and 7111 lead to the discovery and working out of the solutions.

If ve follow out siraple reasoning we find that a condition exists to-day. That to my mind is a clearly astablished fucs. It is, if you chose to call it, for lack of a better tarm, a condition of unrest. And such condition requires a renedy. To my mind there has boon, not only in this count.y but abroad, too much sooking aftor the rorady without suffioient attention to the cause underlying the condition.

Take as an analogy the science of medicine. Before science began to be neyeloped as $1 t$ is to-day, doctors existed eren as they do now. There were doctors in early European history, there were medicine men, magicians and sooth sayers in the gast, all practicing the art of remedying a cortain condition of the numan body. They were offering ramedies and did not know the cause of the disease. It has only been in comparative recent tines and anong the so-called civilized nations of the west that an attempt has been made to study the original cause before preseribing the remedy. The result is that to-day the science of medicient has accomplished vast results, where for centuries previousiy nothing had been accomplished and the fundamental reason for the stacesss of the remedy must be traced to the gearch for the cause. In just the same way I nold that there has been, in the last few years, too much grouping for the remedy a condition of unrest and too little attention to the underlying cause.

If any man were to ask me tomay what reaedial legislation I would seek, I would be unable to answer the question directiy. What we want io-day is, not so much, laws aimed at this, that or the other business of class or system of government off hand in the nope that some target will be hit somewnere. I would answer rather that the underlying cause mist ilrst be studied with the utmost eare by the best qualified personssand that a comprehensive remedy be proposed which would go to the root of the disease and not seek merely to apply external remedies.

For the same reason I feel a certain amount of nesitation In even giving my views in ragard to the unaerlying causes but here again must be applied the doctrine that a full aiscussion is the safest and best means of attaining the end.

II we go baok through history, or rather through the nistory of the past thousand years we are struck by the ract that as a general proposition the aryan races have been struggling to obtain individual fresdom. For nearly one thousand years and in almost every zuropean and American Country this has been the great and fundarental question in the economic life of the people. The reformation for instance and the renaissance in jurope are too commonly regaried as religious or educational struggle and have not in most history book been surficiently explained as sfforts on the part of tho various peoples affected to obtain indistaual ifberty. In the same way the Arosican Revolution while on the surface a striggle to obtain a separate form of government, was, even more in basic principai a struggia for individual liverty. So too, the prench revolution and at a later date the general Juropean uprisings of 18is. Almost every strugele of representative govermment has been in reality an attempt to secure individual ireedom and almost everymere that
one tums so-day, can be found a form of govermment, which to a grat deres guarantees this personal liberty. It is a sweeping statement to make but taking the nations as a whole to-day, in furope and Anerion, the liber:y of the individual has been accomplished.

Let us for the sake of argument assume for a while that this is so, that the efforts of centuries, drected to the attainment of the freedon of the individual, have, as a whole been successful and that this freedom exists to-day. If wo assume this we mast assume at the same time that individual liberty or rather the lack of it is not to-day one of the fundaraental causes of the existing conditions, which call for a remedy. At least we have progressed far enough to eliminate one often quoted cause as no cause at all. Let us see if we cannot elimimate the others.

We hear people talking today about the struggle between labor and capltal and I dare say that many of you will disagree with me when I make the ascortion that in itself the struggle between labor and capital is not and cannot be the underlying cause of conditions of unrest. I the first place there is no such thing as a struggle between labor and capital, not only is there no struggle but there is and has always been the neartiest co-operation for neither capital can exist without the co-operation of labor nor labor without the comoperation of capitial. Therefore I say there is no struggle between the two; not even a dividing line.

Going back for a moment to the question of the liberty of the individual. On my assumption that this liberty has been accomplished I come to the next, step in the search for the cause and I find the cause in the growth of what is speaking as a modern, a new way of looking at things, a new econonic theory. It is new because there has never been any immediate need for such a theory in
the past. When men are surfs or are ruled by tyrants they need first of all, individual freedom. They do not need to go beyond that but when this freedom has been acquired they have not yet got to Utopia.

Conditions of civilization that come with individual freedorl are thevitably bound to bring up many questions that mere individual liberty camnot solve. That is to my mind exactly whathas happened in tho past century. We have acquired new sets of conditions of life, that require new theories for their solution and when one as in
seeks for a theory it is wist nature and human intercourse when the to seek for the simpliest thaory.

To put is in the simpliest and fewest wrds I nave always called inls new theory the struggle for the liberty of the community rather than liberty of the individual. When all is said and done every new doctrine which had been advanced for the last 25 years comes under this definition. Jvery new start that the people have hitched their wagon to for the past quarter century whether it be ant1-robating or anti-trusts or new fashioned education or conservation of our natural resources or state regulation of common carriers or milder forms of socialism or commission government or any of the thousand and one other things that we have run after of late without any exception come under the same heading. They are all steps in the evolution of the nev theory of the liberty of the community.

And if we use the word liberty in conjunction with the word commanity we necessarliy give to that ford liberty a nigher and a nobler meaning than where the sane word was applied to the individual.

The socialist has at tires called the same thing " comanity interest" and some nigh sounding orators have calledit the "brotherhood
of man." Neither of these expressions are possible to use anywhere outside of haven for, commanlty of interest at once sugfests to the rind a kind of happy condition where everybody wants the same thing and everybody get $1 t$, where all are on an absolute parity, not only in regard to worldly weazth but also in regard to ability, education and morals and "Brother hood of Man" 18 a purely Utoplan phrase that means very little as long as every person in the vorld does not think as Breny other person cioes.

If you will follow what I am strivine to explain you will gather that I boliave the liberty of the Comathitity to be a comparatively macent locinine; but, 25 I have stated belore, the liberty of the indivilual has to al2 incents and purposes to-day been obtainec, and the normal prosreass of civilization durins the tiae in Which this liberty of the individual was beinf obtained has brought us to the point whone the new conditions mast ba mot by nev fheories. In othan woeds the rient, of anyone of use to work or not as he sees fit, to live to a great extent where and now he gees ift is not sufficient. We have found that if evesy man does as he sees ilt with a due regard to lav and order, other new factors have entered into his lif'e and proved that he is not entirely happy or ready to march on w1th sivilisation in a way satisfactory to the Ereat majority of य及。

To put it another way competition has been shown to be useful up to a gettain point and no further. co-operation must begin whare conpetition leavas off and co-oprotation is as good a word for the new theory as any other. The founders of the republic vere groliping for the idea when they tried to form a government aimed to secure the greatest good for the greatest number and it 18 precige ly that idea which 18 boing developed to-day along every possible
walk of ilfe.
Let us take sone examples of this, in what we call to-day, Conservation. We are taking merely a theory which began to be developed in othef countried many years afo. It was recognized in Germany for instance one mundred years ago that the trees on the land were necossary fon the preservation of the vater powar and indeed for the nealth of the people. As a result practically all of Garmany $i 8$ to-tay vorkine nut the theory of the liberty of the Commanity rather than of: the liberty or tho individuad.
ons numded and iffey years ago in Geriany the individual was not rostrleted from demuding his lands of the spoving trees. To-day ne must mit only in a mames selentifleally worked out, which is calculated to seave the ends of the somandity and not nis ends.

They pask beyond the liberty of the individual to do as no pleased with $h 1 / s$ own property and found it was necessary to check this ilborty for the benerit of the freedom of the whole pople.

So in New York stato wo are beginning to do the same
thing. As a whole we are begirning to realize that it is negessary to the health and happiness of the whole people of the state that individuals and lumber companies should not so into our wooded areas 11ke the Adrendacks and the Catskills and cut them off root and branch for the bonefit of their own pocket.

There are many persons left to-day that can see no reason why if a man wrms lands he shouit not be permitted to do as ne likes with it. The yaist striking example of what happens in such a case, that I know of, was a picture shown me by Mr. Gifford pinchot last wook. It was a photograph of a walled city in northern china. Four or five hundred years afo inls city had been the center of the populus and prosperous district. A district whose mountains and
ridges were covored with gagnificent trees. Its streams following without int, Aruption and its crops in the valleys prospering. It was known as one of tha most prosporous provinces in China, ooth as a lumber exporting canter and as an agrimitural comaunity. To-day the pleture shows the walled tow, almost as it gtood 500 years ago. There is not a human being within the walls. There are but few human being in the whols region. Rows upon rows of bame nitpers and Igomntains stretch xk back from the City without a. Vestige of tree life, without a vastige of flowing streams and with the bawe rocks reflecting the glace of the sun. Below in the plains the little soil which ralnains is parched and umabla to yield more than a ixny fraction of 1 ts formar crops. This 1.3 the best ax mple I know of the 1 inarty of the individual without anything furthe?.

Jwowy lainn 500 years gigo did as he pleased with nis own rroperty. He out ths trees without afzording a change for reproduction and he thoreby prrened the ground, dried ur the streans and mined the valley and the sad Mart of it is that inere are to-riay men of the Gtate who for the sake of linins their pookets during their own 11fe time ara villing to cauge the same thing that happened in China. With them the motto 18 "After us the deluge."

They care not what happens after thoy are gone and I
will so pven further and say that thay oure not what happens even to their neighbors, to the commurity as a whis, during their own life tirae. The opponents of Conservation who, after all, are merely oppoments of the liberty of the commanity, vill argue that even though they do exhaust all the natural resources, the eventedness of man and the progress of clvilization will supply a substitute whon the crisis comes. Then the orisis came on that prosperous province of China the prorress of civilization and the eventednesa nf
man did not find a substitute. Why will we assume that we can do it when the chinege falled.

It is tho sane way with all of our other natural resources in adilition to forests. Why, let me ask are so many of the farms in the state oi Her York abandoned. The ansvrry 18 easy. Their omers 50 or 100 years ago took from the soil without returning any equivalent to the 8011 In other words they fot something for nothing Their land was rich and the work was easy. whey prospered for a"while until the deluge eane and when it came they discovered that their lands rould not proluce: They had tiken the richness away and did not pay for it with fartilizors and other anthods or soll ragenerat10n.

To-hay the people in the staka cities and the people on the fartas are sufegrins becutuse those eazly farmers gave no thouzht to the 11burty of the Community. To have sugcested to is Tew York state famer one hundred years ago that the goverment would compel hin to put so much 11 me of 80 much fertillzer on every acre ne cultivated would have been an impossibility. He wolld have stared and ruttered somothing about taking care of his own land in his own way.

Tot there are many thinking people in the state to-day who belleve that the time is not far distant when the government of the state will rightiy and of necessity compel avozy cultivator of land to pay back to that land some quit pro quo.

I have taken the conservation of our natural resources as the firgt lebson that points to the necessity for seeking cominnty freedora, because I believe it to be the most important of all our lagsons. Pive nundred years ago the peasant of Jurope, our ancestors were not giving much thought to us who are here to-day. But I think a. good rany people in the audience have often considered what kind
of a country we to-day are fashioning to hand down to out descendants. As it 18 with consarvation of Naturel resourees so also

Is it bound to become with the production of food supply. The two go hand in hand so mach so that if we can prophecy to-day that the state, ( or in other words the people as a whole) will shortly tell a man hov many trees he mast cut. Then why can we not, vithout being cailed radical, predict that the state will compel every farmer to till is land or raise beer, or norses? After all if I orm a farm of is hundred acres and let it ife waste and overerown, I am just as much of a dertroyor of the liborty of the Sornumity, and by liberty, wo nean happiness and prosparity, as tioe strong, man who stands ide on the coiner, perusine to work, a destroyer of n2s neishbor because ne 13 a negative.

I uged to row in college in an eight oared orew and there I got an exprossion that best deseribes ny moaning apulling your wel ht." Bome men would sit in that shell and if they were shirkers we said" they don't pull their own raxk weight." for remember, that a manl must pull not only his own welght, but in addition one-elghth part of tho total welght of the coxswain, or helmsman and the boat itsolf. It is the same example of Co-operation arain. Thare is, to ny mind, no valid raason viny the food supply of the nation should not be put on the most aconomical and at the same tine the most productive basis by carrying out co-operation. If we call the method regulation, people nold up thei hands in norror and says" on Alaerica" or "Dangerous." But if we call the same identical prosess comoperation these same old fogies will cry out " Well done."

It may sound absurd in these days to call the rebating formerly done by railroads, and the great trusts so called, and the
control of common carriers by the state minor issues, but after all rebating was discrimpination and the doctrine of co-operation overcame 1t- 30 too Tmats were and are sun on the theory of monopoly, but co-operation makes monopoly out of date.

Address before the People's Forum, Troy, N.Y., Mar. 3, 1912
(Senator Roosevelt seeks to explain the cause for the present discontent among the working classes and suggests a probable remedy He says a condition of unrest prevails throughout the world but when any workingman is questioned about it he does not know the cause of it - summary by Poughkeepsie News-Press, Mar. 5, 1912)
"... They do not seek the cause, but simply know that it exists.

It can be compared to the science of medecine. There were doctors, magicians and soothsayers among the Indians, and in the far east in early history, practicing medecine in their own way, but it has only been in comparative recent times and among the so-called civilized nations of the west that an attempt has been made to study the original cause before prescribing the remedy. The result is that today the science of medecine has accomplished vast results, where for centuries previously nothing had been accomplished. The fundamental reason for the success of the remedy must be traced to the search for the cause. In just the same way I hold that there has been, in the last few years, too much groping for a remedy to cure a condition of unrest, and that too little attention has been paid to the underlying cause.

If any man were to ask me today what remedial
legislation I would seek I would be unable to answer that question firmly. What we want to day is, not so much laws

FDR's Speech at T3 , N.Y., Mar. 3, 1912 (cont Sued)
aimed at this, that or the other business or class or system of government off hand in the hope that some target will be hit somewhere.

If we go back through history, or rather through the history of the past thousand years, we are struck by the fact that as a general proposition the Aryan races have been struggling to obtain individual freedom. For nearly one thousand years and in almost every European and American country this has been the great and fundamental question in the economic life of the people. The Reformation, for instance, and the Renaissance in Europe are too commonly regarded as religious or educational struggles and have not, by teachers of history, been sufficiently explained as efforts on the part of the various peoples affected to obtain individual liberty. In the same way the American revolution, the French revolution and at a later date the general European uprisings of 1848.

Almost every struggle of representative government has been in reality an attempt to secure individual freedom and almost everywhere one turns today, can be found a form of government, which to a great degree, guarantees this personal liberty. There are exceptions of course, like Russia. It is a sweeping statement to make but taking the nations as a whole today, in Europe and America, the liberty of the individual has been accomplished.

On my assumption that this liberty of the individual has been largely accomplished and that it has been until now

FDR's Speech at Trc N.Y., Mar. \&, 1912 (cont1 ed)
the main object of human research, I come to the next step in the search for the cause of the conditions of unrest today, and I find the cause in the growth of what is in modern civilization a new way of looking at things, a new economic theory. It is new because there never has been any immediate need for such a theory in the past. When men are serfs or are ruled by tyrants they need first of all, individual freedom. They do not need to go beyond that, but when this freedom has been acquired they have not yet got to Utopia.

During the past century we have acquired a new set of conditions which we must seek to solve. To put it in the simplest and fewest words I have called this new theory the struggle for liberty of the community rather than liberty of the individual. When all is said and done every new doctrine which had been advanced for the last fifty years comes under this definition. Every new star that people have hitched their wagon to for the past half century, whether it be anti-rebating, or anti-trusts, or new fashioned education, or conservation of our natural resources or State regulation of comion carriers, or commission government, or any of the thousand and one other things that we have run after of late, almost without any exception come under the same heading. They are all steps in the evolution of the new theory of the liberty of the community.

The Socialist has at times called this same thing 'community interest' and some sounding orators have called it
the 'brotherhood of man.' Neither of these expressions is possible to use anywhere outside of heaven for community of interest at once suggests to the mind a kind of happy condition where everybody wants the same thing and everybody gets it. This is comparatively recent doctrine, but at least the liberty of the individual has been obtained, and we must face new theories.

To state it plainly, competition has been shown to be useful up to a certain point, but co-operation, which is the thing that we must strive for today, begins where competition leaves off. This was what the founders of the republic were groping for and it is precisely today along every possible walk of life.

Let us take some examples of this - for instance what we call today, conservation. We are taking merely a theory which began to be developed in other countries many years ago. It was recognized in Germany for instance a hundred years ago that the trees on the land were necessary for the preservation of the water power and indeed for the general health and presperity of the people. One hundred and fifty years ago in Germany the individual was not restricted from denuding his lands of the growing trees. Today he must cut only in a manner scientifically worked out, which is calculated to serve the ends of the community and not his ends.

They passed beyond the ilberty of the individual to
do as he pleased with his own property and found it was necessary to check this liberty for the benefit of the freedom of the whole people. So it is in New York State today. We are beginning to see that it is necessary for our health and happiness that the rights of individuals that lumber companies may not do as they please with the wooded growths in the Catskills and the Adirondacks.

There are, however, many persons who still think that individuals can do as they please with their own property even though it affects a community. The most striking example of what happens in such a case that I know of, was a picture shown me by Gifford Pinchot last week. It was a photograph of a walled city in northern China. Four or five hundred years ago this city had been the center of the populous and prosperous district, a district whose mountains and ridges were covered with magnificent trees, its streams flowing without interruption and its crops in the valleys prospering. It was known as one of the richest provinces in China, both as a lumber exporting center and as an agricultural community.

Today the picture shows the walled town, almost as it stood 500 years ago, but there is not a human being within the walls, and but few in the whole region. Rows upon rows of bare ridges and mountains stretch back from the city without a vestige of life. Everything is in a

## FDR's Speech at T y, N.Y., Mar. 3, 1912 (con nued)

dilapidated condition, and this is all due to the liberty of the individual. This is what will happen in this very State if the individuals are allowed to do as they please with the natural resources to line their own pockets during their life. With them the motto is 'After us the deluge.' They do not care what happens after they are gone and even do not care what happens to their neighbors.

The opponents of conservation who, after all are merely opponents of the liberty of the community, will argue that even though they do exhaust all the natural resources, the inventiveness of man will provide some substitute when the time arrives. Why should we assume that we can do it when the Chinese falled?

It is the same way with all of our other natural resources in addition to forests. Why, let me ask, are so many of the farms in the State of New York abandoned? The answer is easy. Their owners fifty or one hundred years ago took from the soil whout returning any equivalent. In other words they got something for nothing. Their land was rich and the work was easy, and they prospered until the deluge came and then they forsook the farms. The result is that the farmers today and the people in the cities are suffering as a result. It was not thought then that the government would compel the farmer to put so much lime or fertilizer on every acre of land he cultivated. The idea would have been scoffed at

```
FDR's Speech at: y, N.Y., Mar. 3, 1912 (cor nued)
```

as ridiculous, yet there are many thinking people in the State today who believe that the time is not far distant when the government of the State will rightly and of necessity compel every cultivator of land to pay something back to that land.

As it is with conservation of natural resources so is it bound to become with the production of food supply. The two go hand in hand together so much that if we can prophesy today that the State (or in other words the people as a whole) will shortly tell a man how many trees he must cut, then why can we not, without being radical, predict that the State will compel every farmer to till his land or raise beef, orhorses? For afterall 1f I own a farm of a hundred acres and let it lie waste and overgrown, I am gust as much a destroyer of the liberty of the community, and by liberty, we mean happiness and prosperity, as is the strong man who stands idle on the corner, refusing to work.

There is, to my mind, no valid reason why the food supply of the nation should not beput on the most economical and at the same time the most productive basis by carrying out co-operation. If we call the method regulation, Beople hold up their hands in horror and say 'Unamerican,' or 'dangerous,' but if we call the same identical process co-operation these same old fogies will cry out 'well done.' It may seem absurd to call the rebating formerly done by railroads, and the great trusts so-called, minor

1ssues, but after all rebating was discrimination and the doctrine of co-operation came with it. The same with trusts, they were and arerun on the theory of momopoly, but co-operation puts monopoly out of date and we now understand that the mere size of a trust is not of necessity its evil. The trust is evil because it monopolizes for a few and as long as this keeps up it will be necessary for a community to change its features.

And here I come to the final point. How must the liberty of the community be obtained? It will not be obtained at once, whether the Democrats, Republicans or Socialists say so or not. It must be worked out by keeping ever in view the cause of the condition and we must also keep in view the other essential point: Law and order."
from: Poughkeepsie (N.Y.) News-Press, Mar. 5, 1912, p. 4 (Filed in Adriance Memorial Library, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.)
copied: May 25, 1948
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## LOMBSTIUREETE FORPRFIOMM

RACES STRTVING TO OBTAIN INDIVIDUAL HBFRTX

ADDRESS BY SEN. ROOSEVELT
Well Known Legislator Speaks at Regular Meeting of People's Forum and Dwells Particularly Upon the Rights of the People as a Whole-Some Present Etils.

Senator Frankitn D. Roosevelt of Duichess couhty, delivered an interest Ing address yesterday afternoun bs fore the People's Forum, saying in part:
"If we so back through history, or rather through the history of the past thousand years, we are struck by the fact that as, a Eeneral proposition the Aryan races have been struggling to
obtain individual freedom. For neariy obtain individual freedom. For neariy ery Duropean and American country thig has bopn the great and fundamental question in the economic Iffe of the people. The Reformation for instance and the Renalssance In Eurepe are too commonly regarded as religtous or equcational struggles and have not by teachers of history been sufaciently explained at efforts on the part of the various peoplen anfopted to obtain thalvidual liberty. In the same Way the American Revolution while on the surface n was to obtain a separate form of govermment, was, even more In basic principie a atrugsie for Individual Ifberty, So too, the French revolution and at a iater date the general Duropean uprislngs of 1848. A1móst every strugsie of representative Sovernment has been in reality an attempt to securg individual freedom and almont everywhere one turns tooday, fan be found i form of sovernment, which to a great degree guarantees this pertonal Ifberty, There are exceptions of course, IHie Russia. It is a swoeplng atatement to mako but takAns the nations as a whole to-day, in Durope and Amerlca, the liberty of the Individual has beon accomplished.
"Let us for the sake of argument asgume for a whio that this ${ }^{\text {ginges thet }}$
 vldua, have, as a whole been success-
ful and thet this freedom exime today. If we assume, this we munt as sume it the tame timp, that individual ifkerts, or rather the tack of it, ts not to-day one of the fundamental causea
of the existing conditions, which call of the existing conditions, which call for remedy, At lost we have prosoften guoted cause ne no causer at ant.

Fixo putt it in the smpert and rew: est words 1 have called thin new the-
ory thin Atruggie for the liberty of the
cumanity rather thinn ilberty of the orymunity rather than hberty of the
commolaual. When all is nald and done imivinua. When rit is matd and done
elery tew doctrine which has beon ad-
ianced for the lint fitty years comes

 it be anti-rebating. or enti-trunts, or Tew fashioned education, or conserva-
Hon of our natural resoircs, or tate
resulation of commonsarriers, or comregulation of common carriers, or com-
mission government. or any of the
thousand gand thousand and one other thing that We have run aftor of late, aimont without any exception come under the
seme heading. They are all xters in the evolution of the new theory of the Clberty of the communtty, ord conjunction with the word communt in w.t necesmarlly give to that word erty ${ }^{\text {a }}$ higher and a nobler meaning than where tic and ame nobder maning
to the individual applled Individual IAberty.
If you will follow what 1 am atriv.
Ing to explain you wil: gather that 1 befleve the liberty of the community
to be a comparatively recent doctrine? but, ag I have stated before, the 11b tents and purposes to-daye heen ob tained, and the normal progrons of civilization during the time in which
thin IIberty of the individual was being obtained has brought un to the point where the new conditions must $\mathrm{b} \rightarrow$ met by new theortes. In other words the right of any one individual to a great not as he sees fit, to whe to a great extent where and how he found that if every man does as he sees fit, oven with a due regard to law and order, other new factors have en-
tered into his ilfe and proved that he is not entirely happy or ready to march on with civimization in a way great majority of us.
"To put it another way, competition has been the wa to bo urerul up to a certain point and no further, cooope-
ration must bogin where competition leaves must and co-operation is as sood other. The toinders theory as any other The rounders of the repubirs were sroping for the idea when they secure the greatest sood for the great est number and tisprectsily that tace every possibic walk of sire.
"There are many person; left to-day that can see ng reason why if a man to fo as he llkes. whth-1t. Rhe most striking example of what happens in
such a cape. that k know of wase tuch a ame, that i know of was a pleweek, It was a photograph of a wail five hunared yeara aso this of ty had propperous drertct. a ditrict whon mountaink and ridses were coverec With magnificent trees, Ith covered fowing whthout interruption and it waps in the valley prospering. it incces in Chinn, both the richect proy. portng conter and, as an agrlcuiturai community.


 Nan won Hithe wid orxinctain



 wit onm an turtindiviaual carried out without any
further theory of prosresa. urther theory of prosress.
pleased with his own proparty. he cut the treos without proparty, He chance for reproduction and he thereby

 sad part of it is that there are to-day
men in this state who for the sake of
ining their pockets during their Ining their pockets during their own Wimer
 +\%

Wryt in the name way wrin an if owr forents. Why, 筑 manke, are no many
of the farma in the state of New York of the farms in the state of New Their
abondoned. The answer is easy. Thes owners firty or on: hundred years ugo took from the soll without returnink
any equivalent to the noil. in nther Thelr land wan richetand the work wha easy fil prospered for a whlle aritl the deluke came mond when
came they discovered- that their lands would not produce. They had taken the richness away and did not pay of of woll regeneration.

For the Good of All. 3 To-day the people in the citics and the people on the farms are surfering because those early farmers gava no
thought to the lomerty of the commuhouglet to the ciberty of the New York tate farmer one hundred years ago im to put so much lime or mo much ertalizer on every acre he cultivated ould lave been an imposslblity, He
oud have stared and mutered sont hing about taking care of his owil and in his own way.
or natural taken sen conservation of ur natural resources as the firat les.
on that points to the necessity ful ooking communtty freedom. because belleve it to be the most imporan tg c the peasants of Durope,-our an-estors-were not giving much thousnt o us who are here to-day. But I think sood many people in the audience ave often considered what kind of sountry we to-day are fashooning to and down to our descendants.
As it is with conseryation of natual resources no also is to bound to beome with the production of food sup1y, The two go hand in hand, so huch that that if we can prophesy to for in other wordy ay that the stato (or in other word man how many irees ho must cut. hol. why can wo not, without belns alled radical, predict that the stato vill compel every farmer-to till his
end or raise beef, or horses in, if I own a farm of a hundred acres ino let it Ile waste and overcrown, I m just as mych of a destroyer of the
iberty of the community Iberty of the community, and by 11 b -
rty we metin happiness and prosperirty wo metn happincss and prospere oin on the cosner, refuisins to work, destroyer of his belghborg, happiness, prosperity and atherty
on where is, to my mind, no yalld reaFn why the rood supply of the nation cat and at the same time the most podudtive biste by carrying out eo-
peratfoar. if weichti the mathod res pperation. If weichit the method rest hation, people hotd up their, handsen grous, But if wosenil the tome Jdens
cou process cocoperation these mame
 "It may sound absurd in themo days enirif the robating formeriy cone by क., and the contro of common cirnes bating was diserimination cand the ectring of co-operition overeame th
too irums wergemd are rum on tha co too trunts werbsind are run on tho
Yeory of monopoti but co pporation Makes monopoly out of date, and Wer Tre comins to underistand that the ts evf. i trast is evil if it monopor Izes for the bendit of a if it monoporepy to the interests of the comma-
 innse this feature of them. anity to ny as they fall to fulnif:the needs of the community they must be, and Me beins:resulated.
And here, corie to the fnel point:
ow must the Iberty of the communit: ow must the liberty of the communtty

 rot. it must be vorked, out by
cepins ever in view the ennere of the ondition and it must be worked out y keeping ever in view the other
sat eamential point-jaw and order:

Troy (. .Y.) Fecord, Nar. 4, 1912

