zenry. Sloppy, opportunistic thinking is simply inexcusable in the engineering world. I would be the last to suggest that the engineer abandon the precision of his thinking and his honesty in facing facts. I am merely asking that the same qualities be brought to bear insofar as possible on the more complex situations which have to do with living organisms and our social life.

In brief, then, we wish a wider and better controlled use of engineering and science to the end that man may have a much higher percentage of his energy left over to enjoy the things which are non-material and non-economic, and I would include in this not only music, painting, literature, and sport for sport's sake, but I would particularly include the idle curiosity of the scientist himself. Even the most enthusiastic engineers and scientists should be heartily desirous of bending their talents to serve these higher human ends. If the social will does not recognize these ends, at this particular stage in history, there is grave danger that Spengler may be proved right after all, and a thousand years hence a new civilization will be budding forth after this one has long laid fallow in a relative Middle Ages.

III: 1934

Prior to his entrance into public service, Wallace was at one with a vigorous pressure group, behind the McNary-Haugen bill. Some of the men who now came to put the heat on him, as Secretary, were his former associates. He had a friendly feeling in general toward the "farm leaders," but their excesses of zeal disturbed him; and certain of the Washington lobbyists exerted pressure in ways which Wallace soon came to consider no less than attempted "political blackmail."

Reviewing the first year of Agricultural Adjustment in his book, *New Frontiers,* "Congressmen, Senators and the people in administrative positions are fully familiar," Wallace reflected, "with the technique that we may call hot spots, pressure groups and news drives. But ninety-nine percent of the people who depend for their understanding on what they read would be amazed if they could see the method at first hand. The injudicious use of these methods may eventually cause the United States to follow Rome into history.

"Insofar as these methods are used to awaken a sleepy government to its fundamental responsibilities, there can be no sound criticism. Energetic, yet selfish people thinking solely about short-time or regional objectives put on

drive after drive. One of the most interesting political thunderstorms I ever watched was that which precipitated the five Northwestern Governors upon Washington in November, 1933. . . . They had allowed themselves to be persuaded of the practicality of price-fixing and they came down to Washington to put the Administration on the spot instead of themselves. . . .

"The Farm Holiday folks in the Middle West were rarin' to go. A judge was jerked off his bench and confronted with a rope. A lawyer from an insurance company which was about to foreclose on an Iowa farm was tarred and feathered. Harassed debtors, kindly folk driven to desperation, were bound and determined to hold onto their farms and homes, law or no law. These things happened, and many more. . . .

"The Administration could not condone the violence and the defiance of law, but it could and did understand it. Every farmer in danger of foreclosure was invited to write, wire or telephone the Farm Credit Administration in Washington. Farmers who had corn to sell were invited to apply for a government loan at forty-five cents a bushel on the farm, the corn to be placed under seal for disposal in 1934. And, finally, a corn-hog adjustment program involving $350,000,000 in benefit payments during 1934 and 1935 was at last ready for launching.

"By November the Corn Belt rebellion had begun to subside. It was possible once more to appeal to men's minds. . . . The thunderstorm had cleared the air. It was possible to explain why the emergency slaughter had to be followed by a complicated adjustment both in hog numbers and corn acreage in 1934, and to ask the help of thousands of volunteers in pushing this newest and hardest program."

His scheduled articles and addresses in 1934 numbered twenty-two, ten less than the total of 1933; but he published also in the course of the year three books. The first two were pamphlets of some 20,000 and 15,000 words respectively, derived entirely or in large part from speeches; the third, *New Frontiers,* was a full-length record of accomplishments, experiences, doubts and reflections, extending to 90,000 words.

The first pamphlet, *Statesmanship and Religion,* is in many ways the most valuable and revelatory of Wallace's published works. Published by the Round Table Press, New York, it is a rare book now, but still available in libraries. A great deal of nonsense has been talked and written about Wallace's "mysticism." Here we have his own decent and not too reticent expression of faith. The following excerpts touch but lightly on the first three chapters, transcripts of the Alden-Tuthill Lectures given before the Chicago Theological Seminary. The fourth or title lecture of the series, delivered before the Federal Council of Churches in New York City, is reprinted almost entire.

PROPHETS AND REFORMERS

The most fascinating thing in all history is the endeavor to discern the metaphysical, the psychological, the spiritual roots of those great movements in human behavior which take centuries to work out in the form of government, methods of transportation, music, literature and all the varied panoply of that which we call civilization.

The Hebrew prophets were the first people in recorded history to cry out in a loud clear voice concerning the problems of human justice. The social conflict of the day was strangely modern in many ways. The wandering tribes of Israel had come into the Promised Land and, while they killed off many of the Canaanites, a great many of them were undoubtedly left living.

The Canaanites were much more familiar than the Israelites with the ownership of land, the giving of mortgages, the taking of interest, the foreclosure of mortgages and the loss of property and even of freedom. All of these things seemed right and proper in a settled commercial civilibation, but they never seemed right to those who had in their immediate ckground the traditions of wandering tribesmen.

The military genius of David for a time welded together these diverse elements in a superficial form. It will be remembered that David started Af by gathering four hundred men of the discontented debtor class. After David became firmly seated, he forgot more and more about the downtrodden debtor class. Or perhaps the problem was such that no administrator could have handled it anyway. Absalom, seeing the discontent, led a revolt which David was able to put down because of superior military force. The same thing happened again after David died. Solomon, with the support of the urban commercial element, was able to triumph over Adonijah representing those who were discontented with what had become an urbanized administration. During Solomon's time, commerce expanded enormously. It was a period of great public works. Taxes increased, but not to an unbearable point until after Solomon died.

The binding together of the city and country populations, of the worshipers of Baal and of Jehovah, under David and Solomon was a temporary thing made possible only by the striking personalities of an exceptional warrior and an unusual builder and wise man. It costs money to maintain armed forces and to construct great buildings. Increased commerce is often at the expense of the country people, and a resplendent court is not always a joy to the farmer. Samuel foresaw all this, if we are to believe

the eighth chapter of I Samuel in which he predicts that kings would bring slavery and taxes and war.

The battle which had been brewing for more than fifty years broke out the moment Solomon died. The tax-burdened people no longer had their imagination fired by a great and wise man. They saw instead the taxes of the temple, and when Rehoboam was unable to furnish them either with a program of reduced taxes or commercial expansion, the breakup was inevitable. The richer country to the north, which had been paying more than its share of taxes and receiving less than its share of glory, withdrew. And now in both kingdoms, but especially in the richer land of Israel, began that striking conflict between Baal and Jehovah, between the commercial point of view and the old-fashioned hillman's attitude, and between the kept priestly prophets attached to the courts and those lionhearted, independent prophets who first of all historic men on this earth denounced the way in which a commercial civilization so often enables the rich to get richer at the expense of the poor.

It happens, fortunately it seems to me, that the Biblical record is heavily loaded on the side of the Progressive Independents. The fight conducted against the standpatters worshiping Baal and running their commercial affairs according to ancient respectable Canaanitish traditions in its inward essence is as strikingly modern as that between the Sons of the Wild Jackass and Wall Street. Of course today most people thoughtlessly look on such vigorous prophets as Elijah, Amos, Micah and Jeremiah as respectable old grandfathers with long white beards. As a matter of fact, they were as vivid as Senator Norris and at the time they made their pronouncements were as unpopular as the Senator in the Coolidge administration.

I am sure if we had been trying to earn a living in one of the walled cities of Judah six hundred twenty years before Christ, most of us would have been respectable worshipers of Baal genuinely worried about the subversive tendencies of that fellow Jeremiah who was breaking down confidence and saying things that were bad for business. Or if in the time of Amos we had been watching sheep in the hill country of Gilead or Judah, most of us would have said, paraphrased into modern vernacular. "Old Amos is sure telling those crooked priests and businessmen where to get off. If he keeps it up he will stop foreclosures and maybe get us an honest dollar that will remain stable in purchasing power from one generation to the next."

This was more than the professional prophet Amaziah could stand.

Amaziah immediately complained to King Jeroboam with the age-old plaint of respectable men rudely disturbed by a reformer; said Amaziah

concerning Amos, "The land is not able to bear all his words." He assumed Amos was one of the kept prophets of Judah and suggested that he go back home and prophesy there in return for the bread of his own land. Most prophets have been true to their bread, but you can't tell how they will act in a strange land.

It happened Amaziah was wrong and Amos in his wrath denied, as though it were an insult, that he was a prophet or a son of a prophet. He was simply a farmer and the Lord had come to him as he followed his flock. With wrath redoubled he returned to his task of prophesying disaster for misdeeds committed. Amos, an enraged farmer, seeing the havoc wrought by a commercial civilization, gave expression to the oldest passages of the Bible.

* * *

The reformers of the sixteenth century are astonishingly like the prophets who lived twenty-five hundred years earlier. They did not say, "Thus saith the Lord," but they spoke with equal conviction, and it is evident from their actions that such men as John Calvin and John Knox felt just as deeply, and were prepared to suffer just as much, for their convictions as Amos, Isaiah or Jeremiah. Like their earlier prototypes, they were attacking a powerful, entrenched priesthood. Undoubtedly, many of the evils and blessings of our present-day civilization trace to these men of iron who determined to seek God in their own way, no matter how much trouble they caused easygoing contemporaries.

It takes a long while to get out from under the shadow of a tremendous emotional conflict following suffering and the shedding of blood. Once prejudices are born, people tend to cherish them long after the need for them has passed away.

The causes which led to the Civil War were superficial phenomena compared with those which produced the Reformation. The warfare and the shedding of blood which grew out of the Reformation ideas lasted for nearly two hundred years. It is not surprising, therefore, that this tremendous conflict should cast a shadow which even today obscures the vision of both Protestants and Catholics as they attempt to assess the true character and contribution of the reformers.

Before going farther, I think it might be wise for me to give enough of my own religious background so that you can make due allowance for certain prejudices which may appear in this discussion. It should be obvious that I wish to emphasize those things which unite humanity

rather than those which separate humanity and perpetuate hatred, fear and prejudice.

It happens that I was raised in the United Presbyterian Church and that my grandfather was a United Presbyterian minister. The United Presbyterian ministers were educated men, well grounded in Calvinism, and many of them took delight in occasional sermons against the idolatry of the Papacy. In 1928 I remember a good United Presbyterian and his wife called on me and attempted to demonstrate from the Book of Revelation that the Roman Church was the Whore of Babylon and that in case Al Smith won the 1928 election, then the last days, in truth, were upon us.

As a growing boy and young man, I found considerable intellectual exercise and interest in following the severely logical Presbyterian sermons. A little later I began to question many of the points raised by the minister in the course of his sermon. After a time I felt that a critical attitude in the House of God on the Sabbath was not proper, and so I stopped going to church. In college I imbibed the customary doctrines of *laissez-faire* economics and "the survival of the fittest" evolution. Also, one of my college friends interested me in reading some pamphlets by Ralph Waldo Trine, one of which was entitled, *Thoughts Are Things.* Like all young men partially trained in science, I became rather skeptical for a time. More and more I felt the necessity for believing in a God, immanent as well as transcendent. About this time I attended a Roman Catholic service and was greatly impressed by the devotional attitude of all present. I had an instinctive feeling that I, also, would like to *genuflect,* to cross myself, and remain quietly kneeling after the conclusion of the Mass, in silent adoration. Some years later I studied, rather superficially, to be sure, the Aristotelian logic as developed by St. Thomas Aquinas, and used by the Jesuits and other neo-scholastic churchmen in support of the present Roman Catholic position.

Unfortunately, I found that intellectual studies of this sort tended to destroy for me the spiritual beauty of the Mass. For some reason the scholastic method of reasoning, as applied to religious matters, has the same effect on me as a closely reasoned Calvinistic sermon. I fear both Presbyterians and Roman Catholics would say that the Lord had hardened my heart. And so it is that I eventually became a member of a so-called high Episcopalian parish which, incidentally, is the most poverty-stricken in my home town. It is fair to tell these things so that you may make allowances as I deal with the men who brought on the Reformation. I have read both Catholic and Protestants books about these men and cannot but feel that all of the biographers are prejudiced witnesses. My

testimony may be equally prejudiced but, at any rate, I have given you a certain amount of data so as to put you on guard as to the type of prejudice.

Barbarous as John Knox undoubtedly was in many particulars, he nevertheless served to give the Scotchmen the character they have today. He was far more decisively on the side of the common man than Luther. More than any other reformer of his day, he believed that the church and the schoolhouse went hand in hand and many of his ideas, which seemed wild at the time, had a rather striking fulfilment a century or two later. His vigor was so overwhelming that he transformed one of the most miserably mismanaged countries of Europe into one which eventually became one of the most law-abiding and orderly. But Knox also unleashed other forces, as witness Froude, the historian, who credits him with responsibility for the "Adam Smiths with their political economies, and steam engines, and railroads, and philosophical institutions and all the other blessed and unblessed fruits of liberty."

Undoubtedly, the Scotch are better critics, scientists and economists than they would have been without Knox. Probably they are better statesmen and businessmen, but equally probably they are poorer in all that goes to make for appreciation of the beautiful and enjoyment of a rich and abundant life. Unfortunately, many of the Scotch gained from Knox a facility in denunciatory prophecy which makes them somewhat uncomfortable as relatives and neighbors.

This world was meant to be one world, and while it is proper that there should be the greatest diversity in unity, yet there is a spiritual fellowship which means something so definite in terms of the brotherhood of man that it must of necessity be expressed to some extent in outward form. Catholic and Mason alike recognize the validity of the saying, "Except the Lord build the house, their labor is but lost that built it."

No great religion, whether it be Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism or Mohammedanism, can recognize ideals which set up a particular race or class as an object of religious worship. While admittedly there has been but little true Christianity in the world during the past five hundred years, yet it would seem that a follower of Christ least of all should recognize nationalism as the commander of his spiritual self. From the standpoint of true religion, it is singularly unfortunate that so many of the faiths, churches and doctrines are confined by national boundaries and, therefore, take on national colorings. Any religion which recognizes above all the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man must of necessity

have grave questionings concerning those national enterprises where the deepest spiritual fervor is evoked for purely nationalistic, race or class ends.

In saying this, I am quite willing to admit that the great religions of the world have for the most part abdicated during the past fifty years, and perhaps even for much longer than that. Certain outward forms were maintained, vast sums of money were given, churches were built, rituals were observed, alms were distributed, ethical principles were inculcated, but the heart of religion which has to do with faith in the values of a higher world, with the cultivated joy of the inner life which comes from the Holy Spirit, both immanent and transcendent, was lacking.

I am afraid that Calvin would be forced to conclude that the soul of Protestantism had left the Church and gone into capitalism and that there it had become distorted by strange theories from the field of economics and biology. Searching for intensity of belief, Calvin might find it among capitalists, fascists or communists, all of whom are his spiritual descendants. Seeing all of this, Calvin would doubtless not weep but would observe, "Lord, thou hast foreordained all of this for the enhancement of thine ultimate glory."

The truly dismaying thing, of course, is the lukewarmness, the wishy-washy goody-goodiness, the infantile irrelevancy of the Church itself. Millions of people still bring joy to their individual souls by attending a church service. I know that there are millions of Catholics and high-church Episcopalians alone who obtain extraordinary comfort from the celebration in due form of the Holy Eucharist, the very thing which John Knox felt was more dangerous than ten thousand armed men. Millions of other church-going people find rest for their souls in attending church service, but here all too often there tends to arise a disputatious attitude concerning ethical matters discussed in the sermon and more appropriate to a weekday lecture course than to a Sabbath worship in the House of God.

You are all acquainted with fine, cultured, tolerant people who reserve their sharp practices and grabbing tendencies for the hard life of the business world and who are delightful and enjoyable companions in the social life of evenings and holidays. They yearn for a more satisfactory business existence, but do not know exactly how to bring it to pass. Most of them, unless they are only two or three generations removed from saintly ancestors, are decidedly materialistic and skeptical about the existence of God or a future life. They want their children to go to Sunday school and learn the Ten Commandments and the salient facts of the Bible, but they themselves are convinced of the fundamental truth of evolution, the strug-

gle for existence and *laissez-faire,* dog-eat-dog economics. They know that they have to "get" if they are not to be "gotten" and, while they don't like this kind of business any better than you or I, they don't know of anything practical to do about it. Therefore, the most decent of the well-educated materialists accept some form of "Lippmannesque" humanism as the way of making the best of a bad job.

Now, humanists are, as a rule, superficially agnostic yet resolutely practice the good life as they see it and do their best to bring that life to pass for other people as well. Many of them derive considerable pleasure from making fun of the sacred superstitions of the preceding generation and are doubtless a healthful influence in many ways because they puncture the hypocritical pretensions of people who dully profess "religion" and sharply practice business. In ordinary every-day life, humanists are interesting, amusing, stimulating and humble. People of this sort will always be very useful in keeping "religious" people from taking themselves prematurely seriously.

STATESMANSHIP AND RELIGION

The problem of statesmanship is to mold a policy leading toward a higher state for humanity, and to stick by that policy and make it seem desirable to the people in spite of short-time political pressure to the contrary. True statesmanship and true religion therefore have much in common. Both are beset by those who, professing to be able politicians and hardheaded men of affairs, are actually so exclusively interested in the events of the immediate future or the welfare of a small class that from the broader, long-time point of view they are thoroughly impractical and theoretical.

Religion to my mind is the most practical thing in the world. In so saying I am not talking about churchgoing, or charity, or any of the other outward manifestations of what is popularly called religion. By religion I mean the force which governs the attitude of men in their inmost hearts toward God and toward their fellowmen.

Jesus dealing with that force said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy strength and all thy soul and all thy mind. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

The Catholic Church dealing with this force said in effect that the minds and hearts of men are best attuned to God and humanity through

the continual celebration in due form of the Mass by specially ordained priests whose duty it is also to receive and distribute alms.

Martin Luther and John Calvin dealing with this force said each man can meet his God face to face without priestly intercessor—each man can worship God most effectively by working hard in his chosen calling every minute of every day except the Sabbath.

The Reformation in action contracted rather than expanded the doctrine of Jesus; nevertheless, the extraordinary emphasis on the individual unleashed forces which enabled man through energetic self-discipline to conquer a new continent in record-breaking time, to develop an unprecedented control over nature, and to develop capitalism as a temporary mechanism for social control.

The classical economists of a hundred years ago in their highly individualistic, *laissez-faire* doctrine expressed in non-emotional terms the economic essence of Protestantism. Spencer, Darwin, Huxley, and their followers in promulgating the doctrine of natural selection and the survival of the fittest gave the whole idea an apparent foundation in nature. As a result Protestantism, which in its origin was highly spiritual, became in fact more and more material. Many of the ministers fought against the trend, but the children of the best families in their congregations for two generations or more have gone to college and accepted as gospel truth *laissez-faire* economics and "survival of the fittest" biology. Trimmings have been put on this foundation, but most of the children of our leading families have accepted as a matter of course an attitude toward the universe and toward their fellow man which is based on pseudo-economics, pseudo-science, and pseudo-religion.

Today I am glad to say that economics, science and religion are all reexamining the facts under pressure from the common man who is appalled by the tragic nonsense of misery and want in the midst of tremendous world stocks of essential raw materials. Science has given us control over nature far beyond the wildest imaginings of our grandfathers. But, unfortunately, the religious attitude which produced such keen scientists and aggressive businessmen makes it impossible for us to live with the balanced abundance which is now ours as soon as we are willing to accept it with clean, understanding hearts.

To enter the kingdom of heaven brought to earth and expressed in terms of rich material life it will be necessary to have a reformation even greater than that of Luther and Calvin. I am deeply concerned in this because I know that the social machines set up by the present administration will break down unless they are inspired by men who in their hearts catch a larger vision than the hard-driving profit motives of the past. More

than that, the men in the street must change their attitude concerning the nature of man and the nature of human society. They must develop the capacity to envision a co-operative objective and be willing to pay the price to attain it. They must have the intelligence and the will power to turn down simple solutions appealing to the short-time motives of a particular class.

Enduring social transformation is impossible of realization without changed human hearts. The classical economists, most orthodox scientists and the majority of practical businessmen question whether human nature can be changed. I think it can be changed because it has been changed many times in the past. The Christians of the second and third centuries inaugurated a tremendous change. Again, the Protestants of the sixteenth century introduced an element of firm resolution and of continuous daily discipline into human nature which had hitherto been lacking.

What a marvelous opportunity there is today to minister to the disillusioned ones who at one time had such perfect faith in endless mechanical progress, in the continual rise of land values in their own particular sections, in the possibilities of ever-expanding profits, and in wages which were to go higher and higher while the hours of work per week became less and less. This faith in triumphant machinery as the last word in human wisdom has now been rudely shaken. The ideal of material progress could satisfy only so long as we were engaged in the material job of conquering a continent.

Of course, those of us who are close to the scientists and inventors realize that extraordinary progress is yet possible. As a matter of fact, the possibilities along this line are almost infinite, but the significant thing is that we cannot enter into these possibilities until we have acquired a new faith, a faith which is based on a richer concept of the potentialities of human nature than that of the economists, scientists and businessmen of the nineteenth century.

What an extraordinary twist of the human mind it was in the nineteenth century to think of human society as composed of so-called "economic men"! As a result of this thought an increasing percentage of our population did become in fact "economic automatons." The profit motive ruled and it was discovered that, through the mechanism of money and the organized commodity and stock exchanges, it was possible to make huge profits in an atmosphere so theoretical and divorced from reality that mistakes in judgment, involving millions of innocent victims, became all too easy.

It is possible for powerful men in positions of financial influence or in control of certain fundamental mechanical processes to pose as hard-

headed men of affairs when as a matter of fact they have all too often created temporary illusions; they have been merely blowing bubbles. By the manipulation of money, the floating of bonds, they have distorted the judgment of our people concerning the true state of future demand and future supply. Oftentimes with excellent motives and looking on themselves as realists, they were in fact sleight-of-hand performers and short-change artists.

Yes, we have all sinned in one way or another and we are all sick and sore at heart as we look at the misery of so many millions of people, including among them many of our close friends and relatives; and we ask again and again why this should be so in a nation so blest with great resources, with nearly half the world's gold, with great factories, with fertile soil and no embarrassing external debt. We look at all this and ask what mainspring inside of us is broken, and where can we get a new mainspring to drive us forward.

The bitterness in the hearts of many of the communists and farm strikers in this country appalls me, but I am even more concerned about the way in which powerful business interests, steeped in the doctrines of *laissez-faire* and survival of the fittest, are able to hire fine intelligent men to serve short-time selfish ends by presenting their case in Washington. The expressions of the extreme left-wingers may oftentimes be venomously cruel and brutal, but I am thinking even more about the intelligent burrowing of those whose thoughts are guided chiefly by concern for immediate profit. Of course, our hope lies in the fact that the great bulk of laboring men, farmers and businessmen are neither bitter nor rapacious. They are patient, long-suffering people, slowly struggling to find the light.

We are approaching in the world today one of the most dramatic moments in history. Will we allow catastrophe to overtake us, and as a result force us to retire to a more simple, peasantlike form of existence? Or will we meet the challenge and expand our hearts, so that we are fitted to wield with safety the power which is ours almost for the asking? From the standpoint of transportation and communication, the world is more nearly one world than ever before. From the standpoint of tariff walls, nationalistic strivings, and the like, the nations of the world are more separated today than ever before. Week by week the tension is increasing to an unbelievable degree. Here reside both danger and opportunity.

The religious keynote, the economic keynote, the scientific keynote of the new age must be the overwhelming realization that mankind now has such mental and spiritual powers and such control over nature that the doctrine of the struggle for existence is definitely outmoded and replaced

by the higher law of co-operation. When co-operation becomes a living reality in the spiritual sense of the term, when we have defined certain broad objectives which we all want to attain, when we can feel the significance of the forces at work not merely in our own lives, not merely in our own class, not merely in our own nation, but in the world as a whole—then the vision of Isaiah and the insight of Christ will be on their way toward realization.

We are no longer faced with the problems of material scarcity. It no longer suffices, therefore, to strengthen the spiritual powers of the individual with the simple doctrine of the Psalms of David. The time has come now for the striking of a more universal note. This is especially necessary from the world point of view because never before have the different nations been so moved to act as separate national entities. It is time to hold aloft a compelling ideal which will appeal to all nations alike. I am sure that all of the noble religions of the world have in them a teaching of this sort. In the Christian religion you will find it in the Sermon on the Mount, and in some of the sayings of Isaiah and Micah. It is time for the religious teachers to search for these broader teachings. They are dealing with forces even more powerful than the scientists or the economists. When they have a fiery yet clear understanding of this, they will, by working on the human heart, so balance the message of the economist and the scientist that we will yet be saved from ruin.

Wallace's second pamphlet in 1934 gained wider attention and acclaim. Partly because its publishers, The Foreign Policy Association and the World Peace Foundation, had the foresight to print on the flyleaf a complete waiver of copyright, *America Must Choose* was reprinted in a variety of pamphlet formats by other organizations, reproduced in large part by *The New York Times,* and completely serialized by Scripps-Howard and other newspaper chains and syndicates. Its circulation in English ran into the millions, and the pamphlet was later translated into a number of foreign languages, including Italian.

Arthur P. Chew, senior economic writer of the Department of Agriculture, has recently published (*The Land*: Vol. III, #1; p. 35, 1944) some penetrating observations on the content and general response to *America Must Choose.* He argues that the drive of the New Deal's agrarian wing, which is commonly supposed to have proceeded Leftward, was in reality a rapid march toward the Right. He observes that

> "the use of the tariff power in behalf of agriculture, through an artificial separation of exports from supplies intended for domestic use, was not a counsel of perfection, but a mere compromise, an offset as it were to industry's use of tariff powers. In its draft forms, moreover, the farm

program had demerits, such as its likelihood to promote reprisals abroad. Still, the alternative was farm bankruptcy. The agricultural leaders consequently pushed their program, though not without fear that it would break with our tradition and involve a compromise with principles that agriculture had condemned. They promoted it, in short, as a choice of evils—not as something intrinsically good. Even then it had the look of a movement to the right.

It isn't natural, however, for agriculture to move to the right; it loves production more than it loves restriction, initiative more than governmental regulation, and trade more than monopoly. With the cynical view that wealth should be acquired rather than produced, it has no sympathy. It wants income, not through overreaching, but through fair exchange, with prices made by markets rather than by governments. It has moved to the right since World War I, and built up a tremendous apparatus for controlling acreage, stocks, prices, and trade, not from choice but because the interwar breakdown of international trade has left it no alternative. Making a virtue of necessity doesn't mean liking such rough discipline. Farmers have not liked the recent growth of nationalism in agriculture, particularly not the repercussions it has had abroad; they have distrusted the growth of the superstate and looked back wistfully to the days when farmers could make their own decisions on the basis exclusively of market facts. Beneath agricultural nationalism, agriculture has developed a longing to be rid of it.

Henry A. Wallace expressed this counter-current as long ago as 1934, in a famous pamphlet entitled *America Must Choose*. It had tremendous success both here and abroad. *America Must Choose* foreshadowed what is now the official philosophy of the Allied Nations. It proposed world trade in place of trade restrictions; lower tariffs in place of crop controls. In a nutshell the idea was simply that our agricultural restriction program was something we should ditch as soon as possible. 'If we finally go all the way toward nationalism,' said the pamphlet (p. 11) 'it may be necessary to have compulsory control of marketing, licensing of plowed land, and base and surplus quotas for every farmer for every product for each month in the year. We may have to have government control of all surpluses, and a far greater degree of public ownership that we have now. . . . This whole problem should be debated in such a lively fashion that every citizen of the United States will begin definitely to understand the price of our withdrawing from world markets, and the price of our going forth for foreign trade again. Not only the price, but the practicality of going national should enter into the public's decision on the question.'

Here was criticism of the movement from its head; for the author of the pamphlet was the Secretary of Agriculture. He was the man in charge—the leader of the retreat from surplus acres, and of the entire "nationalistic" program with its government loans, government holding

operations, marketing quotas, acreage allotments, and export subsidies. This policy, the agricultural counterpart of our industrial tariff system, had obviously more kinship with the conservative than with the liberal tradition in American life. Mr. Wallace advised the farmers to look where it would lead—to count the cost in terms of land retirement, crop shifting, loss of comparative advantages, and increasing farm regimentation. He made it clear that though circumstances were forcing agriculture toward the right, its long-run interest lay in the opposite direction. In basic theory he wasn't very far from Clarence Darrow. Perhaps if Darrow had been Secretary of Agriculture he too would have moved toward farm regimentation and the rest of the nationalistic system, and at the same time deplored the need."

The brief excerpts from the pamphlet which follow omit points which have been covered in previous papers, and also omit passages which seemed pertinent to the world situation ten years ago but which are outdated now.

AMERICA MUST CHOOSE

Much as we all dislike them, the new types of social control that we have now in operation are here to stay and to grow on a world or national scale. We shall have to go on doing all these things we do not want to do. The farmer dislikes production control instinctively. He does not like to see land idle and people hungry. The carriers dislike production control because it cuts down loadings. The processors dislike it because of the processing tax. The consumer dislikes it because it adds to the price of food. Practically the entire population dislikes our basic program of controlling farm production; and they will do away with it unless we can reach the common intelligence and show the need of continuing to plan. We must show that need of continuing if we are to save in some part the institutions which we prize.

Enormously difficult adjustments confront us, whatever path we take. There are at least three paths: internationalism, nationalism and a planned middle course. We cannot take the path of internationalism unless we stand ready to import nearly a billion dollars more goods than we did in 1929. What tariffs should we lower? What goods shall we import? Tariff adjustments involve planning just as certainly as internal adjustments do. Even foreign loans might involve a certain amount of planning. When we embarked on our terrific postwar expansion of foreign loans, we did not plan. We plunged in blindly, and soon any reasonable observer could predict that the whole thing was bound to blow up.

We did not then in our boisterous youth have the same view that England had after the Napoleonic Wars. Rather consciously Great Britain placed its loans with a long-time program of imports and an exchange of goods in view. Our own adventure was only from the short-time profit consideration. What tariffs to lower? What goods to accept? How readjust our own farming operations and industrial operations to the planned inflow of foreign goods? We scarcely gave such things a thought.

I shall here try to sketch the probable price—in terms of the actual and psychological pain of readjustment—of following the national, the international, or a rigorously planned middle trail out of the woods.

As a foundation and framework of a new American design, we have undertaken to put our farmland into better order. What we have done has been frankly experimental and emergency in nature, but we are working on something that is going to be permanent.

If we finally go the whole way toward nationalism, it may be necessary to have compulsory control of marketing, licensing of plowed land, and base and surplus quotas for every farmer. Every plowed field would have its permit sticking up on its post.

I have raised the question whether we as a people have the patience and fortitude to go through with an international program when the world seems with varying degrees of panic to be stampeding the other way. It is quite as serious a question whether we have the resolution and staying power to swallow all the words and deeds of our robust, individualistic past, and submit to a completely armylike, nationalist discipline in peacetime.

Our own maneuvers of social discipline to date (1934) have been mildly persuasive and democratic. I want to see things go on that way. I would hate to live in a country where individual thought is punished or stifled, and where speech is no longer free. Even if the strictest nationalist discipline reared for us here at home, exclusively, a towering physical standard of living, I would consider the spiritual price too high. I think, too, that this would be pretty much the temper of the rest of the country; but there is no telling. Regimentation without stint might, indeed, I sometimes think, go farther and faster here than anywhere else, if we once took the bit in our teeth and set out for a 100 percent American conformity in everything. The American spirit as yet knows little of moderation, whichever way it turns.

A surprising number of farmers, after a year of voluntary production control, are writing me letters insisting that hereafter the co-operation of all farmers be compelled absolutely; and that every field, cotton gin, cow, and chicken be licensed; and that the strictest sort of controls be applied

to transportation and marketing. I believe they mean it, but I wonder very seriously whether they are ready for such measures, and if they really know what they are asking for.

The middle path between economic internationalism and nationalism is the path we shall probably take in the end. We need not go the whole way on a program involving an increase of a billion dollars a year in imports. There are intermediate points between internationalism and nationalism, and I do not think we can say just where we are headed yet. We shall be under increasing difficulties, no matter which way we tend, as our people become more and more familiar with the discomforts of the procedure.

My own bias is international. It is an inborn attitude with me. I have very deeply the feeling that nations should be naturally friendly to each other and express that friendship in international trade. At the same time we must recognize as realities that the world at the moment is ablaze with nationalist feeling, and that with our own tariff impediments it is highly unlikely that we shall move in an international direction very fast in the next few years.

There is still another trail—I mean the back trail, letting things drift, trusting to luck, plunging on toward internationalism as sellers and trying at the same time to huddle behind nationalist barriers as buyers. Even this, probably the most painful trail of all, is worth mentioning, for thousands of our people vociferously yearn to head that way; and the number of such people is likely to increase rather than diminish, I am afraid, in the next few years.

Whether we are prepared at this time to engage in a genuinely scientific nationwide discussion of the tariff, as it affects agriculture and other elements in a long-time plan for the whole nation, I have little means of knowing; but I suspect that the desperateness of the situation has done a great deal to make realists of us all. And I have faith that we can arouse from the ranks of our democracy, in city and country alike, a leadership that will address itself to fundamentals, and not simply blow off in the empty and prejudiced emotional bombast which has characterized such discussions in the past.

I lean to the international solution. But it is no open-and-shut question. It needs study, and above all dispassionate discussion. I want to see the whole question examined by our people in a new spirit.

The farm march toward a calculated harvest seemed now to be proceeding more evenly and to be gaining a level of understanding which permitted rather lofty discussion in world terms. Early in 1934, however, shortly after the

issuance of *America Must Choose* in February, it became apparent that 1934 was to be a dry year; and as the spring came on, the drought attained a severity and extent beyond the memory of any living American. "Never before in this country," Wallace, a long-time student of the weather, said late that summer, "has there been anything like it." Not only the Far West was seared, with cattle thirsting and starving; in the eastern intermountain and the Piedmont meadows the crops and pastures were burned to a deadening brown. M. L. Wilson of Montana, visiting the Piedmont upland of Maryland that summer, said it looked just like home.

On May 12, for the first time in the recorded history of our country, dust from the Far West had blown over our eastern seaboard, shrouding the Capitol, dropping the richness of Texas farms on the decks of ships a hundred miles offshore. This proved later an inestimable stimulus to soil-conservation measures the country over, but it was hard to see anything helpful about it at the time. "The drought," Wallace wrote in August, "created a new and gigantic relief problem." (R. G. Tugwell, the Under-Secretary, went West to oversee that.) "It compelled the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to face a situation in 1935 it did not expect to face until 1936 at the earliest; and it set in motion several imponderables—economic, social, political—the full effect of which none could foresee." The drought devoured the surpluses. "What the A.A.A. had planned to do in three years, the drought did—except for cotton and tobacco—in one. . . . In May and June of 1934 the A.A.A. began to overhaul its programs with the drought in mind."

Drought-nerves led many a stricken farmer and rancher to cry, sincerely, that the drought was a judgment of God. They saw in the dust swirling above their baked fields the image of tall cotton plants slain in their prime. They heard in the wind the wail of the little pigs. "To hear them talk," said Wallace, "you'd think that pigs were raised for pets." He pointed out that the people of western Canada who had not been forced voluntarily to reduce output had also been stricken by God's weather; and argued on the radio, June 6, 1934, for an ever-normal granary, such as had been used in ancient China and again in Bible times, to carry over the fat yield of good years and provision the people more evenly in times such as these. But "voodo talk," as Wallace called it, increased and mounted; and the tom-toms of the press and opposition magnified the sound. Deeply troubled, almost angry, Wallace's talks began to take on a fighting edge; and on August 19 he published in *The New York Times,* for wider distribution later, an aggressive defense of the farm program which revealed for the first time his latent abilities as a campaigner. In the course of this article he prophesied, or came close to prophesying, that another world war was brewing, and that America would be in it.

IF WAR SHOULD COME

Because we have had in the United States this season the worst weather for crops in forty years, advocates of the old order whisper it around the country that the drought is a judgment from Heaven upon us, and they say that the entire program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration should be abandoned immediately. They are advocates of chaos.

An adjustment program must in its very nature be kept adjustable, and it should be at all times subject to free criticism. But when you come to examine most proposals of the opposition you find that the cry is for no course at all. On our course to balanced harvest and an assured and stable food supply we have met bad weather. In time we shall meet bad weather again. Therefore, these old-deal pilots say that we must abandon distant landmarks, toss all charts overboard, and steer as of old from wave to wave. It was just such childish courses that had us about on the rocks on March 4, 1933, and we have as yet by no means triumphantly weathered the consequences of their heedlessness.

In our grabbing, joyous youth as a nation we could better afford to trust ourselves to such pilots. When things went wrong there was a near and friendly shore. In time of depression you could hit out for free land or still unplundered mines and forests, each man for himself, devil take the hindmost, and gamble some more.

But it should by now be plain to nearly everyone that we can no longer escape from depressions by a restless, greedy spirit and dumb luck. We cannot get out of this mess by throwing all discretion overboard, or by blindly sailing separate courses which have no sensible relation or common port. For the long pull we cannot starve agriculture and save industry, or fatten our agriculture at undue cost to our townspeople. Americans are too exclusively one another's customers to permit free raiding privileges either way.

The job of maintaining a just and workable internal balance of purchasing power is a hard one, but we cannot afford again to let things ride. We must lay a long-time course and manage to obtain an understanding, general allegiance to it. For one thing, our people in both agriculture and industry must soon decide whether they are going to make some necessary sacrifices along our tariff barricades, and open up business with the world again, or whether, under a rather severe system of internal co-operative discipline, we are going to try to keep business going more or less exclusively among ourselves.

There is also the long-time question of a wise use of our natural resources. The first of these is our soil. The damage this savage drought has done our land will heal with rain, but the damage that we ourselves have done our land by generations of haphazard, misplaced settlement, overcropping, exploitation, and permitted erosion will never heal unless we take hold of the situation, and keep hold, with a long-time program of soil repair, resettlement, and balanced harvests.

On the new course, we are making progress; but we have far to go. There will still be out of work in the United States this winter about 8,000,000 men and women. Perhaps 5,000,000 of these are able and aching to work. They are blameless inheritors of a long-continued national policy of simply trusting to luck. The considerable part of our still-existing farm surpluses which is diverted through the present program to feed these millions will be of great help; but the unemployment situation continues serious and calls for something more enduring than patchwork and guesswork.

Our program to secure for farmers a pre-war parity price for their products has a definite and demonstrable connection with city employment rolls. When farmers are permitted to go broke by the millions, as they were under the old deal, our greatest single domestic market for city goods is shattered; factories are closed; breadlines are lengthened, and again are lengthened by the migration of dispossessed and desperate farmers seeking jobs in town, at any price.

Let me say at this point that opposition to agricultural adjustment is not merely partisan. Prominent among the opposition are men and interests tagged Democratic as well as Republican. They are believers in an industrial and agricultural wonderland where nothing is managed but where they imagine all things work for the best, and especially so for the best people. Their cruel and stupid national policy of high and yet higher tariffs for industry, with nothing to compensate agriculture for a vast loss of export business, led me to get out of the Republican Party. It seems that they have forgotten nothing and learned nothing in the hard years since 1929.

The same leaders who stood steadfastly against the restoration of foreign purchasing power by making possible importations of more goods from abroad, and who with equal steadfastness refused farmers producing export crops the right to make the tariff effective on their products, are again at work. All they can do is to league themselves with chaos. They have nothing new to offer whereby chaos can be reduced to order.

What counsel do these leaders bring us now? With tongues of duplicity they say in one part of the country that the A.A.A. should be done away

with forthwith, because most surpluses will have disappeared by the summer of 1935. At the same time in another section of the country their spokesmen profess to be greatly fearful of increasing imports of goods from abroad. They tell the consumer that he is paying the processing tax, the farmer that he is paying it, and the processors that they are suffering from it. It is the same old blend of fierce personal greed and muggy thinking that they offered us before.

The Democratic Party has been thrust by dire need into the role of a party of national reconstruction. The old party tags do not mean as much as they used to, by any means. I hope that they will mean even less in time to come. We badly need a new alignment: conservatives versus liberals; those who yearn for return to a dead past, comfortable for only a few, versus those who feel that human intelligence, freed and exercised, can lead us to a far more general abundance and peace between warring groups.

With the old crowd shouting the same cries and whimpering the same old incantations, it seems to me that the faster the showdown comes, and the more definite the division between the old dealers and new dealers of both great present parties, the better.

It is not true, as the old-timers charge, that the young Agricultural Adjustment Administration is inhospitable to criticism and cannot take it. We have taken plenty from the first, and have used whatever we could find in it to repair our mistakes on the march.

At times we have had to meet emergencies by rather crude measures. We have made some bad guesses. But on the whole I think we may claim to having stuck fairly close to attacking a fact which throws this nation badly off balance, unless something is done about it, from year to year.

The very first thing we tried to stress about the A.A.A. was its adjustability to changing circumstances and emergencies. Immediately after the passage of the Farm Act, in May of 1933, I went on the air, and said:

"If it happens that the world tide turns we can utilize to excellent advantage our crop adjustment setup. We can find out how much they really want over there, and at what price; and then we can take off the brakes and step on the gas a little at a time, deliberately, not recklessly and blindly, as we have in the past. But first a sharp downward adjustment is necessary, because we have defiantly refused to face an overwhelming reality, and changed world conditions bear down on us so heavily as to threaten our national life."

It is a poor piece of social machinery which is built to operate always in reverse. The A.A.A. was not thus planned or built. We have in it some-

thing new, and still crude, but it is a typically American invention equipped to meet crises, go around or through them.

Our agricultural adjustment machinery could readily be turned to spur rather than to check farm production should need arise. If this country should ever attain to an enlightened tariff policy reopening world trade, or if there should be war beyond the ocean and other nations clamor for our foods again, it is conceivable that we might offer adjustment payments for more rather than for less acreage in certain crops.

That is the very last use I should want to see our adjustment machinery put to, but it could ameliorate the waste and suffering of such an emergency, just as it can meet and to some extent ameliorate the suffering caused by this drought. With controls locally organized and democratically administered, we could provision a war in an orderly, organized manner, with far less of that plunging, uninformed and altogether unorganized overplanting which got us into so much trouble during and after the last great war.

I am convinced that the people of this country do not want to see another war or to get into one. If we have learned anything at all, we have learned that war is a bad business, a murderous business, and that all you can collect on it afterward is increasing grief. Another World War would conceivably destroy us and destroy civilization.

I do find some feeling here and there that a good-sized war abroad which we could keep out of, yet provision and supply, would be better as a measure of national recovery than toilsome, peaceful planning and a more generous internal sharing of existing wealth. But I do not think this feeling is widespread in business circles or elsewhere in our country. I feel that even those who did not suffer in the field the last time the world went crazy have now suffered enough postwar consequences so that they do not want new foreign customers, temporarily, for our farm and other products at such a price.

Like drought, earthquakes, flood, fire and famine, war remains, however, a recurring reality. Drought is upon us now. Beyond the seas, nations hurt by the terrible grind of ungoverned economic forces are in warlike mood. Their men are arming. We want none of that, but the world is small.

It is the duty of wise statesmanship to lay a far course and to lead people toward security; toward an alleviation of needless misery, dissension, and waste; toward peace among neighbors, classes, and nations. Yet the machinery set up to that end must be adaptable to use in times of tragic natural disasters, such as this drought, and in times of terrific outbursts of blind competition, carried, as has long been customary, to the *n*th de-

gree, with gunfire. That is why I have mentioned the adaptability of the A.A.A. to a wartime state, should such madness again possess the nations of Europe and Asia or our own.

As it is, we have laid a peaceful course, not too fixed or rigid, for American agriculture. It is a course to a far end: balanced harvests, with storage in an ever-normal granary; a peaceful balance between our major producing groups, rural and urban; a wise and decent use of all our land; a shared abundance, here at home; and, if possible, sensible and friendly trading relations with the people of other lands.

A TALK TO MORTGAGE BROKERS

There are certain rules of the game which must of necessity concern us. Those rules change from time to time. We have always had rules of the game, some of them set forth in the Constitution. The government must abide by these rules of the game, and to do so is not government-in-business. It is a function of the government to set traffic lights. It is not a function of the government to provide drivers for every car.

These traffic lights must be placed insofar as possible so that they will not distort our judgment as to future events. The deplorable thing about the tariff since the World War ended has been that the tariff was used to indicate that there was a market for goods which eventually proved not to exist. That was a traffic light falsely placed.

Insofar as the government had control through the State Department over loans abroad, that was a traffic light falsely placed. Insofar as the government has control over the corporate form of organization and through the methods whereby the corporate form of organization controls production and sets prices, government again has an opportunity rightly to place or to misplace traffic lights or rules of the game.

I think there should not be one type of rule for interpreting the law of supply and demand for products produced by machinery and another type of rule for interpreting the law of supply and demand for products produced by farmers or by small businessmen. Yet that is a situation that has existed.

We have come to the time when the world is knit together, when in considering the rights of the individual, we have to consider them with due regard for the rights of the encompassing whole. That presents the necessity for developing a social discipline such as we in the United States have never hitherto had to develop. It presents the necessity for discover-

ing what are, in the long run, the sound rules of the game for deciding just where we want to place the traffic lights and how long we want the green light to be on and how long we want the red light to be on.

Yes, there are truly stimulating possibilities as we endeavor to evolve an economic democracy. I think all of the forces which I have described having to do with the passing of a frontier; having to do with technological employment and new inventions; the fact that our population is not going to increase in the future as it has in the past; the fact that we have changed from a debtor to a creditor nation; the fact there is a grave social tension because corporations have been able to treat production and labor in one way and farmers in another; all will have to be reckoned with by any type of government we may have, whether it be communism, fascism, or socialism, or whether there be a Republican party or a Democratic party in power.

No matter what group of people may be in charge of our government, these forces will have to be reckoned with, and I trust solid, substantial, thoughtful people will be doing the thinking about these forces. For my own part, I hope that the administration that will be in power will be of the type that will be based on a true economic democracy, one which will endeavor to evolve the solution to economic problems in just the same understanding way that our county control committees are trying to evolve the solution of their own local problems as a unit, but with due regard and consideration for the necessities of the encompassing whole.

[*Chicago, Ill., October 4, 1934.*]

A FOUNDATION OF STABILITY

For a number of years I have been interested in the concept of the ever-normal granary, a concept not greatly different from that of Joseph, in Bible days, or of the Confucians in ancient China. It is obvious that when we produce very little for export, we have very little to fall back on in years of drought. When we were producing two or three hundred million bushels of wheat annually above domestic needs, an occasional short crop did not endanger our domestic supply; we simply exported less. In years when carryover is high, a short crop is likewise no embarrassment. Without either a large exportable surplus or a large carryover, however, a control program must admit the possibility of real shortage. To prevent this would be the purpose of the ever-normal granary.

If we are to continue production control, therefore, it may be the part

of wisdom to hold in storage much larger quantities of agricultural produce than we have formerly considered normal. We have before us as a warning the experience of the Farm Board. We must not build up these adequate stocks in such a way as continually to depress prices and damage the farmer. We want the strong hand of the government in control of these stocks, but the plan must be such that no mere political attack can dislodge it. Furthermore, the question marks that traders in the Farm Board days had on that plan must be removed.

Out of the combined experience of the Farm Board, the Adjustment Administration, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, it ought to be possible to devise a workable plan.

The corn loan program which held corn under seal would not have been sound had it not been tied up with production control. To lend anywhere near the market price on a farm product, and then to ignore this stimulus to production, is merely to invite trouble. The loans must be accompanied by production control. If that condition is met, a more uniform corn supply would be possible from year to year and a more uniform corn price would stabilize the quantity of fat livestock coming on the market. This would build a permanent foundation of stability under the livestock industry which in turn would contribute enormously to the stability of the entire business structure in the United States.

The outstanding danger would be a tendency continually to push the government loan higher, no matter what the supply-and-demand situation might be. We have already had sufficient experience with that to appreciate how weighty the pressure can be, and how real the peril. If farmers misuse the centralizing powers of government to the extent that certain business and financial groups have in the past, the result will be unhappy for all concerned. I am convinced that the concept of an ever-normal granary cannot be satisfactorily administered unless those in positions of power determinedly hold on to the ideal of a harmonious continuing balance among all our major producing groups, and resist at all times the pressure of the shortsighted.

[*To the National Grange, Hartford, Conn., November 20, 1934.*]

THE NATION'S DIET

The nation's diet is an important factor in the objective of our farm program. Dietitians have worked out, on the basis of the best available information, the kind of diet that the country needs in order to maintain

adequate health standards. Whether the nation's diet is restricted or liberal depends to a large extent on its purchasing power. The average family must have an income twice that of 1929 to enable it to buy the liberal diet which would absorb the product of land now in farms.

If city consumers could buy a liberal diet the immediate adjustment programs would take on an entirely different character. Instead of having forty million or fifty million acres producing surpluses, as in the last few years, we probably would require all these acres and more—not because human stomachs would expand with buying power, but because items in the more liberal diet are generally more costly in terms of land required to produce them.

Such a diet would result in some changes in the map of agricultural production, for it would alter considerably the proportions of various farm commodities that make up our menu. We would consume less cereals and more livestock products than we are accustomed to eating. We would consume less wheat than at present. We would eat more fruits, vegetables and dairy products. The production of truck crops, fruits and dairy products would have to be doubled or trebled to meet the ideal diet. An industrial revival with full employment and substantial increases in the income of low-income groups would be required to supply the needed purchasing power to support such a diet. And, in addition, the people would have to understand much better than they now do the nutritional values of balanced diets.

[*New York Herald Tribune, December 30, 1934.*]

IV: 1935

THIS WAS rather a light year for Secretary Wallace. He put forth twenty-four speeches or articles, but wrote or compiled no books. The drought relented, except in spots. Partly in consequence of short crops the year before, prices paid farmers were somewhat better, and on the whole farmers were happier. Ably backed by M. L. Wilson, his Assistant Secretary and later his Under-Secretary, Wallace advanced, within the Department and without, the concept that only by contributing fundamentally to the general wefare could Agricultural Adjustment be maintained on public funds. "Triple-A has got to get more honest groundline conservation for its money," he stated bluntly in De-