

---

**Franklin D. Roosevelt — “The Great Communicator”**

**The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945**

**Series 1: Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Political Ascension**

---

**File No. 435**

**1931 July 6**

**University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA**

*Ans. 46-62*

Address by Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York on State Planning  
Round Table on REGIONALISM - Monday, July 6, 1931

---

I did not come here with any prepared speech this morning. I came to present to you very informally a subject that is very close to all of our hearts, a subject which I think needs and deserves much public and private discussion and needs and requires perhaps just as few formal public addresses as possible. It seems particularly appropriate that we at the University should be discussing plans, for the great planner of our nation, the first planner, was the father of the university; an architect of buildings, an architect of industry, and most of all an architect of government. And yet, after the age of Thomas Jefferson, it seems to me that our nation as a whole, and our several states forgot architecture in the sense in which it had been used and practiced by Thomas Jefferson, and it is only in the last generation, our generation that we have returned to thoughts of planning for the days to come.

Like Mr. Brownlow, I do not know what "Regionalism" means. I do have certain fairly clear ideas in respect to the relative spheres of governments of states on the one hand and Federal government on the other hand. Let me cite some of the instances I call planning of any kind.

I think we are apt very often to run after false gods in this country, to take up some "ism" and assume that in a generation or two that they are going to be so different from ourselves that we must scrap everything tried and familiar. One of the most eminent chemists of this country said to me "It will be only another generation before there will be no more farms in the United States." I said "No more farms?" and he said "I may modify that. There will be probably one tenth of the present farm areas cultivated in the next generation. Ninety per cent will go out of agricultural production. Why, the next generation will be eating synthetic food." Then he drew the most delightful picture of synthetic food.

Getting up in the morning you will go to the mantle shelf. While you are shaving and bathing, you take up a bottle of pills marked "Poached Eggs" and you take up another bottle of pills marked "Toast" and you take one poached egg pill and one toast pill, and nowadays there would probably be a "Cup of Coffee" pill. Even science is apt to outrun itself, and I take it that in the next generation we will still be eating real eggs and real toast, and by the same token we will still have our farms in this country.

But, there are problems that have come to life and that do require the most fundamental kind of thought. We are told by many social experts today that the size of cities is getting to a point where they are no longer economic for human beings to live in. You and I know of examples where industries have declined to go in some of the larger cities of our nation and have preferred to

locate their plants in smaller communities. And in the same way we are beginning to wonder whether this movement of leaving the farm and going to the great city is ever coming to an end. Of course it has got to come to an end, because the point is approaching where it can go on no longer. It was only, I think two or three generations ago, somewhere around 1850, that 75 per cent of Americans lived in rural communities and 25 per cent were urban, and yet today those figures are completely reversed. Seventy-five per cent of the people of the United States are in urban and only 25 per cent rural, and we have looked with fear to the point where 100 per cent would be urban. Of course, that is an impossible figure to arrive at, and I am inclined to the belief that we have reached very nearly the saturation point of urban population. This means that one of our first efforts in meeting the problem of maintaining a proper balance between city life and country life is to be made according to the old formula, "Make country life more attractive." In many of the states much has been done to survey conditions. In a few states, New York and two others, I think, definite efforts have been made to find out the facts about land.

I can best illustrate the point that I am coming to by using as an example what has been definitely accomplished by the state of New York during the past three years.

First from the point of view of government, in other words, taxes. The burden upon the rural communities was so heavy that something had to be done to relieve the country community from this overburden of taxes. That was accomplished by a series of laws. Under the old plan, not only in the State of New York

but in other states the rule followed seemed to be when it came to the question of state contribution to local needs, they followed the old maxim "To him that hath shall be given." In one of our counties, for example, where the land values were high, a county near New York city, where the assessed values ran from \$2000 and \$3000 to \$5000 an acre, the order was for the state to contribute as high as \$1500 and \$1800 per mile of town road, whereas the great bulk of our counties up-State New York counties, the state contributed as low as \$25 and \$30 per mile of highway, and so our first effort was to correct this system. In highways and taxes and education and various other ways, we have made the lot of the rural dweller more equitable.

Then following that program, we saw perhaps the possibility of outlining a plan for the state as based upon the land unit, for after all in this country and in the nation from which most of our people came, the fundamental unit is the unit of land. So, we have taken a survey of land within the state, and a couple of other states are doing the same thing, trying to find out the facts. The one thing that impresses me is the lack of facts, not merely facts which let us see the work of the late Wickersham committee, but facts relating to almost every other phase of life. One reason that we are not proceeding further with the crime problem is that we do not know any of the facts regarding crime. So one of our first efforts on the question of population and land was together facts. We have surveyed, for example, one of our rural counties and we find in that one county that 22 per cent of all the land now being cultivated ought not to be cultivated. So we are

extending that survey through all of the counties to determine what should be the use of land.

Let me give you some very simple figures. As Mr. Brownlow suggested, the State of New York is not merely the city of New York. The state is twenty-ninth in area of the forty-eight states, and runs from year to year in the value of its agricultural products, between the third and sixth state. We are a state of farmers. Six million people outside the city of New York itself. Now with that area and with that important agricultural system, we come back to find out about its history, and we find that the state contains 30 million acres of land, and out of those thirty million acres three million are occupied by cities, towns and villages, and five million acres more represent state owned rough lands in the Adirondacks, lake areas, Catskill Mountains, etc., leaving a total of two million acres that fifty years ago were cultivated. Yet in these past fifty years, four million of those have been abandoned. Those figures apply to almost every other state east of the Mississippi in very much the same proportion. Every state has its problem of abandonment of farms, New England and most of the South, and more recently a larger part of the middle west.

Abandoned farms: People couldn't make a success of their lives on farms, so out of 22 million acres that once were farmed in the State of New York four million are already abandoned. In this survey, we believe we shall find another four million that ought to be abandoned. We have eighteen million acres in farms and we believe we ought not to have more than fourteen million. What will be the result of that, and how are we going about it?

Shall we depend on people to just follow the normal economic course? Shall we depend on them to voluntarily abandon these four million acres? Probably not. It should be accelerated by government action. I should say abandon four million acres more for the very good reason that on those four million acres are not making both ends meet. It is uneconomical for them to try to stay on year after year, tilling land that won't keep their families up to the American standard of living. And so the state is this year submitting to the voters a bond issue of some twenty millions of dollars for a comparatively short period of years, which will be used for these marginal lands. Some call them sub-marginal lands. The point is, in some way we have got to take those lands out of agriculture.

The other large waste is in maintaining highways up into these sparsely settled regions; highways that cost at least \$100 per year to per mile to maintain, highways that ought to have a lot more spent on them, highways going into sections where there are only two or three families to be served by five miles of road, and then think of the other economic wastes. If these people on this marginal land are to be brought up to our modern standards, they ought to have a telephone line, and that means running up a road for several miles to serve one, two or three families. They should have electric light on their farms, but if they could afford it, two or three farms might have to pay for four or five miles of poles and lines. So we figure that by the expenditure of a comparatively small sum which the state may put in the purchase of these marginal lands, the money will be returned to the economic wealth

of the state many times over in a comparatively short period.

Think of what it means in this problem of eliminating in so far as possible the one room school house. How many are there in this country? There are between 30,000 and 40,000 in the United States today, and in every state of the union we are working for the consolidation of school districts and the improvement of education. In the state of New York there are still thousands of one-room schoolhouses, and we believe that in this process of eliminating the marginal lands, we will be eliminating the one-room schoolhouses. Those are some of the advantages.

What is going to happen to the people on the land? That is always the question that is asked in the first place. Our survey so far shows that very largely these people are old people. Most of the young people have gotten out and moved off somewhere else. I do not believe that we ought to take these old people on these farms and remove them from the homes they were born in and were raised in and have lived all their lives in. It is entirely possible to let them live there the balance of their lives, it won't be long. What is ten or twenty years in the life of a community? But, we believe that after they are gone, to those impossible farms should be taken out of farming, and so with due regard for the feelings of these people, in the course of a generation, nearly all of these farms will be abandoned as such.

Then there will be other people, and provision can probably be made through cooperative methods for them to move to land where they can make a living. That is just a rough picture

of that part of our plan.

But let me mention what will have to be done with four million acres. Of course, it has two or three possibilities. First, for the growing of a long-term crop - trees, and everybody who is in a position to know something of our forestation problem, knows we will need all the trees we can get in the next fifty years. A large part of this marginal land can and ought to be turned into forest land.

Then another phase that we have taken up in practically every state; the recreation value of these lands, giving an opportunity to the city dweller to get out into the country, recreation that is extending every year, that a few years ago was limited to the months of July and August, that has extended now to a point earlier in the spring and lasting way on through the autumn, and more and more is beginning to develop into an all year round happening. We have somewhere around three million acres in state parks, a system of state parks in every part of the state. Just as an example let us note the use of the state parks for the past five years in the Adirondac reservation, which has been used every year by twice the number of people that have used it the year before. The use has doubled each year for five years. People are becoming out-door-minded all over the nation. The result of all this, we believe, is going to bring up a new class in our civilization.

We have talked a great deal about the country-dweller and about the city-dweller. Isn't there a third possibility, a possibility for us to create by cooperative effort some form of living which will combine industry and agriculture? Today states

are looking at it from two angles. For instance in Pennsylvania with the idea of bringing agriculture to industry. In the coal mining town, in the town with the steel plant or factory, they are trying to locate their operators and employees out a little way, a mile or two, where each one can have in place of two or three rooms in a four-family house, a house of his own with maybe an acre of land, giving them a chance to raise some of their own food supply.

In Vermont they are working through a state commission to bring industry to agriculture. Dr. Taylor up there has written the report of an investigation of an experiment in a valley up in Vermont, where most people were leaving the valley. There came back to that valley some ten or fifteen years ago, a boy who had left it twenty years earlier, and had become wealthy. He came back there and he found that the young people were leaving the valley and that the old people were discouraged. They were trying to farm the thin soil up on the mountain side; that the people were just dying out. What did he do? He looked over this valley and found there was some fine second growth of hard wood and no market for it. Then he conceived the idea of putting in a little turning mill and then he went out to Sears-Roebuck and said, "What do you need in the way of wood contraptions that can be made at our turning mill?" "We need those little round knobs that go on the tops of kettles and lids of pans," they said. The result was that he entered into a contract for making, I don't know how many millions of these things. He went back and said to the people, "I am going to open up my factory after you get your corn in."

When the corn was harvested, he opened up his factory and gave employment to that valley in two ways. He told them he needed so many lengths of this hard wood, and he said he needed to employ so many of those people, and he paid them cash, and they had a cash crop of kettle knobs.

The result has been that the young people are staying, When the planting time comes in the spring, the kettle knob factory closes down. Then up there in the summer time, after the hay is in and before the corn ripens, there is always a period in August when things are dull, and the little old factory opens up again and they get two or three weeks more of cash crops. That is one example.

We have many in this country and more than are being tried out. I am hoping that in everyone of our states, we shall be able to do some experimenting in these coming years, with the creation of a new group in our civilization. We may call them the rural-industries. We may call them the factory-farmers, one simple term that will connote just that position of keeping people on the land with agriculture as what you might call their roots way down in the ground, and at the same time some safety during the long months of the winter season for them to earn some kind of cash wages. It will make our whole nation individual and independent. It will open vast areas and at the same time, by state planning, by eliminating the marginal lands, the lands that are still left in agriculture will be more useful and will be worth cultivating.

Then we come to one final subject that I want to pass over quite rapidly. The question of regional planning. Let me illustrate. When I first started going down to Warm Springs in Georgia, there came through at night on the railroad a very noisy long train, about three a.m. It was always on time, five minutes to three, and they said it was the milk train. "Where to," I asked. "To Florida" they told me. That train of eighteen or twenty cars, run on passenger schedule, most of them glass tank cars, carrying south the milk cream supply for Miami, Palm Beach and all other resorts down there. I said, "Where does it come from?" "It comes from Wisconsin." That milk originating in Wisconsin, Northern Illinois, was passing through Kentucky, which certainly can grow milk, passing through the corner of Tennessee, and passing through the length of Georgia, absolutely eliminating the three states they passed through as sources of supply for the Florida market. This is the result of a lack of planning more than anything else. There is no reason why the State of Georgia shouldn't furnish all of the milk and cream for the State of Florida.

We are doing something in the State of New York, which I must admit is of doubtful constitutionality. The citizens of New York outside of New York City, with a population of six million people, and another two million people in the nearby state of New Jersey make a population of eight million people raising a lot of milk and cream. The New York State dairy farmers up to three years ago were going broke. Something had to be done, and the principle concern was this: that a great many farmers out in the central western states of Ohio, Indiana,

Illinois, Wisconsin and part of Iowa had gotten a little tired of raising corn and wheat and were trying to diversify. Therefore, they bought some cows, any old kind of cows so long as they gave milk, uninspected, of course. They started shipping milk, and because it was a by-product of their farms it was produced cheaply. We called it bootleg milk, and it was, it was not what you would call seasoned, aged, inspected, or anything else. The result was that our own farmers were being put out of business, although our own farmers under the state laws had to maintain the highest kind of sanitary requirements on their farms. Then we did our unconstitutional act.

We got the Health Commissioner of New York City first to lay down the simple rule that no milk could come into New York unless it came from inspected cows, and inspected sources, milk that came from cows that had been tested against tuberculosis, milk that was inspected and met all requirements. But, the second part was pretty hard on some people, we have got to admit that. He then said, "I am very sorry, gentlemen, but I have only so many inspectors. They can't be running all over the country, out to Wisconsin and states in the middle west. They have to cover a field which is of a practical size, so I am awfully sorry, we cannot send down Mr. Palmer to Illinois to inspect your farm. We cover the state of New York and a few thousand acres in Northern New Jersey, a few thousand acres of Southern Pennsylvania and a few thousand acres of Western Vermont. That became by that act, the milk-shed of the metropolitan area, lived in by about eight million people. The result is that at

last we have the milk farmer in that area cooperating, and they have been told the exact situation in respect to supply and demand. They may be told one year that we are producing too much milk and not to grow too many cows. So far the experiment has been going on for three or four years and is past the stage of experiment. Nobody would say that the dairy farmers of this region are getting rich, but at least we can say they are keeping their farms. They are not having the mortgages foreclosed, and they are making an honest living and getting fair prices for their product, and they are not getting an excessive price from the point of view of the public. That is one case where regional planning has worked, and there is no state that that principle should not be extended to.

We have heard about the port of Norfolk. It is not merely a municipal enterprise. The development affects a very definite area in this region. We are doing a little today in the way of discouraging shipments of large quantities of produce to New York. Here is an instance. There comes a time every year when during a period of three or four days, the whole United States decides, by mental telepathy, that they are going to ship their cabbages to New York, and if the whole eight million people were to eat corned beef and cabbage three time aday, they would not be able to eat the supply. The result is that every single year, carload after carload of cabbages, which we cannot allow to lay around and rot on the piers (for we have some sanitary regulations) are dumped into barges, and taken out, I think now to the twelve-mile limit, and either dropped overboard there or fed to the people who live

just outside that twelve-mile limit.

Two or more years ago I was willed some fifteen thousand peach trees down in Georgia, and I tried being a farmer down there. Last year, I cut down eleven thousand out of the fifteen thousand trees and started to raise cattle. The reason is that apparently five or six years ago, every other owner of land in Georgia decided to grow peach trees. I made a perfectly magnificent crop of peaches down there, growth after growth, and if I had shipped them to the main markets in the big Northern Cities, I would have made a net loss of 15 cents to 20 cents on a crate, over and above the cost of picking, packing, and shipping. In the same way in many parts of this country, I believe, they went pecan mad, and the result is there are so many pecans grown now that they are feeding them to the hogs. This is all due to a lack of planning.

It seems to me that with all our ability, our vaunted wealth, we have not kept pace with the needs of the time. The waste that has come about on account of lack of planning in this country has run into billions of dollars. Probably billions each year that goes by, and there is still the social side of it to consider.

Have we, because of the absence of planning, not wasted much of the goodness and sun in the lives of the youth of the country? Have not they been debased not only in our cities, but also in many of our rural communities? Have they not been pressed in surroundings and circumstances which have led them into ways that were something new to our civilization? Have we older

people been fair? Have we given them the chance, economically or socially, as we should have done? It seems to me that in this coming day, call it what you want, call it planning, or call it thinking hard, we have an opportunity in our own locality and community and county in our own state, to do what is not merely a good thing to do, but to do what is a common sense thing about the generation that is coming after.

That, after all, is the simple way of describing the plan. What are we going to hand on to those who come later. That is a task that a few of us older people are working on, but a task of such interest that contains so many elements of guessing right, so many elements of chance, of trying to catch the lucky number and work the thing out in a way that will be successful, that it seems to me the young generation today have got not merely the greatest chance that any generation has had in other times. We can't all be right on what is going to happen anywhere here or hereafter. We can't guess definitely on the future. Some people will take their conclusions according to a formula. The gentleman who came out of the middle west to see me, I said to him, "How are things in your state?" "Looking up," he said, "Really! How do you figure they are looking up. You are one of the few people who have given me so optimistic a report." "It is absolutely inevitable," he said. "Things are flat on their back now, and they must be looking up."

*Ashew*

Address by Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York on State Planning  
Round Table on REGIONALISM - Monday, July 8, 1931

---

I did not come here with any prepared speech this morning. I came to present to you very informally a subject that is very close to all of our hearts, a subject which I think needs and deserves much public and private discussion and needs and requires perhaps just as few formal public addresses as possible. It seems particularly appropriate that we at the University should be discussing plans, for the great planner of our nation, the first planner, was the father of the university; an architect of buildings, an architect of industry, and most of all an architect of government. And yet, after the age of Thomas Jefferson, it seems to me that our nation as a whole, and our several states forgot architecture in the sense in which it had been used and practised by Thomas Jefferson, and it is only in the last generation, our generation that we have returned to thoughts of planning for the days to come.

Like Mr. Brownlow, I do not know what "Regionalism" means. I do have certain fairly clear ideas in respect to the relative spheres of governments of states on the one hand and Federal government on the other hand. Let me cite some of the instances I call planning of any kind.

I think we are apt very often to run after false gods in this country, to take up some "ism" and assume that in a generation or two that they are going to be so different from ourselves that we must scrap everything tried and familiar. One of the most eminent chemists of this country said to me "It will be only another generation before there will be no more farms in the United States." I said "No more farms?" and he said "I may modify that. There will be probably one tenth of the <sup>present</sup> farm areas cultivated in the next generation. Ninety per cent will go out of agricultural production. Why, the next generation will be eating synthetic food." Then he drew the most delightful picture of synthetic food.

Getting up in the morning you will go to the mantle shelf. While you are shaving and bathing, you take up a bottle of pills marked "Poached Eggs" and you take up another bottle of pills marked "Toast" and you take one poached egg pill and one toast pill, and nowadays there would probably be a "Cup of Coffee" pill. Even science is apt to outrun itself, and I take it that in the next generation we will still be eating real eggs and real toast, and by the same token we will still have our farms in this country.

But, there are problems that have come to life and that do require the most fundamental kind of thought. We are told by many social experts today that the size of cities is getting to a point where they are no longer economic for human beings to live in. You and I know of examples where industries have declined to go in some of the larger cities of our nation and have preferred to

locate their plants in smaller communities. And in the same way we are beginning to wonder whether this movement of leaving the farm and going to the great city is ever coming to an end. Of course it has got to come to an end, because the point is approaching where it can go on no longer. It was only, I think two or three generations ago, somewhere around 1850, that 75 per cent of Americans lived in rural communities and 25 per cent were urban, and yet today those figures are completely reversed. Seventy-five per cent of the people of the United States are in urban and only 25 per cent rural, and we have looked with fear to the point where 100 per cent would be urban. Of course, that is an impossible figure to arrive at, and I am inclined to the belief that we have reached very nearly the saturation point of urban population. This means that one of our first efforts in meeting the problem of maintaining a proper balance between city life and country life is to be made according to the old formula, "Make country life more attractive." In many of the states much has been done to survey conditions. In a few states, New York and two others, I think, definite efforts have been made to find out the facts about land.

I can best illustrate the point that I am coming to by using as an example what has been definitely accomplished by the state of New York during the past three years.

First from the point of view of government, in other words, taxes. The burden upon the rural communities was so heavy that something had to be done to relieve the country community from this overburden of taxes. That was accomplished by a series of laws. Under the old plan, not only in the state of New York

but in other states the rule followed seemed to be when it came to the question of state contribution to local needs, they followed the old maxim "To him that hath shall be given." In one of our counties, for example, where the land values were high, a county near New York City, where the assessed values ran from \$2000 and \$3000 to \$5000 an acre, the order was for the state to contribute as high as \$1500 and \$1600 per mile of town road, whereas the great bulk of our counties up-State New York counties, the state contributed as low as \$25 and \$30 per mile of highway, and so our first effort was to correct this system. In highways and taxes and education and various other ways, we have made the lot of the rural dweller more equitable.

Then following that program, we saw perhaps the possibility of outlining a plan for the state as based upon the land unit, for after all in this country and in the nation from which most of our people came, the fundamental unit is the unit of land. So, we have taken a survey of land within the state, and a couple of other states are doing the same thing, trying to find out the facts. The one thing that impresses me is the lack of facts, not merely facts which let us see the work of the late Wickersham committee, but facts relating to almost every other phase of life. One reason that we are not proceeding further with the crime problem is that we do not know any of the facts regarding crime. So one of our first efforts on the question of population and land was to gather facts. We have surveyed, for example, one of our rural counties and we find in that one county that 22 per cent of all the land now being cultivated ought not to be cultivated. So we are

extending that survey through all of the counties to determine what should be the use of land.

Let me give you some very simple figures. As Mr. Brownlow suggested, the state of New York is not merely the city of New York. The state is twenty-ninth in area of the forty-eight states, and runs from year to year in the value of its agricultural products, between the third and sixth state. We are a state of farmers. Six million people outside the city of New York itself. Now with that area and with that important agricultural system, we come back to find out about its history, and we find that the state contains 30 million acres of land, and out of those thirty million acres three million are occupied by cities, towns and villages, and five million acres more represent state owned rough lands in the Adirondacks, lake areas, Catskill Mountains, etc., leaving a total of two million acres that fifty years ago were cultivated. Yet in these past fifty years, four million of those have been abandoned. Those figures apply to almost every other state east of the Mississippi in very much the same proportion. Every state has its problem of abandonment of farms, New England and most of the South, and more recently a larger part of the middle west.

Abandoned farms! People couldn't make a success of their lives on farms, so out of 22 million acres that once were farmed in the state of New York four million are already abandoned. In this survey, we believe we shall find another four million that ought to be abandoned. We have eighteen million acres in farms and we believe we ought not have more than fourteen million. What will be the result of that, and how are we going about it?

Shall we depend on people to just follow the normal economic course? Shall we depend on them to voluntarily abandon these four million acres? Probably not. It should be accelerated by government action. I should say abandon four million acres more for the very good reason that on those four million acres are not making both ends meet. It is uneconomical for them to try to stay on year after year, tilling land that won't keep their families up to the American standard of living. And so the state is this year submitting to the voters a bond issue of some twenty millions of dollars for a comparatively short period of years, which will be used for these marginal lands. Some call them sub-marginal lands. The point is, in some way we have got to take those lands out of agriculture.

The other large waste is in maintaining highways up into these sparsely settled regions; highways that cost at least \$100 per year to per mile to maintain, highways that ought to have a lot more spent on them, highways going into sections where there are only two or three families to be served by five miles of road, and then think of the other economic wastes. If these people on this marginal land are to be brought up to our modern standards, they ought to have a telephone line, and that means running up a road for several miles to serve one, two or three families. They should have electric light on their farms, but if they could afford it, two or three farms might have to pay for four or five miles of poles and lines. So we figure that by the expenditure of a comparatively small sum which the state may put in the purchase of these marginal lands, the money will be returned to the economic wealth of the state many times over in a comparatively short period.

Think of what it means in this problem of eliminating in

so far as possible the one room school house. How many are there in this country? There are between 30,000 and 40,000 in the United States today, and in every state of the union we are working for the consolidation of school districts and the improvement of education. In the state of New York there are still thousands of one-room schoolhouses, and we believe that in this process of eliminating the marginal lands, we will be eliminating the one-room schoolhouses. Those are some of the advantages.

What is going to happen to the people on the land? That is always the question that is asked in the first place. Our survey so far shows that very largely these people are old people. Most of the young people have gotten out and moved off somewhere else. I do not believe that we ought to take these old people on these farms and remove them from the homes they were born in and were raised in and have lived all their lives in. It is entirely possible to let them live there the balance of their lives, it won't be long. What is ten or twenty years in the life of a community? But, we believe that after they are gone, to those impossible farms should be taken out of farming, and so with due regard for the feelings of these people, in the course of a generation, nearly all of these farms will be abandoned as such.

Then there will be other people, and provision can probably be made through cooperative methods for them to move to land where they can make a living. That is just a rough picture

of that part of our plan.

But let me mention what will have to be done with four million acres. Of course, it has two or three possibilities. First, for the growing of a long-term crop - trees, and everybody who is in a position to know something of our forestation problem, knows we will need all the trees we can get in the next fifty years. A large part of this marginal land can and ought to be turned into forest land.

Then another phase that we have taken up in practically every state; the recreation value of these lands, giving an opportunity to the city dweller to get out into the country, recreation that is extending every year, that a few years ago was limited to the months of July and August, that has extended now to a point earlier in the spring and lasting way on through the autumn, and more and more is beginning to develop into an all year round happening. We have somewhere around three million acres in state parks, a system of state parks in every part of the state. Just as an example let us note the use of the state parks for the past five years in the Adirondac reservation, which has been used every year by twice the number of people that have used it the year before. The use has doubled each year for five years. People are becoming out-door-minded all over the nation. The result of all this, we believe, is going to bring up a new class in our civilization.

We have talked a great deal about the country-dweller and about the city-dweller. Isn't there a third possibility, a possibility for us to create by cooperative effort some form of living which will combine industry and agriculture? Today states

are looking at it from two angles. For instance in Pennsylvania with the idea of bringing agriculture to industry. In the coal mining town, in the town with the steel plant or factory, they are trying to locate their operators and employees out a little way, a mile or two, where each one can have in place of two or three rooms in a four-family house, a house of his own with maybe an acre of land, giving them a chance to raise some of their own food supply.

In Vermont they are working through a state commission to bring industry to agriculture. Dr. Taylor up there has written the report of an investigation of an experiment in a valley up in Vermont, where most people were leaving the valley. There came back to that valley some ten or fifteen years ago, a boy who had left it twenty years earlier, and had become wealthy. He came back there and he found that the young people were leaving the valley and that the old people were discouraged. They were trying to farm the thin soil up on the mountain side; that the people were just dying out. What did he do? He looked over this valley and found there was some fine second growth of hard wood and no market for it. Then he conceived the idea of putting in a little turning mill and then he went out to Sears-Roebuck and said, "What do you need in the way of wood contraptions that can be made at our turning mill?" "We need those little round knobs that go on the tops of kettles and lids of pans," they said. The result was that he entered into a contract for making, I don't know how many millions of these things. He went back and said to the people, "I am going to open up my factory after you get your corn in."

When the corn was harvested, he opened up his factory and gave employment to that valley in two ways. He told them he needed so many lengths of this hard wood, and he said he needed to employ so many of those people, and he paid them cash, and they had a cash crop of kettle knobs.

The result has been that the young people are staying. When the planting time comes in the spring, the kettle knob factory closes down. Then up there in the summer time, after the hay is in and before the corn ripens, there is always a period in August when things are dull, and the little old factory opens up again and they get two or three weeks more of cash crops. That is one example.

We have many in this country and more than are being tried out. I am hoping that in everyone of our states, we shall be able to do some experimenting in these coming years, with the creation of a new group in our civilization. We may call them the rural-industrialists. We may call them the factory-farmers, one simple term that will connote just that position of keeping people on the land with agriculture as what you might call their roots way down in the ground, and at the same time some safety during the long months of the winter season for them to earn some kind of cash wages. It will make our whole nation individual and independent. It will open vast areas and at the same time, by state planning, by eliminating the marginal lands, the lands that are still left in agriculture will be more useful and will be worth cultivating.

Then we come to one final subject that I want to pass

over quite rapidly. The question of regional planning. Let me illustrate. When I first started going down to Warm Springs in Georgia, there came through at night on the railroad a very noisy long train, about three a.m. It was always one time, five minutes to three, and they said it was the milk train. "Where to," I asked. "To Florida," they told me. That train of eighteen or twenty cars, run on passenger schedule, most of them glass tank cars, carrying south the milk cream supply for Miami, Palm Beach and all other resorts down there. I said, "Where does it come from?" "It comes from Wisconsin." That milk originating in Wisconsin, Northern Illinois, was passing through Kentucky, which certainly can grow milk, passing through the corner of Tennessee, and passing through the length of Georgia, absolutely eliminating the three states they passed through as sources of supply for the Florida market. This is the result of a lack of planning more than anything else. There is no reason why the State of Georgia shouldn't furnish all of the milk and cream for the State of Florida.

We are doing something in the state of New York, which I must admit is of doubtful constitutionality. The citizens of New York outside of New York City, with a population of six million people, and another two million people in the nearby states of New Jersey makes a population of eight million people raising a lot of milk and cream. The New York State dairy farmers up to three years ago were going broke. Something had to be done, and the principle concern was this: that a great many farmers out in the central western states of Ohio, Indiana,

Illinois, Wisconsin and part of Iowa had gotten a little tired of raising corn and wheat and were trying to diversify. Therefore, they bought some cows, any old kind of cows so long as they gave milk, uninspected, of course. They started shipping milk, and because it was a by-product of their farms it was produced cheaply. We called it bootleg milk, and it was. It was not what you would call seasoned, aged, inspected, or anything else. The result was that our own farmers were being put out of business, although our own farmers under the state laws had to maintain the highest kind of sanitary requirements on their farms. Then we did our <sup>un-</sup>constitutional act.

We got the Health Commissioner of New York City first to lay down the simple rule that no milk could come into New York unless it came from inspected cows, and inspected sources, milk that came from cows that had been tested against tuberculosis, milk that was inspected and met all requirements. But, the second part was pretty hard on some people, we have got to admit ~~that~~. He then said, "I am very sorry, gentlemen, but I have only so many inspectors. They can't be running all over the country, out to Wisconsin and states in the middle west. They have to cover a field which is of a practical size, so I am awfully sorry, we cannot send down Mr. Palmer <sup>to Illinois</sup> to inspect your farm. We cover the state of New York and a few thousand acres in Northern New Jersey, a few thousand acres of Southern Pennsylvania and a few thousand acres of Western Vermont. That became by that act, the milk-shed of the metropolitan area, lived in by about eight million people. The result is that at

last we have the milk farmer in that area cooperating, and they have been told the exact situation in respect to supply and demand. They may be told one year that we are reproducing too much milk and not to grow too many cows. So far the experiment has been going on for three or four years and is past the stage of experiment. Nobody would say that the dairy farmers of this region are getting rich, but at least we can say they are keeping their farms. They are not having the mortgages foreclosed, and they are making an honest living and getting fair prices for their product, and they are not getting an excessive price from the point of view of the public. That is one case where regional planning has worked, and there is no state that that principle should not be extended to.

We have heard about the port of Norfolk. It is not merely a municipal enterprise. The development affects a very definite area in this region. We are doing a little today in the way of discouraging shipments of large quantities of produce to New York. Here is an instance. There comes a time every year when during a period of three or four days, the whole United States decides, by mental telepathy, that they are going to ship their cabbages to New York, and if the whole eight million people were to eat corned beef and cabbage three times a day, they would not be able to eat the supply. The result is that every single year, carload after carload of cabbages, which we cannot allow to lay around and rot on the piers (for we have some sanitary regulations) are dumped into barges, and taken out, I think now to the twelve-mile limit, and either dropped overboard there or fed to the people who live just outside that twelve-mile limit.

Two or more years ago I was willed some fifteen thousand peach trees down in Georgia, and I tried being a farmer down

there. Last year, I cut down eleven thousand out of the fifteen thousand trees and started to raise cattle. The reason is that apparently five or six years ago, every other owner of land in Georgia decided to grow peach trees. I made a perfectly magnificent crop of peaches down there, growth after growth, and if I had shipped them to the main markets in the big Northern Cities, I would have made a net loss of 15 cents to 20cents on a crate, over and above the cost of picking, packing, and shipping. In the same way in many parts of this country, I believe, they went pecan mad, and the result is there are so many pecans grown now that they are feeding them to the hogs. This is all due to a lack of planning.

It seems to me that with all our ability, our vaunted wealth, we have not kept pace with the needs of the time. The waste that has come about on account of lack of planning in this country has run into billions of dollars. Probably billions each year that goes by, and there is still the social side of it to consider.

Have we, because of the absence of planning, not wasted much of the goodness and sun in the lives of the youth of the country? Have not they been debased not only in our cities, but also in many of our rural communities? Have they not been pressed in surroundings and circumstances which have led them into ways that were something new to our civilization? Have we older people been fair? Have we given them the chance, economically or socially, as we should have done? It seems to me that in this

coming day, call it what you want, call it planning, or call it thinking hard, we have an opportunity in our own locality and community and county in our own state, to do what is not merely a good thing to do, but to do what is a common sense thing about the generation that is coming after.

That, after all, is the simple way of describing the plan. What are we going to hand on to those who come later. That is a task that a few of us older people are working on, but a task of such interest that contains so many elements of guessing right, so many elements of chance, of trying to catch the lucky number and work the thing out in a way that will be successful, that it seems to me the young generation today have got not merely the greatest chance that any generation has had in other times. We can't all be right on what is going to happen anywhere here or hereafter. We can't guess definitely on the future. Some people will take their conclusions according to a formula. The gentleman who came out of the middle west to see me, I said to him, "How are things in your state?" "Looking up," he said, "Really! How do you figure they are looking up. You are one of the few people who has given me so optimistic a report." "It is absolutely inevitable," he said, "Things are flat on their back now, and they must be looking up."

[Extemporaneous address given by FDR at the University of Virginia's Institute of Public Affairs held in Charlottesville, July 6, 1931.]

Address by Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York on State Planning  
Round Table on REGIONALISM - Monday, July 6, 1931

---

I did not come here with any prepared speech this morning. I came to present to you very informally a subject that is very close to all of our hearts, a subject which I think needs and deserves much public and private discussion and needs and requires perhaps just as few formal public addresses as possible. It seems particularly appropriate that we at the University should be discussing plans, for the great planner of our nation, the first planner, was the father of the university; an architect of buildings, an architect of industry, and most of all an architect of government. And yet, after the age of Thomas Jefferson, it seems to me that our nation as a whole, and our several states forgot architecture in the sense in which it had been used and practiced by Thomas Jefferson, and it is only in the last generation, our generation that we have returned to thoughts of planning for the days to come.

Like Mr. Brownlow, I do not know what "Regionalism" means. I do have certain fairly clear ideas in respect to the relative spheres of governments of states on the one hand and Federal government on the other hand. Let me cite some of the instances I call planning of any kind.

I think we are apt very often to run after false gods in this country, to take up some "ism" and assume that in a generation or two that they are going to be so different from ourselves that we must scrap everything tried and familiar. One of the most eminent chemists of this country said to me "It will be only another generation before there will be no more farms in the United States." I said "No more farms?" and he said "I may modify that. There will be probably one tenth of the present farm areas cultivated in the next generation. Ninety per cent will go out of agricultural production. Why, the next generation will be eating synthetic food." Then he drew the most delightful picture of synthetic food.

Getting up in the morning you will go to the mantle shelf. While you are shaving and bathing, you take up a bottle of pills marked "Poached Eggs" and you take up another bottle of pills marked "Toast" and you take one poached egg pill and one toast pill, and nowadays there would probably be a "Cup of Coffee" pill. Even science is apt to outrun itself, and I take it that in the next generation we will still be eating real eggs and real toast, and by the same token we will still have our farms in this country.

But, there are problems that have come to life and that do require the most fundamental kind of thought. We are told by many social experts today that the size of cities is getting to a point where they are no longer economic for human beings to live in. You and I know of examples where industries have declined to go in some of the larger cities of our nation and have preferred to

locate their plants in smaller communities. And in the same way we are beginning to wonder whether this movement of leaving the farm and going to the great city is ever coming to an end. Of course it has got to come to an end, because the point is approaching where it can go on no longer. It was only, I think two or three generations ago, somewhere around 1850, that 75 per cent of Americans lived in rural communities and 25 per cent were urban, and yet today those figures are completely reversed. Seventy-five per cent of the people of the United States are in urban and only 25 per cent rural, and we have looked with fear to the point where 100 per cent would be urban. Of course, that is an impossible figure to arrive at, and I am inclined to the belief that we have reached very nearly the saturation point of urban population. This means that one of our first efforts in meeting the problem of maintaining a proper balance between city life and country life is to be made according to the old formula, "Make country life more attractive." In many of the states much has been done to survey conditions. In a few states, New York and two others, I think, definite efforts have been made to find out the facts about land.

I can best illustrate the point that I am coming to by using as an example what has been definitely accomplished by the state of New York during the past three years.

First from the point of view of government, in other words, taxes. The burden upon the rural communities was so heavy that something had to be done to relieve the country community from this overburden of taxes. That was accomplished by a series of laws. Under the old plan, not only in the State of New York

but in other states the rule followed seemed to be when it came to the question of state contribution to local needs, they followed the old maxim "To him that hath shall be given." In one of our counties, for example, where the land values were high, a county near New York city, where the assessed values ran from \$2000 and \$3000 to \$5000 an acre, the order was for the state to contribute as high as \$1500 and \$1800 per mile of town road, whereas the great bulk of our counties up-State New York counties, the state contributed as low as \$25 and \$30 per mile of highway, and so our first effort was to correct this system. In highways and taxes and education and various other ways, we have made the lot of the rural dweller more equitable.

Then following that program, we saw perhaps the possibility of outlining a plan for the state as based upon the land unit, for after all in this country and in the nation from which most of our people came, the fundamental unit is the unit of land. So, we have taken a survey of land within the state, and a couple of other states are doing the same thing, trying to find out the facts. The one thing that impresses me is the lack of facts, not merely facts which let us see the work of the late Wickersham committee, but facts relating to almost every other phase of life. One reason that we are not proceeding further with the crime problem is that we do not know any of the facts regarding crime. So one of our first efforts on the question of population and land was to gather facts. We have surveyed, for example, one of our rural counties and we find in that one county that 22 per cent of all the land now being cultivated ought not to be cultivated. So we are

extending that survey through all of the counties to determine what should be the use of land.

Let me give you some very simple figures. As Mr. Brownlow suggested, the State of New York is not merely the city of New York. The state is twenty-ninth in area of the forty-eight states, and runs from year to year in the value of its agricultural products, between the third and sixth state. We are a state of farmers. Six million people outside the city of New York itself. Now with that area and with that important agricultural system, we come back to find out about its history, and we find that the state contains 30 million acres of land, and out of those thirty million acres three million are occupied by cities, towns and villages, and five million acres more represent state owned rough lands in the Adirondacks, lake areas, Catskill Mountains, etc., leaving a total of two million acres that fifty years ago were cultivated. Yet in these past fifty years, four million of those have been abandoned. Those figures apply to almost every other state east of the Mississippi in very much the same proportion. Every state has its problem of abandonment of farms, New England and most of the South, and more recently a larger part of the middle west.

Abandoned farms: People couldn't make a success of their lives on farms, so out of 22 million acres that once were farmed in the State of New York four million are already abandoned. In this survey, we believe we shall find another four million that ought to be abandoned. We have eighteen million acres in farms and we believe we ought not to have more than fourteen million. What will be the result of that, and how are we going about it?

Shall we depend on people to just follow the normal economic course? Shall we depend on them to voluntarily abandon these four million acres? Probably not. It should be accelerated by government action. I should say abandon four million acres more for the very good reason that on those four million acres are not making both ends meet. It is uneconomical for them to try to stay on year after year, tilling land that won't keep their families up to the American standard of living. And so the state is this year submitting to the voters a bond issue of some twenty millions of dollars for a comparatively short period of years, which will be used for these marginal lands. Some call them sub-marginal lands. The point is, in some way we have got to take those lands out of agriculture.

The other large waste is in maintaining highways up into these sparsely settled regions; highways that cost at least \$100 per year to per mile to maintain, highways that ought to have a lot more spent on them, highways going into sections where there are only two or three families to be served by five miles of road, and then think of the other economic wastes. If these people on this marginal land are to be brought up to our modern standards, they ought to have atelephone line, and that means running up a road for several miles to serve one, two or three families. They should have electric light on their farms, but if they could afford it, two or three farms might have to pay for four or five miles of poles and lines. So we figure that by the expenditure of a comparatively small sum which the state may put in the purchase of these marginal lands, the money will be returned to the economic wealth

of the state many times over in a comparatively short period.

Think of what it means in this problem of eliminating in so far as possible the one room school house. How many are there in this country? There are between 30,000 and 40,000 in the United States today, and in every state of the union we are working for the consolidation of school districts and the improvement of education. In the state of New York there are still thousands of one-room schoolhouses, and we believe that in this process of eliminating the marginal lands, we will be eliminating the one-room schoolhouses. Those are some of the advantages.

What is going to happen to the people on the land? That is always the question that is asked in the first place. Our survey so far shows that very largely these people are old people. Most of the young people have gotten out and moved off somewhere else. I do not believe that we ought to take these old people on these farms and remove them from the homes they were born in and were raised in and have lived all their lives in. It is entirely possible to let them live there the balance of their lives, it won't be long. What is ten or twenty years in the life of a community? But, we believe that after they are gone, to those impossible farms should be taken out of farming, and so with due regard for the feelings of these people, in the course of a generation, nearly all of these farms will be abandoned as such.

Then there will be other people, and provision can probably be made through cooperative methods for them to move to land where they can make a living. That is just a rough picture

of that part of our plan.

But let me mention what will have to be done with four million acres. Of course, it has two or three possibilities. First, for the growing of a long-term crop - trees, and everybody who is in a position to know something of our forestration problem, knows we will need all the trees we can get in the next fifty years. A large part of this marginal land can and ought to be turned into forest land.

Then another phase that we have taken up in practically every state; the recreation value of these lands, giving an opportunity to the city dweller to get out into the country, recreation that is extending every year, that a few years ago was limited to the months of July and August, that has extended now to a point earlier in the spring and lasting way on through the autumn, and more and more is beginning to develop into an all year round happening. We have somewhere around three million acres in state parks, a system of state parks in every part of the state. Just as an example let us note the use of the state parks for the past five years in the Adirondac reservation, which has been used every year by twice the number of people that have used it the year before. The use has doubled each year for five years. People are becoming out-door-minded all over the nation. The result of all this, we believe, is going to bring up a new class in our civilization.

We have talked a great deal about the country-dweller and about the city-dweller. Isn't there a third possibility, a possibility for us to create by cooperative effort some form of living which will combine industry and agriculture? Today states

are looking at it from two angles. For instance in Pennsylvania with the idea of bringing agriculture to industry. In the coal mining town, in the town with the steel plant or factory, they are trying to locate their operators and employees out a little way, a mile or two, where each one can have in place of two or three rooms in a four-family house, a house of his own with maybe an acre of land, giving them a chance to raise some of their own food supply.

In Vermont they are working through a state commission to bring industry to agriculture. Dr. Taylor up there has written the report of an investigation of an experiment in a valley up in Vermont, where most people were leaving the valley. There came back to that valley some ten or fifteen years ago, a boy who had left it twenty years earlier, and had become wealthy. He came back there and he found that the young people were leaving the valley and that the old people were discouraged. They were trying to farm the thin soil up on the mountain side; that the people were just dying out. What did he do? He looked over this valley and found there was some fine second growth of hard wood and no market for it. Then he conceived the idea of putting in a little turning mill and then he went out to Sears-Roebuck and said, "What do you need in the way of wood contraptions that can be made at our turning mill?" "We need those little round knobs that go on the tops of kettles and lids of pans," they said. The result was that he entered into a contract for making, I don't know how many millions of these things. He went back and said to the people, "I am going to open up my factory after you get your corn in."

When the corn was harvested, he opened up his factory and gave employment to that valley in two ways. He told them he needed so many lengths of this hard wood, and he said he needed to employ so many of those people, and he paid them cash, and they had a cash crop of kettle knobs.

The result has been that the young people are staying. When the planting time comes in the spring, the kettle knob factory closes down. Then up there in the summer time, after the hay is in and before the corn ripens, there is always a period in August when things are dull, and the little old factory opens up again and they get two or three weeks more of cash crops. That is one example.

We have many in this country and more than are being tried out. I am hoping that in everyone of our states, we shall be able to do some experimenting in these coming years, with the creation of a new group in our civilization. We may call them the rural-industries. We may call them the factory-farmers, one simple term that will connote just that position of keeping people on the land with agriculture as what you might call their roots way down in the ground, and at the same time some safety during the long months of the winter season for them to earn some kind of cash wages. It will make our whole nation individual and independent. It will open vast areas and at the same time, by state planning, by eliminating the marginal lands, the lands that are still left in agriculture will be more useful and will be worth cultivating.

Then we come to one final subject that I want to pass over quite rapidly. The question of regional planning. Let me illustrate. When I first started going down to Warm Springs in Georgia, there came through at night on the railroad a very noisy long train, about three a.m. It was always on time, five minutes to three, and they said it was the milk train. "Where to," I asked. "To Florida" they told me. That train of eighteen or twenty cars, run on passenger schedule, most of them glass tank cars, carrying south the milk cream supply for Miami, Palm Beach and all other resorts down there. I said, "Where does it come from?" "It comes from Wisconsin." That milk originating in Wisconsin, Northern Illinois, was passing through Kentucky, which certainly can grow milk, passing through the corner of Tennessee, and passing through the length of Georgia, absolutely eliminating the three states they passed through as sources of supply for the Florida market. This is the result of a lack of planning more than anything else. There is no reason why the State of Georgia shouldn't furnish all of the milk and cream for the State of Florida.

We are doing something in the State of New York, which I must admit is of doubtful constitutionality. The citizens of New York outside of New York City, with a population of six million people, and another two million people in the nearby state of New Jersey make a population of eight million people raising a lot of milk and cream. The New York State dairy farmers up to three years ago were going broke. Something had to be done, and the principle concern was this: that a great many farmers out in the central western states of Ohio, Indiana,

Illinois, Wisconsin and part of Iowa had gotten a little tired of raising corn and wheat and were trying to diversify. Therefore, they bought some cows, any old kind of cows so long as they gave milk, uninspected, of course. They started shipping milk, and because it was a by-product of their farms it was produced cheaply. We called it bootleg milk, and it was, it was not what you would call seasoned, aged, inspected, or anything else. The result was that our own farmers were being put out of business, although our own farmers under the state laws had to maintain the highest kind of sanitary requirements on their farms. Then we did our unconstitutional act.

We got the Health Commissioner of New York City first to lay down the simple rule that no milk could come into New York unless it came from inspected cows, and inspected sources, milk that came from cows that had been tested against tuberculosis, milk that was inspected and met all requirements. But, the second part was pretty hard on some people, we have got to admit that. He then said, "I am very sorry, gentlemen, but I have only so many inspectors. They can't be running all over the country, out to Wisconsin and states in the middle west. They have to cover a field which is of a practical size, so I am awfully sorry, we cannot send down Mr. Palmer to Illinois to inspect your farm. We cover the state of New York and a few thousand acres in Northern New Jersey, a few thousand acres of Southern Pennsylvania and a few thousand acres of Western Vermont. That became by that act, the milk-shed of the metropolitan area, lived in by about eight million people. The result is that at

last we have the milk farmer in that area cooperating, and they have been told the exact situation in respect to supply and demand. They may be told one year that we are producing too much milk and not to grow too many cows. So far the experiment has been going on for three or four years and is past the stage of experiment. Nobody would say that the dairy farmers of this region are getting rich, but at least we can say they are keeping their farms. They are not having the mortgages foreclosed, and they are making an honest living and getting fair prices for their product, and they are not getting an excessive price from the point of view of the public. That is one case where regional planning has worked, and there is no state that that principle should not be extended to.

We have heard about the port of Norfolk. It is not merely a municipal enterprise. The development affects a very definite area in this region. We are doing a little today in the way of discouraging shipments of large quantities of produce to New York. Here is an instance. There comes a time every year when during a period of three or four days, the whole United States decides, by mental telepathy, that they are going to ship their cabbages to New York, and if the whole eight million people were to eat corned beef and cabbage three time aday, they would not be able to eat the supply. The result is that every single year, carload after carload of cabbages, which we cannot allow to lay around and rot on the piers (for we have some sanitary regulations) are dumped into barges, and taken out, I think now to the twelve-mile limit, and either dropped overboard there or fed to the people who live

just outside that twelve-mile limit.

Two or more years ago I was willed some fifteen thousand peach trees down in Georgia, and I tried being a farmer down there. Last year, I cut down eleven thousand out of the fifteen thousand trees and started to raise cattle. The reason is that apparently five or six years ago, every other owner of land in Georgia decided to grow peach trees. I made a perfectly magnificent crop of peaches down there, growth after growth, and if I had shipped them to the main markets in the big Northern Cities, I would have made a net loss of 15 cents to 20 cents on a crate, over and above the cost of picking, packing, and shipping. In the same way in many parts of this country, I believe, they went pecan mad, and the result is there are so many pecans grown now that they are feeding them to the hogs. This is all due to a lack of planning.

It seems to me that with all our ability, our vaunted wealth, we have not kept pace with the needs of the time. The waste that has come about on account of lack of planning in this country has run into billions of dollars. Probably billions each year that goes by, and there is still the social side of it to consider.

Have we, because of the absence of planning, not wasted much of the goodness and sun in the lives of the youth of the country? Have not they been debased not only in our cities, but also in many of our rural communities? Have they not been pressed in surroundings and circumstances which have led them into ways that were something new to our civilization? Have we older

people been fair? Have we given them the chance, economically or socially, as we should have done? It seems to me that in this coming day, call it what you want, call it planning, or call it thinking hard, we have an opportunity in our own locality and community and county in our own state, to do what is not merely a good thing to do, but to do what is a common sense thing about the generation that is coming after.

That, after all, is the simple way of describing the plan. What are we going to hand on to those who come later. That is a task that a few of us older people are working on, but a task of such interest that contains so many elements of guessing right, so many elements of chance, of trying to catch the lucky number and work the thing out in a way that will be successful, that it seems to me the young generation today have got not merely the greatest chance that any generation has had in other times. We can't all be right on what is going to happen anywhere here or hereafter. We can't guess definitely on the future. Some people will take their conclusions according to a formula. The gentleman who came out of the middle west to see me, I said to him, "How are things in your state?" "Looking up," he said, "Really? How do you figure they are looking up. You are one of the few people who have given me so optimistic a report." "It is absolutely inevitable," he said. "Things are flat on their back now, and they must be looking up."

Address by Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York on State Planning  
Round Table on REGIONALISM - Monday, July 6, 1931

---

I did not come here with any prepared speech this morning. I came to present to you very informally a subject that is very close to all of our hearts, a subject which I think needs and deserves much public and private discussion and needs and requires perhaps just as few formal public addresses as possible. It seems particularly appropriate that we at the University should be discussing plans, for the great planner of our nation, the first planner, was the father of the university; an architect of buildings, an architect of industry, and most of all an architect of government. And yet, after the age of Thomas Jefferson, it seems to me that our nation as a whole, and our several states forgot architecture in the sense in which it had been used and practiced by Thomas Jefferson, and it is only in the last generation, our generation that we have returned to thoughts of planning for the days to come.

Like Mr. Brownlow, I do not know what "Regionalism" means. I do have certain fairly clear ideas in respect to the relative spheres of governments of states on the one hand and Federal government on the other hand. Let me cite some of the instances I call planning of any kind.

I think we are apt very often to run after false gods in this country, to take up some "ism" and assume that in a generation or two that they are going to be so different from ourselves that we must scrap everything tried and familiar. One of the most eminent chemists of this country said to me "It will be only another generation before there will be no more farms in the United States." I said "No more farms?" and he said "I may modify that. There will be probably one tenth of the present farm areas cultivated in the next generation. Ninety per cent will go out of agricultural production. Why, the next generation will be eating synthetic food." Then he drew the most delightful picture of synthetic food.

Getting up in the morning you will go to the mantle shelf. While you are shaving and bathing, you take up a bottle of pills marked "Poached Eggs" and you take up another bottle of pills marked "Toast" and you take one poached egg pill and one toast pill, and nowadays there would probably be a "Cup of Coffee" pill. Even science is apt to outrun itself, and I take it that in the next generation we will still be eating real eggs and real toast, and by the same token we will still have our farms in this country.

But, there are problems that have come to life and that do require the most fundamental kind of thought. We are told by many social experts today that the size of cities is getting to a point where they are no longer economic for human beings to live in. You and I know of examples where industries have declined to go in some of the larger cities of our nation and have preferred to

locate their plants in smaller communities. And in the same way we are beginning to wonder whether this movement of leaving the farm and going to the great city is ever coming to an end. Of course it has got to come to an end, because the point is approaching where it can go on no longer. It was only, I think two or three generations ago, somewhere around 1850, that 75 per cent of Americans lived in rural communities and 25 per cent were urban, and yet today those figures are completely reversed. Seventy-five per cent of the people of the United States are in urban and only 25 per cent rural, and we have looked with fear to the point where 100 per cent would be urban. Of course, that is an impossible figure to arrive at, and I am inclined to the belief that we have reached very nearly the saturation point of urban population. This means that one of our first efforts in meeting the problem of maintaining a proper balance between city life and country life is to be made according to the old formula, "Make country life more attractive." In many of the states much has been done to survey conditions. In a few states, New York and two others, I think, definite efforts have been made to find out the facts about land.

I can best illustrate the point that I am coming to by using as an example what has been definitely accomplished by the state of New York during the past three years.

First from the point of view of government, in other words, taxes. The burden upon the rural communities was so heavy that something had to be done to relieve the country community from this overburden of taxes. That was accomplished by a series of laws. Under the old plan, not only in the State of New York

but in other states the rule followed seemed to be when it came to the question of state contribution to local needs, they followed the old maxim "To him that hath shall be given." In one of our counties, for example, where the land values were high, a county near New York city, where the assessed values ran from \$2000 and \$3000 to \$5000 an acre, the order was for the state to contribute as high as \$1500 and \$1800 per mile of town road, whereas the great bulk of our counties up-State New York counties, the state contributed as low as \$25 and \$30 per mile of highway, and so our first effort was to correct this system. In highways and taxes and education and various other ways, we have made the lot of the rural dweller more equitable.

Then following that program, we saw perhaps the possibility of outlining a plan for the state as based upon the land unit, for after all in this country and in the nation from which most of our people came, the fundamental unit is the unit of land. So, we have taken a survey of land within the state, and a couple of other states are doing the same thing, trying to find out the facts. The one thing that impresses me is the lack of facts, not merely facts which let us see the work of the late Wickersham committee, but facts relating to almost every other phase of life. One reason that we are not proceeding further with the crime problem is that we do not know any of the facts regarding crime. So one of our first efforts on the question of population and land was together facts. We have surveyed, for example, one of our rural counties and we find in that one county that 22 per cent of all the land now being cultivated ought not to be cultivated. So we are

extending that survey through all of the counties to determine what should be the use of land.

Let me give you some very simple figures. As Mr. Brownlow suggested, the State of New York is not merely the city of New York. The state is twenty-ninth in area of the forty-eight states, and runs from year to year in the value of its agricultural products, between the third and sixth state. We are a state of farmers. Six million people outside the city of New York itself. Now with that area and with that important agricultural system, we come back to find out about its history, and we find that the state contains 30 million acres of land, and out of those thirty million acres three million are occupied by cities, towns and villages, and five million acres more represent state owned rough lands in the Adirondacks, lake areas, Catskill Mountains, etc., leaving a total of two million acres that fifty years ago were cultivated. Yet in these past fifty years, four million of those have been abandoned. Those figures apply to almost every other state east of the Mississippi in very much the same proportion. Every state has its problem of abandonment of farms, New England and most of the South, and more recently a larger part of the middle west.

Abandoned farms: People couldn't make a success of their lives on farms, so out of 22 million acres that once were farmed in the State of New York four million are already abandoned. In this survey, we believe we shall find another four million that ought to be abandoned. We have eighteen million acres in farms and we believe we ought not to have more than fourteen million. What will be the result of that, and how are we going about it?

Shall we depend on people to just follow the normal economic course? Shall we depend on them to voluntarily abandon these four million acres? Probably not. It should be accelerated by government action. I should say abandon four million acres more for the very good reason that on those four million acres are not making both ends meet. It is uneconomical for them to try to stay on year after year, tilling land that won't keep their families up to the American standard of living. And so the state is this year submitting to the voters a bond issue of some twenty millions of dollars for a comparatively short period of years, which will be used for these marginal lands. Some call them sub-marginal lands. The point is, in some way we have got to take those lands out of agriculture.

The other large waste is in maintaining highways up into these sparsely settled regions; highways that cost at least \$100 per year to per mile to maintain, highways that ought to have a lot more spent on them, highways going into sections where there are only two or three families to be served by five miles of road, and then think of the other economic wastes. If these people on this marginal land are to be brought up to our modern standards, they ought to have a telephone line, and that means running up a road for several miles to serve one, two or three families. They should have electric light on their farms, but if they could afford it, two or three farms might have to pay for four or five miles of poles and lines. So we figure that by the expenditure of a comparatively small sum which the state may put in the purchase of these marginal lands, the money will be returned to the economic wealth

of the state many times over in a comparatively short period.

Think of what it means in this problem of eliminating in so far as possible the one room school house. How many are there in this country? There are between 30,000 and 40,000 in the United States today, and in every state of the union we are working for the consolidation of school districts and the improvement of education. In the state of New York there are still thousands of one-room schoolhouses, and we believe that in this process of eliminating the marginal lands, we will be eliminating the one-room schoolhouses. Those are some of the advantages.

What is going to happen to the people on the land? That is always the question that is asked in the first place. Our survey so far shows that very largely these people are old people. Most of the young people have gotten out and moved off somewhere else. I do not believe that we ought to take these old people on these farms and remove them from the homes they were born in and were raised in and have lived all their lives in. It is entirely possible to let them live there the balance of their lives, it won't be long. What is ten or twenty years in the life of a community? But, we believe that after they are gone, to those impossible farms should be taken out of farming, and so with due regard for the feelings of these people, in the course of a generation, nearly all of these farms will be abandoned as such.

Then there will be other people, and provision can probably be made through cooperative methods for them to move to land where they can make a living. That is just a rough picture

of that part of our plan.

But let me mention what will have to be done with four million acres. Of course, it has two or three possibilities. First, for the growing of a long-term crop - trees, and everybody who is in a position to know something of our forestation problem, knows we will need all the trees we can get in the next fifty years. A large part of this marginal land can and ought to be turned into forest land.

Then another phase that we have taken up in practically every state; the recreation value of these lands, giving an opportunity to the city dweller to get out into the country, recreation that is extending every year, that a few years ago was limited to the months of July and August, that has extended now to a point earlier in the spring and lasting way on through the autumn, and more and more is beginning to develop into an all year round happening. We have somewhere around three million acres in state parks, a system of state parks in every part of the state. Just as an example let us note the use of the state parks for the past five years in the Adirondac reservation, which has been used every year by twice the number of people that have used it the year before. The use has doubled each year for five years. People are becoming out-door-minded all over the nation. The result of all this, we believe, is going to bring up a new class in our civilization.

We have talked a great deal about the country-dweller and about the city-dweller. Isn't there a third possibility, a possibility for us to create by cooperative effort some form of living which will combine industry and agriculture? Today states

are looking at it from two angles. For instance in Pennsylvania with the idea of bringing agriculture to industry. In the coal mining town, in the town with the steel plant or factory, they are trying to locate their operators and employees out a little way, a mile or two, where each one can have in place of two or three rooms in a four-family house, a house of his own with maybe an acre of land, giving them a chance to raise some of their own food supply.

In Vermont they are working through a state commission to bring industry to agriculture. Dr. Taylor up there has written the report of an investigation of an experiment in a valley up in Vermont, where most people were leaving the valley. There came back to that valley some ten or fifteen years ago, a boy who had left it twenty years earlier, and had become wealthy. He came back there and he found that the young people were leaving the valley and that the old people were discouraged. They were trying to farm the thin soil up on the mountain side; that the people were just dying out. What did he do? He looked over this valley and found there was some fine second growth of hard wood and no market for it. Then he conceived the idea of putting in a little turning mill and then he went out to Sears-Roebuck and said, "What do you need in the way of wood contraptions that can be made at our turning mill?" "We need those little round knobs that go on the tops of kettles and lids of pans," they said. The result was that he entered into a contract for making, I don't know how many millions of these things. He went back and said to the people, "I am going to open up my factory after you get your corn in."

When the corn was harvested, he opened up his factory and gave employment to that valley in two ways. He told them he needed so many lengths of this hard wood, and he said he needed to employ so many of those people, and he paid them cash, and they had a cash crop of kettle knobs.

The result has been that the young people are staying, When the planting time comes in the spring, the kettle knob factory closes down. Then up there in the summer time, after the hay is in and before the corn ripens, there is always a period in August when things are dull, and the little old factory opens up again and they get two or three weeks more of cash crops. That is one example.

We have many in this country and more than are being tried out. I am hoping that in everyone of our states, we shall be able to do some experimenting in these coming years, with the creation of a new group in our civilization. We may call them the rural-industries. We may call them the factory-farmers, one simple term that will connote just that position of keeping people on the land with agriculture as what you might call their roots way down in the ground, and at the same time some safety during the long months of the winter season for them to earn some kind of cash wages. It will make our whole nation individual and independent. It will open vast areas and at the same time, by state planning, by eliminating the marginal lands, the lands that are still left in agriculture will be more useful and will be worth cultivating.

Then we come to one final subject that I want to pass over quite rapidly. The question of regional planning. Let me illustrate. When I first started going down to Warm Springs in Georgia, there came through at night on the railroad a very noisy long train, about three a.m. It was always on time, five minutes to three, and they said it was the milk train. "Where to," I asked. "To Florida" they told me. That train of eighteen or twenty cars, run on passenger schedule, most of them glass tank cars, carrying south the milk cream supply for Miami, Palm Beach and all other resorts down there. I said, "Where does it come from?" "It comes from Wisconsin." That milk originating in Wisconsin, Northern Illinois, was passing through Kentucky, which certainly can grow milk, passing through the corner of Tennessee, and passing through the length of Georgia, absolutely eliminating the three states they passed through as sources of supply for the Florida market. This is the result of a lack of planning more than anything else. There is no reason why the State of Georgia shouldn't furnish all of the milk and cream for the State of Florida.

We are doing something in the State of New York, which I must admit is of doubtful constitutionality. The citizens of New York outside of New York City, with a population of six million people, and another two million people in the nearby state of New Jersey make a population of eight million people raising a lot of milk and cream. The New York State dairy farmers up to three years ago were going broke. Something had to be done, and the principle concern was this: that a great many farmers out in the central western states of Ohio, Indiana,

Illinois, Wisconsin and part of Iowa had gotten a little tired of raising corn and wheat and were trying to diversify. Therefore, they bought some cows, any old kind of cows so long as they gave milk, uninspected, of course. They started shipping milk, and because it was a by-product of their farms it was produced cheaply. We called it bootleg milk, and it was, It was not what you would call seasoned, aged, inspected, or anything else. The result was that our own farmers were being put out of business, although our own farmers under the state laws had to maintain the highest kind of sanitary requirements on their farms. Then we did our unconstitutional act.

We got the Health Commissioner of New York City first to lay down the simple rule that no milk could come into New York unless it came from inspected cows, and inspected sources, milk that came from cows that had been tested against tuberculosis, milk that was inspected and met all requirements. But, the second part was pretty hard on some people, we have got to admit that. He then said, "I am very sorry, gentlemen, but I have only so many inspectors. They can't be running all over the country, out to Wisconsin and states in the middle west. They have to cover a field which is of a practical size, so I am awfully sorry, we cannot send down Mr. Palmer to Illinois to inspect your farm. We cover the state of New York and a few thousand acres in Northern New Jersey, a few thousand acres of Southern Pennsylvania and a few thousand acres of Western Vermont. That became by that act, the milk-shed of the metropolitan area, lived in by about eight million people. The result is that at

last we have the milk farmer in that area cooperating, and they have been told the exact situation in respect to supply and demand. They may be told one year that we are producing too much milk and not to grow too many cows. So far the experiment has been going on for three or four years and is past the stage of experiment. Nobody would say that the dairy farmers of this region are getting rich, but at least we can say they are keeping their farms. They are not having the mortgages foreclosed, and they are making an honest living and getting fair prices for their product, and they are not getting an excessive price from the point of view of the public. That is one case where regional planning has worked, and there is no state that that principle should not be extended to.

We have heard about the port of Norfolk. It is not merely a municipal enterprise. The development affects a very definite area in this region. We are doing a little today in the way of discouraging shipments of large quantities of produce to New York. Here is an instance. There comes a time every year when during a period of three or four days, the whole United States decides, by mental telepathy, that they are going to ship their cabbages to New York, and if the whole eight million people were to eat corned beef and cabbage three times a day, they would not be able to eat the supply. The result is that every single year, carload after carload of cabbages, which we cannot allow to lay around and rot on the piers (for we have some sanitary regulations) are dumped into barges, and taken out, I think now to the twelve-mile limit, and either dropped overboard there or fed to the people who live

just outside that twelve-mile limit.

Two or more years ago I was willed some fifteen thousand peach trees down in Georgia, and I tried being a farmer down there. Last year, I cut down eleven thousand out of the fifteen thousand trees and started to raise cattle. The reason is that apparently five or six years ago, every other owner of land in Georgia decided to grow peach trees. I made a perfectly magnificent crop of peaches down there, growth after growth, and if I had shipped them to the main markets in the big Northern Cities, I would have made a net loss of 15 cents to 20 cents on a crate, over and above the cost of picking, packing, and shipping. In the same way in many parts of this country, I believe, they went pecan mad, and the result is there are so many pecans grown now that they are feeding them to the hogs. This is all due to a lack of planning.

It seems to me that with all our ability, our vaunted wealth, we have not kept pace with the needs of the time. The waste that has come about on account of lack of planning in this country has run into billions of dollars. Probably billions each year that goes by, and there is still the social side of it to consider.

Have we, because of the absence of planning, not wasted much of the goodness and sun in the lives of the youth of the country? Have not they been debased not only in our cities, but also in many of our rural communities? Have they not been pressed in surroundings and circumstances which have led them into ways that were something new to our civilization? Have we older

people been fair? Have we given them the chance, economically or socially, as we should have done? It seems to me that in this coming day, call it what you want, call it planning, or call it thinking hard, we have an opportunity in our own locality and community and county in our own state, to do what is not merely a good thing to do, but to do what is a common sense thing about the generation that is coming after.

That, after all, is the simple way of describing the plan. What are we going to hand on to those who come later. That is a task that a few of us older people are working on, but a task of such interest that contains so many elements of guessing right, so many elements of chance, of trying to catch the lucky number and work the thing out in a way that will be successful, that it seems to me the young generation today have got not merely the greatest chance that any generation has had in other times. We can't all be right on what is going to happen anywhere here or hereafter. We can't guess definitely on the future. Some people will take their conclusions according to a formula. The gentleman who came out of the middle west to see me, I said to him, "How are things in your state?" "Looking up," he said, "Really! How do you figure they are looking up. You are one of the few people who have given me so optimistic a report." "It is absolutely inevitable," he said. "Things are flat on their back now, and they must be looking up."

Address by Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York on State Planning

Round Table on REGIONALISM - Monday, July 6, 1931

---

I did not come here with any prepared speech this morning. I came to present to you very informally a subject that is very close to all of our hearts, a subject which I think needs and deserves much public and private discussion and needs and requires perhaps just as few formal public addresses as possible. It seems particularly appropriate that we at the University should be discussing plans, for the great planner of our nation, the first planner, was the father of the university; an architect of buildings, an architect of industry, and most of all an architect of government. And yet, after the age of Thomas Jefferson, it seems to me that our nation as a whole, and our several states forgot architecture in the sense in which it had been used and practiced by Thomas Jefferson, and it is only in the last generation, our generation that we have returned to thoughts of planning for the days to come.

Like Mr. Brownlow, I do not know what "Regionalism" means. I do have certain fairly clear ideas in respect to the relative spheres of governments of states on the one hand and Federal government on the other hand. Let me cite some of the instances I call planning of any kind.

I think we are apt very often to run after false gods in this country, to take up some "ism" and assume that in a generation or two that they are going to be so different from ourselves that we must scrap everything tried and familiar. One of the most eminent chemists of this country said to me "It will be only another generation before there will be no more farms in the United States." I said "No more farms?" and he said "I may modify that. There will be probably one tenth of the present farm areas cultivated in the next generation. Ninety per cent will go out of agricultural production. Why, the next generation will be eating synthetic food." Then he drew the most delightful picture of synthetic food.

Getting up in the morning you will go to the mantle shelf. While you are shaving and bathing, you take up a bottle of pills marked "Poached Eggs" and you take up another bottle of pills marked "Toast" and you take one poached egg pill and one toast pill, and nowadays there would probably be a "Cup of Coffee" pill. Even science is apt to outrun itself, and I take it that in the next generation we will still be eating real eggs and real toast, and by the same token we will still have our farms in this country.

But, there are problems that have come to life and that do require the most fundamental kind of thought. We are told by many social experts today that the size of cities is getting to a point where they are no longer economic for human beings to live in. You and I know of examples where industries have declined to go in some of the larger cities of our nation and have preferred to

locate their plants in smaller communities. And in the same way we are beginning to wonder whether this movement of leaving the farm and going to the great city is ever coming to an end. Of course it has got to come to an end, because the point is approaching where it can go on no longer. It was only, I think two or three generations ago, somewhere around 1850, that 75 per cent of Americans lived in rural communities and 25 per cent were urban, and yet today those figures are completely reversed. Seventy-five per cent of the people of the United States are in urban and only 25 per cent rural, and we have looked with fear to the point where 100 per cent would be urban. Of course, that is an impossible figure to arrive at, and I am inclined to the belief that we have reached very nearly the saturation point of urban population. This means that one of our first efforts in meeting the problem of maintaining a proper balance between city life and country life is to be made according to the old formula, "Make country life more attractive." In many of the states much has been done to survey conditions. In a few states, New York and two others, I think, definite efforts have been made to find out the facts about land.

I can best illustrate the point that I am coming to by using as an example what has been definitely accomplished by the state of New York during the past three years.

First from the point of view of government, in other words, taxes. The burden upon the rural communities was so heavy that something had to be done to relieve the country community from this overburden of taxes. That was accomplished by a series of laws. Under the old plan, not only in the State of New York

but in other states the rule followed seemed to be when it came to the question of state contribution to local needs, they followed the old maxim "To him that hath shall be given." In one of our counties, for example, where the land values were high, a county near New York city, where the assessed values ran from \$2000 and \$3000 to \$5000 an acre, the order was for the state to contribute as high as \$1500 and \$1800 per mile of town road, whereas the great bulk of our counties up-State New York counties, the state contributed as low as \$25 and \$30 per mile of highway, and so our first effort was to correct this system. In highways and taxes and education and various other ways, we have made the lot of the rural dweller more equitable.

Then following that program, we saw perhaps the possibility of outlining a plan for the state as based upon the land unit, for after all in this country and in the nation from which most of our people came, the fundamental unit is the unit of land. So, we have taken a survey of land within the state, and a couple of other states are doing the same thing, trying to find out the facts. The one thing that impresses me is the lack of facts, not merely facts which let us see the work of the late Wickersham committee, but facts relating to almost every other phase of life. One reason that we are not proceeding further with the crime problem is that we do not know any of the facts regarding crime. So one of our first efforts on the question of population and land was together facts. We have surveyed, for example, one of our rural counties and we find in that one county that 22 per cent of all the land now being cultivated ought not to be cultivated. So we are

extending that survey through all of the counties to determine what should be the use of land.

Let me give you some very simple figures. As Mr. Brownlow suggested, the State of New York is not merely the city of New York. The state is twenty-ninth in area of the forty-eight states, and runs from year to year in the value of its agricultural products, between the third and sixth state. We are a state of farmers. Six million people outside the city of New York itself. Now with that area and with that important agricultural system, we come back to find out about its history, and we find that the state contains 30 million acres of land, and out of those thirty million acres three million are occupied by cities, towns and villages, and five million acres more represent state owned rough lands in the Adirondacks, lake areas, Catskill Mountains, etc., leaving a total of two million acres that fifty years ago were cultivated. Yet in these past fifty years, four million of those have been abandoned. Those figures apply to almost every other state east of the Mississippi in very much the same proportion. Every state has its problem of abandonment of farms, New England and most of the South, and more recently a larger part of the middle west.

Abandoned farms: People couldn't make a success of their lives on farms, so out of 22 million acres that once were farmed in the State of New York four million are already abandoned. In this survey, we believe we shall find another four million that ought to be abandoned. We have eighteen million acres in farms and we believe we ought not to have more than fourteen million. What will be the result of that, and how are we going about it?

Shall we depend on people to just follow the normal economic course? Shall we depend on them to voluntarily abandon these four million acres? Probably not. It should be accelerated by government action. I should say abandon four million acres more for the very good reason that on those four million acres are not making both ends meet. It is uneconomical for them to try to stay on year after year, tilling land that won't keep their families up to the American standard of living. And so the state is this year submitting to the voters a bond issue of some twenty millions of dollars for a comparatively short period of years, which will be used for these marginal lands. Some call them sub-marginal lands. The point is, in some way we have got to take those lands out of agriculture.

The other large waste is in maintaining highways up into these sparsely settled regions; highways that cost at least \$100 per year to per mile to maintain, highways that ought to have a lot more spent on them, highways going into sections where there are only two or three families to be served by five miles of road, and then think of the other economic wastes. If these people on this marginal land are to be brought up to our modern standards, they ought to have a telephone line, and that means running up a road for several miles to serve one, two or three families. They should have electric light on their farms, but if they could afford it, two or three farms might have to pay for four or five miles of poles and lines. So we figure that by the expenditure of a comparatively small sum which the state may put in the purchase of these marginal lands, the money will be returned to the economic wealth

of the state many times over in a comparatively short period.

Think of what it means in this problem of eliminating in so far as possible the one room school house. How many are there in this country? There are between 30,000 and 40,000 in the United States today, and in every state of the union we are working for the consolidation of school districts and the improvement of education. In the state of New York there are still thousands of one-room schoolhouses, and we believe that in this process of eliminating the marginal lands, we will be eliminating the one-room schoolhouses. Those are some of the advantages.

What is going to happen to the people on the land? That is always the question that is asked in the first place. Our survey so far shows that very largely these people are old people. Most of the young people have gotten out and moved off somewhere else. I do not believe that we ought to take these old people on these farms and remove them from the homes they were born in and were raised in and have lived all their lives in. It is entirely possible to let them live there the balance of their lives, it won't be long. What is ten or twenty years in the life of a community? But, we believe that after they are gone, to those impossible farms should be taken out of farming, and so with due regard for the feelings of these people, in the course of a generation, nearly all of these farms will be abandoned as such.

Then there will be other people, and provision can probably be made through cooperative methods for them to move to land where they can make a living. That is just a rough picture

of that part of our plan.

But let me mention what will have to be done with four million acres. Of course, it has two or three possibilities. First, for the growing of a long-term crop - trees, and everybody who is in a position to know something of our forestation problem, knows we will need all the trees we can get in the next fifty years. A large part of this marginal land can and ought to be turned into forest land.

Then another phase that we have taken up in practically every state; the recreation value of these lands, giving an opportunity to the city dweller to get out into the country, recreation that is extending every year, that a few years ago was limited to the months of July and August, that has extended now to a point earlier in the spring and lasting way on through the autumn, and more and more is beginning to develop into an all year round happening. We have somewhere around three million acres in state parks, a system of state parks in every part of the state. Just as an example let us note the use of the state parks for the past five years in the Adirondac reservation, which has been used every year by twice the number of people that have used it the year before. The use has doubled each year for five years. People are becoming out-door-minded all over the nation. The result of all this, we believe, is going to bring up a new class in our civilization.

We have talked a great deal about the country-dweller and about the city-dweller. Isn't there a third possibility, a possibility for us to create by cooperative effort some form of living which will combine industry and agriculture? Today states

are looking at it from two angles. For instance in Pennsylvania with the idea of bringing agriculture to industry. In the coal mining town, in the town with the steel plant or factory, they are trying to locate their operators and employees out a little way, a mile or two, where each one can have in place of two or three rooms in a four-family house, a house of his own with maybe an acre of land, giving them a chance to raise some of their own food supply.

In Vermont they are working through a state commission to bring industry to agriculture. Dr. Taylor up there has written the report of an investigation of an experiment in a valley up in Vermont, where most people were leaving the valley. There came back to that valley some ten or fifteen years ago, a boy who had left it twenty years earlier, and had become wealthy. He came back there and he found that the young people were leaving the valley and that the old people were discouraged. They were trying to farm the thin soil up on the mountain side; that the people were just dying out. What did he do? He looked over this valley and found there was some fine second growth of hard wood and no market for it. Then he conceived the idea of putting in a little turning mill and then he went out to Sears-Roebuck and said, "What do you need in the way of wood contraptions that can be made at our turning mill?" "We need those little round knobs that go on the tops of kettles and lids of pans," they said. The result was that he entered into a contract for making, I don't know how many millions of these things. He went back and said to the people, "I am going to open up my factory after you get your corn in."

When the corn was harvested, he opened up his factory and gave employment to that valley in two ways. He told them he needed so many lengths of this hard wood, and he said he needed to employ so many of those people, and he paid them cash, and they had a cash crop of kettle knobs.

The result has been that the young people are staying. When the planting time comes in the spring, the kettle knob factory closes down. Then up there in the summer time, after the hay is in and before the corn ripens, there is always a period in August when things are dull, and the little old factory opens up again and they get two or three weeks more of cash crops. That is one example.

We have many in this country and more than are being tried out. I am hoping that in everyone of our states, we shall be able to do some experimenting in these coming years, with the creation of a new group in our civilization. We may call them the rural-industries. We may call them the factory-farmers, one simple term that will connote just that position of keeping people on the land with agriculture as what you might call their roots way down in the ground, and at the same time some safety during the long months of the winter season for them to earn some kind of cash wages. It will make our whole nation individual and independent. It will open vast areas and at the same time, by state planning, by eliminating the marginal lands, the lands that are still left in agriculture will be more useful and will be worth cultivating.

Then we come to one final subject that I want to pass over quite rapidly. The question of regional planning. Let me illustrate. When I first started going down to Warm Springs in Georgia, there came through at night on the railroad a very noisy long train, about three a.m. It was always on time, five minutes to three, and they said it was the milk train. "Where to," I asked. "To Florida" they told me. That train of eighteen or twenty cars, run on passenger schedule, most of them glass tank cars, carrying south the milk cream supply for Miami, Palm Beach and all other resorts down there. I said, "Where does it come from?" "It comes from Wisconsin." That milk originating in Wisconsin, Northern Illinois, was passing through Kentucky, which certainly can grow milk, passing through the corner of Tennessee, and passing through the length of Georgia, absolutely eliminating the three states they passed through as sources of supply for the Florida market. This is the result of a lack of planning more than anything else. There is no reason why the State of Georgia shouldn't furnish all of the milk and cream for the State of Florida.

We are doing something in the State of New York, which I must admit is of doubtful constitutionality. The citizens of New York outside of New York City, with a population of six million people, and another two million people in the nearby state of New Jersey make a population of eight million people raising a lot of milk and cream. The New York State dairy farmers up to three years ago were going broke. Something had to be done, and the principle concern was this: that a great many farmers out in the central western states of Ohio, Indiana,

Illinois, Wisconsin and part of Iowa had gotten a little tired of raising corn and wheat and were trying to diversify. Therefore, they bought some cows, any old kind of cows so long as they gave milk, uninspected, of course. They started shipping milk, and because it was a by-product of their farms it was produced cheaply. We called it bootleg milk, and it was, It was not what you would call seasoned, aged, inspected, or anything else. The result was that our own farmers were being put out of business, although our own farmers under the state laws had to maintain the highest kind of sanitary requirements on their farms. Then we did our unconstitutional act.

We got the Health Commissioner of New York City first to lay down the simple rule that no milk could come into New York unless it came from inspected cows, and inspected sources, milk that came from cows that had been tested against tuberculosis, milk that was inspected and met all requirements. But, the second part was pretty hard on some people, we have got to admit that. He then said, "I am very sorry, gentlemen, but I have only so many inspectors. They can't be running all over the country, out to Wisconsin and states in the middle west. They have to cover a field which is of a practical size, so I am awfully sorry, we cannot send down Mr. Palmer to Illinois to inspect your farm. We cover the state of New York and a few thousand acres in Northern New Jersey, a few thousand acres of Southern Pennsylvania and a few thousand acres of Western Vermont. That became by that act, the milk-shed of the metropolitan area, lived in by about eight million people. The result is that at

last we have the milk farmer in that area cooperating, and they have been told the exact situation in respect to supply and demand. They may be told one year that we are producing too much milk and not to grow too many cows. So far the experiment has been going on for three or four years and is past the stage of experiment. Nobody would say that the dairy farmers of this region are getting rich, but at least we can say they are keeping their farms. They are not having the mortgages foreclosed, and they are making an honest living and getting fair prices for their product, and they are not getting an excessive price from the point of view of the public. That is one case where regional planning has worked, and there is no state that that principle should not be extended to.

We have heard about the port of Norfolk. It is not merely a municipal enterprise. The development affects a very definite area in this region. We are doing a little today in the way of discouraging shipments of large quantities of produce to New York. Here is an instance. There comes a time every year when during a period of three or four days, the whole United States decides, by mental telepathy, that they are going to ship their cabbages to New York, and if the whole eight million people were to eat corned beef and cabbage three time aday, they would not be able to eat the supply. The result is that every single year, carload after carload of cabbages, which we cannot allow to lay around and rot on the piers (for we have some sanitary regulations) are dumped into barges, and taken out, I think now to the twelve-mile limit, and either dropped overboard there or fed to the people who live

just outside that twelve-mile limit.

Two or more years ago I was willed some fifteen thousand peach trees down in Georgia, and I tried being a farmer down there. Last year, I cut down eleven thousand out of the fifteen thousand trees and started to raise cattle. The reason is that apparently five or six years ago, every other owner of land in Georgia decided to grow peach trees. I made a perfectly magnificent crop of peaches down there, growth after growth, and if I had shipped them to the main markets in the big Northern Cities, I would have made a net loss of 15 cents to 20 cents on a crate, over and above the cost of picking, packing, and shipping. In the same way in many parts of this country, I believe, they went pecan mad, and the result is there are so many pecans grown now that they are feeding them to the hogs. This is all due to a lack of planning.

It seems to me that with all our ability, our vaunted wealth, we have not kept pace with the needs of the time. The waste that has come about on account of lack of planning in this country has run into billions of dollars. Probably billions each year that goes by, and there is still the social side of it to consider.

Have we, because of the absence of planning, not wasted much of the goodness and sun in the lives of the youth of the country? Have not they been debased not only in our cities, but also in many of our rural communities? Have they not been pressed in surroundings and circumstances which have led them into ways that were something new to our civilization? Have we older

people been fair? Have we given them the chance, economically or socially, as we should have done? It seems to me that in this coming day, call it what you want, call it planning, or call it thinking hard, we have an opportunity in our own locality and community and county in our own state, to do what is not merely a good thing to do, but to do what is a common sense thing about the generation that is coming after.

That, after all, is the simple way of describing the plan. What are we going to hand on to those who come later. That is a task that a few of us older people are working on, but a task of such interest that contains so many elements of guessing right, so many elements of chance, of trying to catch the lucky number and work the thing out in a way that will be successful, that it seems to me the young generation today have got not merely the greatest chance that any generation has had in other times. We can't all be right on what is going to happen anywhere here or hereafter. We can't guess definitely on the future. Some people will take their conclusions according to a formula. The gentleman who came out of the middle west to see me, I said to him, "How are things in your state?" "Looking up," he said, "Really! How do you figure they are looking up. You are one of the few people who have given me so optimistic a report." "It is absolutely inevitable," he said. "Things are flat on their back now, and they must be looking up."

Before Round Table, University of Virginia, Charlottesville,  
Virginia, July 6, 1931

*Excessive Cost of Local Government.*

p. 743

The cost of government in this country, particularly that of local government, is causing considerable concern. We are told that the aggregate expenditure of federal, state and local government is approximately twelve or thirteen billion dollars yearly. Of this sum the federal government spends approximately one-third, state governments about 13 per cent, leaving considerably more than one-half as the cost of local government. Notwithstanding the influence of the war on federal governmental expenditures these ratios have existed, with slight variations, since 1890. It is manifest that inasmuch as the cost of local government constitutes the major portion of our aggregate tax bill, we must, if we hope for lower taxes or less rapid increases in taxes, analyze local government and see if its workings may not be simplified and made less expensive for the taxpayers.

The form of local county and town government as we know it in most of our states dates back to the Duke of York's laws, enacted about 1670. The design was to meet conditions as they existed at the time and was continued by American states after the Revolutionary War. It is astonishing how few changes have been made in the form since the formation of our nation. We may assume that at the time of its adoption it was suited to the conditions of that period. You will recall that no steamboats, railroads, telephones, telegraphs, motor vehicles or good roads were in existence. Means

of transportation and communication were meager. The swiftest methods of travel or of communication were the saddle horse, the stagecoach and the canal.

Sometimes we refer to that age as the "horse and buggy age." Perhaps it would be more accurate to describe it as the "ox-cart age." We had no urban centers,—only a few overgrown villages. Our population was almost exclusively rural. In those days at least eight out of every ten workers obtained a living by tilling the soil. The people lived in small territorial groups and led local community lives. They subsisted almost entirely on the things which they produced or which were produced by others in their locality. A town form of government was the natural form. It suited the conditions of the time.

Moreover, the need for governmental service was not extensive. Trails met the need of the limited inter-community travel where expensive motor routes are now necessary. Little attention was given to public health. There might be a village pump, but otherwise each citizen took care of his own water supply, and drainage and garbage disposal were family concerns. At first police and fire protection were not considered municipal functions. Every community made provision for its own poor. An education in the three R's was deemed sufficient for the average child.

But conditions have changed. We have witnessed a most remarkable growth in population and an astonishing transformation in social and economic conditions. Factory production and a high degree of specialization even in our agriculture have kept step with improved methods of transportation and communication, with the result that community living on the old pattern has vanished. Instead of producing for our own families and neighbors to consume, we are putting our thought and labor on products that go to distant cities and states and even to foreign lands. We clothe ourselves in the fabrics of distant factories, we build our homes of materials transported perhaps thousands of miles and our food is collected from the four corners of our own continent and from all the other continents and the seas of all the world.

Our population, too, has become in part transient. We follow the call of industry, of ambition or of whim from community to community and from state to state. It is not only in the newer regions of America that the old resident may find himself in the minority. The personnel and even the character of the population in any village in one of our older states may change within a few years. Every village and every city and every community is made up of rapidly shifting groups whose members are units in a national economic and social scheme rather than fixed residents of any community. The untraveled person has become comparatively a rarity.

Things which originally were of local or community concern are now of much wider interest. This applies, as you will readily agree, to such things as roads, schools, public health, the care of the socially dependent and virtually every activity of local government. Yet we have continued to use the machine designed under radically different conditions as the major instrument through which to sell governmental service in this age of bewildering movement.

Let us inspect the machinery of local government as it exists today. In this country of ours we have, it is said, 500,000 units of government. They range from the federal government down to the smallest school or special district. Take my own state as an instance. We have, first, sixty-two counties and sixty cities, but this is a mere beginning. We go on from these larger wheels of the machine to find 932 towns, and according to the last count, 525 villages, 9,600 school districts and 2,365 fire, water, lighting, sewer and sidewalk districts, a grand total of 13,544 separate, independent governmental units. Carrying the analysis a step further let me cite an example: a small, densely populated suburban county adjacent to New York city where we have three towns and two cities. Again, that is only a start. To these we must add forty villages, forty-four school districts and one hundred and fifty-six special districts in order to understand how complicated the local governmental problem in that county really is—a total of 246 governmental units in one county.

The expenditures of local government have increased at an astonishing rate. In 1890 local government in the entire nation cost \$487,000,000. In 1927, the last year for which complete figures are available, the government of lesser units within states cost \$9,454,000,000. It increased from a per capita of \$7.73 in 1890 to \$54.41 in 1927. Just that you may see what has happened in a small unit such as a county, let me say that in the suburban county to which I have referred, all local taxes in 1900 amounted to \$337,000 and in 1929, in round figures, \$22,000,000. In that space of time the valuation of taxable property increased thirty-five times, but the taxes increased sixty-five times, while population multiplied only five and one-half times. In another case, that of a rural, agricultural county, local taxes amounted to \$159,000 in 1900 and to \$1,150,000 in 1929. In this case taxes were multiplied seven times, tax valuations slightly more than two times, while the population of the county actually decreased 5 per cent. In the suburban county per capita local taxes in 1900 were six dollars and in the rural county four dollars and thirty cents. But by 1929 per capita taxes were ninety dollars in the suburban county and fifty-two dollars in the rural community. These figures demonstrate, first, the very rapid growth in the cost of rural government; second, that such growth was very much more rapid than the increase in either taxable wealth or population, and, third, it presents sharply the question whether we are obtaining our money's worth through this method of buying governmental service.

These conditions have presented in my State—and I think similar problems are present in every State—the question of how to finance local government. In the main, local government must depend for its revenue upon a general property tax. To a very great extent that tax has degenerated into a tax on real estate only, and as local expenditures have increased the tax on real estate has mounted. In the two counties to which I have referred the tax rates ranged in the suburban county in 1900 from fourteen to seventeen dollars per thousand and in the rural county from seven to twenty-one dollars per thousand. In 1929 the suburban county rates ranged from twenty-four to forty-six dollars, while the rates in the rural county were from twenty-five to fifty-four dollars.

The increase in taxes on farm real estate indicates in a striking way the increases in taxation that have occurred and the added burden which this places upon agriculture. Here are some illustrations from New York State.

On a selected group of good farms, taxes just doubled in the period from 1914 to 1923. During the same period the general price level increased only 27 per cent. In another case on three farms in an average agricultural county of the State where records are available for 100 years, the increases in taxes from 1825 to 1925 were as follows:

Farm No. 1, from \$2.48 to \$101.44  
Farm No. 2, from \$2.33 to \$140.36  
Farm No. 3, from \$2.38 to \$115.20

These are typical of increases on several other farms where records are available. This is perhaps the most graphic method of showing the increase on farm property.

On the same group of farms mentioned above, it required three bushels of wheat on the average to pay the taxes on one farm in 1825. In 1925, it required 104 bushels of wheat. In other words, the tax burden per farm on the average of six farms increased in 100 years from three bushels of wheat to 104 bushels of wheat. On these same six farms it required at the going rates for labor six days of labor to pay for the taxes per farm in 1825, and 37 days of labor per farm in 1925.

Taxes bear more heavily upon the poor farms than upon the good farms. In one township where approximately 40 per cent of the farms were abandoned, the taxes averaged 3.4 per cent of the real value of the farms. On six farms in that township the taxes were over 10 per cent of what the farmer considered to be the market value of his farm. Many other figures could be cited from our available farm cost data to indicate similar changes that have taken place in farm taxes.

Accompanying these increases in local rates has been an increasing demand for relief of the burden on real estate. A study was made in New York of the trend in the tax burden on real property, covering a period from 1915 to 1927. That study disclosed that in the wealthy, growing counties of the State the true burden on realty increased 16½ per cent in those twelve years, while in the rural, agricultural counties the increase in the burden was 43 per cent. This established to our satisfaction that something must be done to equalize the burden of taxation as between different counties and communities. Various remedies were suggested, which grouped themselves as follows:

1. To abolish the direct State tax on real estate and personal property;
2. To share with localities State-collected taxes;
3. To grant State aid; and
4. To reorganize local governments, or at least transfer from local government to larger units of administration some of the functions now performed locally.

In New York we have invoked all of these methods except that of reorganizing or simplifying local government. That has been advocated by my distinguished predecessors in office and by me. As yet nothing has been accomplished in that direction. The Legislature for various reasons has almost wholly neglected or refused to act on any of the proposals either to simplify local government or to make a comprehensive study of local government, looking toward improvements. For instance, based upon the report of a commission of eminent health authorities, I urged the enactment of a law this year which would establish the county as the unit for health administration, thereby reducing from more than one thousand to about one hundred the number of health administrative units. I believed the service would be improved, the public health better protected, more efficient use of the tax dollar obtained and discrimination against the rural population as compared with the urban population eliminated. That proposal was allowed to die in the Legislature. In another case I proposed to eliminate from the fee system for handling State aid for public education an expenditure of more than \$300,000 now being made under the present system in the form of a fee of 1 per cent paid to town supervisors for acting as intermediaries in the transfer of funds, and again the Legislature failed to approve.

One of the remedies proposed was to abolish the direct State tax on real and personal property. That we accomplished in New York during the first year of my first term. In that respect we followed Virginia's course established by your distinguished Governor Byrd. A second remedy that we have embraced in New York is that of sharing with the localities certain taxes collected by the State. During the last completed fiscal year the State returned to the various units of local government more than eighty-five million dollars as their share of taxes collected by the State. While I am on this point, let me say that this remedy is not without its dangers. I incline strongly to the view that it should be adopted only when some form of guaranty is exacted that the funds so distributed will be efficiently and economically used. Too frequently, I fear, do the local officials view revenue obtained in this way as "easy money" and spend it accordingly. I am convinced that it is not always used to reduce the general property tax. I am opposing the further development of this program in New York unless more adequate and complete guaranties are required of the sub-divisions that the funds will be distributed so as actually to reduce the local tax burden—or to provide on an efficient basis for services really needed.

Still another remedy that New York has applied for the excessive local tax load is that of granting State aid to local government for specified projects and services. This year the State is appropriating one hundred million dollars for the aid of public schools, more than three million dollars for county highways and something more than four million dollars for town highways. More than one-third of the New York State budget consists of items of this form of aid to localities.

This method of relieving the local tax burden is subject to the same dangers as that of sharing taxes with the subdivisions of the State; it is apt to

lead to extravagance and to result in the inefficient use of money. As I see the situation under the present distribution of functions, State aid is essential in New York and probably the same conditions obtain in other American states. Too frequently, however, State aid is granted and the money turned over to the localities without requiring that its expenditure shall be subject to State supervision,—without exacting any guaranties that the aid so granted will be economically used or applied to reduce the local tax load. In this regard I think our New York system is lax, and I venture to believe that may be truthfully said of similar aid granted in other states.

Finally we come to the remedy of lightening the local tax burden by transferring from local government to the state government, or at least to a larger division of government, some functions of local government, that is to say, transferring the responsibility or the obligation to pay for certain improvements or governmental services. This method of local tax relief is rather extensively used in New York. After my election in 1928, I appointed a commission known as the Agricultural Advisory Commission. The purpose put before its distinguished members was to devise methods of assisting and promoting the interests of the rural population of the State, and of agriculture as an industry in the State and to see if and to what extent justice might be done by way of equalizing taxes as between the rural and the urban communities.

The first reform the commission recommended was that the State assume the entire cost of completing and maintaining the State highway system. Under the then existing law the counties were required to contribute thirty-five per cent of the cost of such highways and to pay approximately \$600,000 annually for their maintenance. It worked out this way: one of the wealthiest counties could pay its share of the cost of completing the State highway system by levying one tax of *thirty-seven cents* per thousand dollars of taxable valuation, while in a poor rural county a tax of *forty-six dollars* per thousand would have to be levied.

The recommendation of the commission was adopted. Thereby the State relieved the counties of an aggregate expenditure of fifty-four million dollars for construction, and an annual charge of six hundred thousand dollars for maintenance.

The next recommendation of the commission was based on the town highway or "dirt road" situation. The State had been granting State aid to the towns, but under a plan which permitted the wealthiest town in the State to obtain out of the State treasury fifteen hundred dollars for each mile of town highway, while the most that any one of six or seven hundred poor towns succeeded in obtaining was twenty-five dollars per mile. Tax rates for the maintenance of town highways ranged from a dollar or two to as high as sixteen or eighteen dollars per thousand of taxable valuation. The high taxes were invariably found in the poor rural towns.

To remedy this condition a law was enacted which provided in substance that no town need have a tax rate higher than three dollars per thousand and that the State would give to a town as State aid the difference between the proceeds of a three-mill levy and a sum needed to create a fund equal to one hundred dollars for each mile of town highway. You will readily see that this tended greatly to relieve excessive local taxation and also to equalize the burden of supporting the town highway system.

The commission then turned to rural schools. They found that school tax rates varied from one dollar to more than twenty dollars per thousand. As in the case of highway taxes, the very high rates were found to obtain in the rural, agricultural communities. The principal of equalization was invoked here with the result that rural schools in our State can now be supported adequately with a tax rate no higher than four dollars per thousand, the State contributing the difference between the proceeds of such a tax and a sum sufficient to maintain the schools.

Attention was then given to bridges in the State highway system. The State had required the counties to pay thirty-five per cent of the cost of all bridges in the State system. The commission proposed, and a law was enacted, pursuant to which the State assumed the entire cost of building

bridges and of maintaining them when constructed. This automatically relieved the counties from an expenditure of \$34,750,000, and to that extent eased local taxes.

In addition to these things the State relieved the counties of twenty million dollars for grade crossing eliminations; and engaged to pay one-half of the cost for snow removal.

I have mentioned these things that you may know of the effort we have made in New York to take from the subdivisions of the State the burden of excessive local taxation, and I think you will agree with me that we have gone a long way.

You will readily realize, however, that in our efforts thus far we have merely shifted from local government to the State government expenditures for these purposes. It is true that in some instances the State is certainly doing these things better and more economically than the localities would have done them, and in that way genuine economy has resulted. It is also true that through these measures we have gone far toward equalizing the tax load in New York State; but the fact remains that we are still supporting a complicated machine of local government which seems to me and to many others unreasonably expensive, wasteful and inefficient. In our effort thus far we have succeeded in reducing somewhat in the aggregate the cost of this elaborate machine. Is it not time that we should analyze this form of local government and see how far it is suited to the conditions of today. Think of it in this light if you will: No citizen of New York can live under less than four governments: Federal, State, county and city. If one lives in a town outside of a village, he is under five layers of government: Federal, State, county, town and school. If he lives in an incorporated village, another layer is added. If he lives in a town outside of the village, he may be in a fire, water, lighting, sewer and sidewalk district, in which case there are ten layers of government.

A citizen so situated has just too much governmental machinery to watch. It is too complicated for him to understand. He may not sense or realize that ten sets of officials are appropriating public funds, levying taxes and issuing bonds. His attention is not usually centered on local government, for seldom, if ever, does he know what sums are being appropriated, what taxes are being levied or what bonds issued. Means for gaining information concerning these things are altogether inadequate.

I question whether there is any real need for so many overlapping units of government. I incline strongly to the view that much can and will be accomplished by reorganizing and simplifying the machinery of local government.

Recently a comprehensive study of this problem was made in the State of North Carolina. The conclusion reached in the report of that survey is that a radical reorganization of local government is needed. It is intimated that county government is obsolete and that the county as a unit of administration may well be eliminated. It is conceded that it will take time to secure majority support for that proposal, and in the meantime it is urged that counties be consolidated and a greatly simplified form of county government be set up to replace present cumbersome forms and many officials. The report of a similar study in New Jersey reaches substantially the same conclusion.

I am quite convinced that the excessive cost of local government can most effectively be reduced by simplifying the local governmental organization and structure and by reallocating the responsibility for performing various services, according to a logical analysis rather than by accident or tradition. I think we need to consider each service and decide what administrative unit and what size unit can most effectively and economically perform that service. The smaller units of rural government are so unequal in wealth that some are unable to maintain satisfactory roads and schools even with excessively high tax rates, while others with very low rates are able to spend generously and even extravagantly. All overlapping of local jurisdictions should be abolished. I incline to agree with those who hold that one or at most two layers of local government, subordinates to the sovereignty of the state is adequate and that we ought seriously to undertake the radical reorganization and reallocation of functions necessary to accomplish the elimination of all others.

There remains to be mentioned another remedy for the excessive cost of local government—the controlling of local expenditures by State or district authority. It is familiarly referred to as the "Indiana plan". In that state ten or more taxpayers in a tax district may appeal to the state tax commission from the local budget or from a proposed bond issue. After hearing, the state tax commission may reduce the proposed appropriation or the amount for which bonds may be issued, or eliminate the item altogether.

Much can be said in favor of this method of controlling local expenditures. It has passed beyond the experimental stage in Indiana, and the information before me indicates it is supported by public sentiment. Colorado and New Mexico have modified forms of the Indiana plan. Ohio, Oklahoma and Oregon have adopted the idea, but the control is exercised through district boards. This general method of controlling the excessive cost of local government is worthy of consideration by the authorities of every state.

If you will permit me to be conservatively prophetic, I foresee in all of the states of the Union in coming years a progressively strengthening movement for reform of the local governmental scheme. It has already, I believe, been much too long delayed and this fact has cost us many an unnecessary dollar in taxation, and on the other hand has deprived us of improvements and services in the way of better protection of our lives and property and of better facilities for orderly, happy living that we might have had with the same expenditure.

We all of us recognize, I think, that much of the increase in the aggregate of governmental expense has been inevitable and necessary. Our limited glimpse today of the functions of local government has been sufficient to show that government has been quite properly called upon to assume an increasing number of responsibilities that once belonged to the individual and the family. In the same way the larger units of government have been properly and logically forced to assume functions that once belonged to the lesser units. The demands of a different sort of civilization and a different sort of national economy have forced us to redistribute the burdens which the public service imposes.

Roads, for instance, are no longer merely local facilities. They are avenues of communication and channels of necessary commerce between all communities of a state and between a state and its neighbors, close and distant. So we have been compelled to build them on a greater scale and to find new ways of meeting and distributing the cost as far as possible upon those who are benefited.

We face the question of education and we find a mandate from the state as sovereign that the children of all shall be given opportunities to learn. In fact it is more than a state mandate, for the American system of education is in fulfillment of a national purpose intimately associated with the great experiment in democracy we are still carrying on after the lapse of three centuries since our forefathers came here to undertake it and to pass the responsibilities on to us along with the inspired ideal which created them. The state's responsibility for education cannot be escaped by passing it on in one case to a city of teeming millions and in another to a dozen farmers scattered over miles of countryside. It is not solely on an altruistic basis that we consider the educational needs of the farm boy and girl as well as those of the tenement children in the city. The character and training of our fellow foot-loose Americans of the future are a matter of concern to us and to our descendants. They will have their part in making up the civilization in which we shall live a generation hence.

We are beginning to recognize, too, that the public health is more than a local responsibility. Disease knows nothing about town lines, no do health undertakers to inquire about local jurisdictions. Their carriers are on the public highways and riding in the railroad trains. If we care nothing about the fact that a farmer's children are dying of infection or malnutrition—and that can happen in the country, too—we can still give some thought to the weaklings and the sufferers whom we may have to support in some day not far off.

Crime ceased to be a local matter and the criminal adopted a state-wide or national range, if not a broader citizenship, long before we thought it

necessary to do anything about it. But that is a question too far-reaching to discuss here further than to say that, along with the general administration of justice and of penology and along with the care of the defective and the insane, the problem of crime has long since transcended the scope of petty jurisdictions. State sovereignty alone can cope with it, and that must be reinforced by better and more adequate and less antiquated means of cooperation between the states.

As to all these matters, I expect to see an increased measure of assumption of functions and responsibilities by the state, through one means or another. We have seen how the effort to equalize the tax burden has made the state the holder of the purse strings as to a large proportion of local expenditures. This creates a responsibility for wise expenditure that can hardly be avoided by the state, in justice to those who have been taxed on a state-wide basis to replenish the state's treasury. This responsibility, it seems to me, is fairly certain to result in much closer and more authoritative supervision of all local expenditures. This will mean inevitably a closer integration of local authority with state-wide authority, based on the fact that as to many functions some competent state authority with expert staffs and state-wide information will possess both an advisory and a veto power over the use of funds for local expenditure.

It seems entirely logical that local authority must consolidate, eliminating many of the local government layers, in order to retain any appropriate measure of home rule over local affairs. Certainly the time has come to give serious consideration to the consolidation of a great many local jurisdictions of one kind and another.

I should like the privilege of stating as forcibly as I can one general conclusion that has long been in my mind. That is, that too many of us have been lazy-minded in this matter of government. We like to talk in large terms about the comparative advantages and defects of democracy and autocracy; we like to admire patriotically the work of our forefathers in devising our forms of government or to criticize them as too slavish imitators, but we are terribly dilatory in following our forefathers' example by seeking to plan and devise for our own immediate needs and for the future. Particularly, we hate the details of government. We talk about Russia's five-year plan and the excellence or iniquity of Mussolini's system, in preference to giving consideration of the question whether a town supervisor is good for anything or inquiring what a village health officer does to earn his pay. This may be because it is easier to form a judgment on matters that are more remote. I hate to think that it is because we prefer to have someone else form our judgments for us.

This suggests to me that those who hold public office should not be content merely to take the duties of their jobs as they find them and to carry them out according to precedent. Those who have had experience in operating the machine should be able to tell of its defects. I once heard of a public official who recommended that his job be abolished as useless. It would be a heartening and refreshing thing if there were a lot more like him.

We heard a great deal during the late war about the challenge to democracy and I think it was a good thing for our complacency to learn that democracy was being challenged. But I think too that democracy is being challenged today just as forcibly if not as clamorously. The challenge is heard right here among us from all who complain about the inefficiency, the stupidity and the expense of government. It may be read in the statistics of crime and seen in the ugliness of many of our communities. It is expressed in all the newspaper accounts of official graft and blundering. It is written on our tax rolls and even in the patriotic-seeming text books that our children study in their schools. It looms large on election day when voters see before them long lists of names of men and women of whom they have never heard to be voted upon as candidates for salaried offices of whose duties and functions the voter has but the haziest impression.

The men who addressed themselves to the task of laying the framework of our national government after freedom had been won, wrote down in enduring words that their aim was to form "a more perfect union." In writing that ideal into the preamble of the Constitution of the United States, I think

they set a task for us as well as for themselves. They were forming a new government, suited, as they believed, to the conditions of their day, but they were wise enough to look into the future and to recognize that the conditions of life and the demands upon government were bound to change as they had been changing through ages past, and so the plan of government that they prepared was made, not rigid, but flexible—adapted to change and to progress.

We cannot call ourselves either wise or patriotic if we seek to escape the responsibility of remolding government to make it more serviceable to all the people and more responsive to modern needs.

---