

VII: 1938

SIX FURTHER lectures, delivered in California, Louisiana and Michigan, were the most carefully wrought of Wallace's public papers during the first half of 1938. The first four were the Earl Foundation Lectures. Edward T. Earl established the foundation in 1901 as part of the Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, California. Earl lecturers of the past have included William Howard Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, William Allen White, George Herbert Palmer, John H. Finley, Walter Rauchenbush, Henry Van Dyke and James Bryce. Wallace's four lectures covered much the same ground as his North Carolina series of the year previous, but were less technical and wider in their range. These lectures were reproduced verbatim in a twenty-five-cent booklet by the Home Library Foundation, Washington, in 1938, under the title *Paths to Plenty*. They were revised, retitled *The Price of Freedom*, and reissued with a preface by David Cushman Coyle under the same publisher's imprint in 1940. In his preface, David Coyle remarked:

In time of fear, when men feel helpless against the flood of disaster, it is natural to cry to God, but this book is no cry of fear. Henry Wallace, man of affairs, with knowledge of corn and cattle and forests, of markets and of foreign commerce, manager of a billion-dollar enterprise, sets the living religion of America across the path of the heathen religion of the Conqueror of Europe.

This is no small thing, as unthinking people might suppose, who have not understood the world revolution that threatens our peace. Tanks and airplanes are only the spearhead, but what lies back of the power that has crushed the free peoples of the Continent? Unless we can know the secret of that power and meet it with power of our own, tanks and airplanes will not help us. The revolution is first of all a religion, an inner force that unites men, drives them forward, gives them strength to do incredible deeds, moves mountains by faith. We have seen the terrible miracles happen one by one. In this month of August, 1940, as we watch the last free country of Europe stand, perhaps only for a moment, against the conqueror's progress, we know that the outcome will not be decided by numbers of planes alone, for if that were all, the victim might as well surrender at once. There is an unseen power of courage and sacrifice and mutual help, a power long unused and corrupted by wealth and selfishness, but roused again and gaining strength. If the faith and courage of free men can match the miracle-working powers and the material advantage of the conqueror, another miracle will happen as it did in the time of

the Great Armada. Guns and faith together are weighed in the scales of history, and the spiritual is as heavy a counterweight as the material.

This is no time, therefore, to think lightly of the unseen powers that we call in vulgar language guts or morale, and that history knows as religion. We had better understand the new heathen religion that hopes to conquer the world, and we had better understand our own and cultivate it, if we hope to survive. Henry Wallace is not playing with pretty pebbles, but deals here with the matters of life and death that are to be decided soon for our civilization.

Each man must make his own idea of the religion of liberty, for it is many-sided, and one of its deepest beliefs is that all men have a right to be different. But one way of regarding this world crisis is to say that it is a crisis of the creative power of science.

During the present century, civilized men have obtained immense scientific powers, beyond those that were dreamed of by Jules Verne or the authors of the *Arabian Nights*. We all deal in magic that would have terrified our ancestors into burning us at the stake, if one of us could step back with modern powers into their simple times. But with these powers have come responsibilities, as Wallace insists again and again in this book. Our religion, our sense of duty, our relations to one another, must be expanded to cover our ability to do good and evil.

There are two kinds of these responsibilities, one that can be called the responsibility to act, and one that is purely moral, the responsibility to act decently.

On the side of action, the dictators have found the true answer to the riddle of technology, the paradox of plenty, the problem of unemployment, and all the other economic evils that have bedeviled our own country. They have established that all who belong to their clan are brothers, that all have useful work to do, that no one of the brethren is abandoned, and that all stand together against the world. This is the foundation of all religions, and what wonder that it lifted a beaten race into magnificent action? Among them money itself is an instrument of action, not a paralyzing poison. The ancient virtue of thrift, with them, has its old meaning: that their society cannot afford to waste soil or minerals or forests or men or brains. No wonder they seem to be supermen to us as we wallow in selfishness and waste our men in idleness.

Such is the new religion of the dictator, and so far as it goes, it is better, in the cold-blooded judgment of nature, than the social system of any people that have no religion but the enervating worship of money. But this is not all that religion can be, and because the religion of the revolution is only partial, the faith of free men may hope to overtop and overcome it.

There is still decency and good will, there is still the ideal of freedom, there is still the hope of a world where not only the closed brotherhood of

the Dictator's Party, but all sorts and conditions of men, may find tolerance, mutual help, and happiness. All these are left out of the ideal world of the conqueror, and if free men have not lost their ancient virtue, this lack will be the conqueror's defeat. He can overcome the weak but he cannot make his victims love him, and in the end, we still believe, God will not be mocked.

CAPITALISM, RELIGION AND DEMOCRACY

Man for man, the productivity of the workers on the farm in this country has increased at about the same rate as the productivity of the workers in town. It is only by virtue of our increased agricultural efficiency that we have been able to support such a high percentage of our people in towns and cities.

Most of the farmers who became efficient necessarily fell under the spell of the capitalistic system. They bought new machinery, enlarged their farms, used fertilizer and sold most of their production on the market. The old-fashioned farmer and the modern peasant farmer consume ninety percent of what they produce and buy only ten percent of what they consume. For such a man, farming is a way of life. He and his family stand to a considerable extent outside of the capitalistic system. He belongs to the old order. The capitalistic doctrine is as strange to him as a foreign language. No farmer in the United States is entirely outside of the commercial system, but in the eastern mountains and parts of the South there are many farmers who might be called our contemporary grandfathers, for whom farming must always be essentially a way of life, inasmuch as it is impossible for them to make an annual cash income of more than two or three hundred dollars on their present small and poor farms. The commercial farmers of the United States comprise only about fifty percent of the farm population but they supply about ninety percent of the farm products which move to market. They have a dollar income several times as great as that of the "way of life" farmers. They have better farms, their children attend better schools and they drive to church in town in their automobiles. And yet, I am not altogether sure that they are leading a spiritually richer life than the poverty-stricken "way of life" farmers in the mountains.

My mind goes to a Sunday morning in western North Carolina, fifteen miles from the nearest town in the mountains. There was an unpainted

Baptist church with no minister on that particular morning, but the people had gathered together to sing from hymnbooks printed with shaped notes. Most of these people were obviously poorly educated and poorly fed. Many of them were lacking teeth at a rather early age. According to all the standards of the capitalistic system they were failures and there was little likelihood that either they or their children would ever be otherwise. Their farms were too small and too poor. Yet poverty-stricken as these people were, they poured a wealth of emotional fervor into their religious service such as I have never seen except in Negro churches. Critical though some people may be of emotional religion, I am convinced these people have something which most wealthy people lack.

There are many "way of life" farmers all over the country who are perhaps not religious in a churchly sense. But in a great many cases, if they have not been treated too harshly by circumstances, you will find them religious toward their soil, their plants and their animals. They may be old-fashioned and unscientific, but they oftentimes have an attitude toward growing things which, in my opinion, is profoundly religious. Most commercial farmers have so many acres and so much improved machinery that they cannot come into the same intimate touch with growing things as these small farmers. When you have a hundred acres of corn and cultivate them with a two-row tractor, you cannot help having a different attitude toward the corn plant than when you have two acres of corn and hoe them by hand. When you have forty cows and milk them with a milking machine you have a different attitude toward them than when you have three and milk them by hand. The commercial farmers are coming closer and closer in their thinking to the businessmen in the towns. The "way of life" farmers are something apart, something out of the past. But also, they have their contribution to the future. They have never lost their touch with the soil, the mother of us all. They have large families, which, in spite of poor food, poor education and poor medical attention, may yet have a contribution of the most profound significance to make to the United States.

* * *

Twenty-five years ago, before the World War, one of the most challenging of all the books I read was entitled *Revolutions of Civilization*, by W. M. Flinders Petrie, the Egyptologist, who first brought to my attention in striking form the idea of spring, summer, fall and winter in civilization. After discussing many ancient civilizations, he advanced the hypothesis that the European civilization of which he claimed the American civilization to be a part, first flowered freely in sculpturing in the

thirteenth century, in painting in the fifteenth century, in literature in the seventeenth century, in music in the eighteenth century, in mechanics in the nineteenth century and in science and wealth in the twentieth century. He inferred that the wealth period was the beginning of the end, and reasoning from the Roman parallel he said, "During this time—of about four centuries—wealth—that is, the accumulated capital of facility—continues to increase. When democracy has attained full power, the majority without capital necessarily eat up the capital of the minority, and the civilization steadily decays, until the inferior population is swept away to make room for a fitter people. The consumption of all the resources of the Roman Empire, from the second century, when the democracy was dominant, until the Gothic Kingdom arose on its ruin, is the best known example in detail."*

But, for my own part, I do not think that civilizations when they mature have to commit suicide. I believe they can, by taking thought, maintain their full vigor for many hundreds of years. The United States has an enormous vitality, but is subject to violent alternations of "fever and chills."

To end these fevers and chills, some clearing agency should be devised to proportion the housing activities, the buying of railroad equipment, the building of factories and the buying of public-utility equipment more uniformly over the years. In the late twenties this nation produced an average of more than thirty billion dollars of durable goods annually. This was too much and was certain to lead to a depression later on. In the early thirties this nation produced less than twenty billion dollars' worth of durable goods annually. This was too little and resulted in stagnation which produced the utmost misery. In 1937 we produced five million automobiles, or many more than were needed for replacement purposes. Therefore, in 1938 we shall not produce nearly as many. The jerkiness in our heavy-goods industries is responsible for much of the recurring unemployment which leads to recessions in farm prices.

This is a problem which must be solved if capitalism is to survive.

The chief way of modifying the capitalism of the future will be through constructively changing the relationship of the corporation to the government and to labor. Also there is the possibility of substituting the co-operative for the corporate form of organization in those lines of activity where the co-operative form of endeavor can eventually prove to be more efficient.

In all efforts of this sort the goal should be not merely to get greater

* *Revolutions of Civilization* (London: Harper & Brothers, 1911), p. 124.

efficiency in the long run but also to bring a larger number of human beings into a feeling of intimate joyous responsibility in their work. In many cases the corporate form of organization will serve this double purpose better than the co-operative. In some cases government ownership will serve the purpose best. In other cases the purpose may best be served by breaking up overhead financial controls which stifle local initiative.

In the main the spirit in which problems of this sort should be approached is the levelheaded spirit of the Scandinavian countries where such an excellent accommodation has been worked out among enterprises which are government-owned, corporate-owned and co-operatively-owned. Our job is much different from that of the Scandinavian countries, because we deal with a continent-wide country, whereas they deal with an area the size of one of our Western states. Nevertheless, we are going to democratize and preserve our capitalism for the benefit of all the people in some such sensible constructive manner as the Scandinavian countries have demonstrated to us. We shall find ways of more nearly equalizing our power and wealth, but without using methods which will imperil the increase of our power and wealth. There is a sound middle course and it is this for which the New Deal and enlightened capitalists are searching as they develop policies of governmental expenditure, taxation and business co-operation.

The cure for the confusion which exists in both capital and labor is for capital to recognize the function of labor and labor to recognize the function of capital, and both of them in co-operation with the government to recognize that there must be a balanced relationship among prices, wages and profits as they affect farmers, workers and businessmen. In this connection, a statement taken from the Papal Encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, of Pius XI, is of great interest:

"A reasonable relationship between different wages here enters into consideration. Intimately connected with this is a reasonable relationship between the prices obtained for the products of the various economic groups; agrarian, industrial, etc. Where this harmonious proportion is kept, man's various economic activities combine and unite into one single organism and become members of a common body, lending each other mutual help and service. For then only will the economic and social organism be soundly established and attain its end, when it secures for all and each those goods which the wealth and resources of nature, technical achievement, and the social organization of economic affairs can give. These goods should be sufficient to supply all needs and an honest livelihood, and to uplift men to that higher level of prosperity and culture which, provided it be used with prudence, is not only no hindrance

but is of singular help to virtue. . . . Now this is the primary duty of the State and of all good citizens, to abolish conflict between classes with divergent interests, and thus foster and promote harmony between the various ranks of society."

One fundamental difficulty with capitalism is the tendency for the machines of capitalism to produce more goods than the workers can consume. Unless the capitalists are willing to co-operate among themselves and with government to eliminate the more violent periods of overinvestment and underinvestment, there will be trouble ahead for all of us.

The days when corporations and capitalists could do pretty much what they pleased are over. From now on, more and more they will enjoy only that liberty which they have purchased by continuously and consciously exercising self-restraint on behalf of the general welfare.

Capitalism is still the faith of most modern businessmen, but since the World War, and especially since the great depression, the completeness of the faith has been shaken. This is especially true with the younger businessmen. They have been disturbed by the problems of war, unemployment, heavy taxation and the uneasiness of the farmers and workers. I believe their faith can be restored, but that it cannot and should not be restored until they have related their thinking about capitalism more consciously to the general welfare. Capitalism, with its emphasis on thrift, hard work and the development of new methods of production, has a great contribution to make to the future. But it can make such a contribution effectively only in case it relates itself more continuously and wholeheartedly to the problems of democracy and religion.

* * *

As I see it, the democratic body of faith includes the following:

1. Action based on the will of the majority after the people have had opportunity to inform themselves as to the real facts.
2. Freedom of speech, press, art, science and religion.
3. Stability, order and the avoidance of violence, bloodshed and anarchy.
4. Promotion of a stable but ascending general welfare by increasing the productivity of the people and distributing the income as evenly as possible without destroying incentive.
5. Belief in the sacredness of the individual and in the unlimited possibilities of both man and nature which can be made manifest if those who are gifted in science, art and religion approach the unknown reverentially and not under the compulsion of producing immediate results for the glorification of one man, one group, one race or one nation.

6. Joyous faith in a progressive future based on the intelligent and constructive efforts of all the people to serve the general welfare.

7. Tolerance and humor in recognizing the right of all men to be different.

Democracy is on trial today. It has been challenged in this country and in the whole world. Organized violence, disregarding legal rights, moral rights and individual rights, threatens to destroy the democratic ideal.

We Americans must not and will not let the rule of force replace the rule of law. But if we are going to succeed, our democracy must be efficient and it must have purpose. Only in this way can we preserve the chance for individual initiative at its best.

* * *

For the first time in the history of the world, we have here in the United States the possibility of combining into a truly harmonious whole all the prerequisites to the good life. We have the natural resources, the accumulated capital, the democratic traditions, the educational institutions and the agencies for instantaneous communication of ideas. Other nations may perhaps rival us in one or two of these progressive forces, but not a single nation is so universally blessed.

A democracy can last over the centuries only if it is composed of individuals who have subjected their individual selves to certain religious disciplines. When I say this I am not pleading that all the people of the United States should be Protestants or Jews or Catholics, but I am asking that Protestants, Jews, Catholics and non-church members should recognize the doctrine of the general welfare.

The original American ideal was an ideal both of the whole man and of the whole society. It had to do with money-making and politics as well as with the religion of the church. Our Pilgrim fathers felt they were being just as religious when they made shoes or hoed corn or engaged in a town meeting as when they engaged in the more formal service in God's house.

The time is now ripe for religion to stand again for the whole man. It is time for ministers to realize that every minute of every day is a religious experience. Going to church may serve to restore our spiritual storage batteries. But we may as well recognize that many people are able to restore their spiritual storage batteries in other ways. In any event, much significant work is done outside the church. The economic, political, artistic and scientific endeavors of man can be made just as significant from a spiritual point of view as the purely churchly endeavors.

Who am I to criticize a Catholic, a Jew or a Protestant for the way in which he obtains the spiritual power with which to discipline himself on

behalf of the general welfare? It is not the American way to be intolerant of any approach to God.

I wish to say, therefore, that in the capitalism, the democracy and the religion of America there can be discovered workable foundations for building here and now an enduring social mechanism for serving first the general welfare of the United States and in so doing eventually the general welfare of the whole world. The foundation has been laid here broad and deep. The time has come to form the bricks of capitalism and the mortar of democracy into a superstructure conceived according to the principles of religion in the very broadest and deepest sense of the whole man and the whole society.

In the past there has been a tendency for the forces of unity and individual liberty to be exclusive. Either one or the other tended to have the upper hand. The excesses of one in time provoked the excesses of the other. Out of the past, with its wide swings in the polarity of thought with regard to unity and liberty, there begins to emerge the concept that the real truth may be a middle path in which the best unity is conditioned on the best individualism and vice versa.

On the whole, the trend now over the entire world is away from individualism, toward a preliminary unity, based on various types of nationalism. The efforts of the autarchical states make it certain that the democracies must emphasize unity more than in the past. Even if there had been no World War and no depression, it is altogether probable that the forces of individualism let loose by the discovery of America and reinforced by the democratic capitalism of the last 150 years would have resulted by this time in a strong movement toward unity. Many of us, seeing the inevitable trend of the times and scared by thoughts of various "isms," try desperately to hold on to concepts which were appropriate only as long as population was rapidly growing and there were great frontiers to be conquered. It is right that there should be concern about the loss of certain individualistic virtues, but it is wrong that such strenuous efforts should be put forth on behalf of that type of individualism which today blocks the path of the general welfare.

We intend most strenuously to avoid being carried to the extremes of an autarchy which denies the liberty of the individual. But we are also faced with the need for educating the different individuals as to the absolute necessity of working out appropriate disciplines, whether state-imposed or self-imposed, which will enable a democracy to exist in a world such as ours. In the final analysis, the power for this job can be furnished only by men imbued with the utmost religious enthusiasm and insight, who have equipped themselves with modern economic and political facts.

Workers must learn to look beyond their objective of shorter hours and higher pay to the problem of how best to produce more goods in a balanced way for all workers and not merely for those who are organized. In like manner, farmers must look beyond their efforts to obtain parity prices to the problem of how best to balance agricultural production and agricultural income with city production, so as to bring about the greatest welfare of all in the long run. Businessmen must look beyond the problem of obtaining the maximum profits on their invested capital to the job of bringing about a stable increased outflow of goods year after year on a basis which will best serve the welfare of all.

The members of each group now recognize their higher allegiance to the general welfare. They are seeking merely for a stronger motivation and increased knowledge. Day by day, governmental and private agencies are gathering increased knowledge. Month after month, an increased number of conferences are being held to exchange knowledge between the different groups. The time is ripe right here in the United States today for a practical yet religious acceptance of the doctrine of the general welfare. Yes, the time has come to emphasize the cost of the various rights and privileges in terms of disciplines and responsibilities. [*Concluding Lecture at Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif., February 24, 1938.*]

Wallace's spring lecture to the students and faculty of the Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, on April 8, was in no sense a cloistered exercise. Huey Long's grand new university plant, which Wallace had been asked to dedicate, was the scene of scandal and unrest at the time; and Wallace knew this as well as anyone. The student body was in low morale and inclined to be unruly. Midway in his address, when the microphone equipment went wrong, students shuffled their feet and booed. Wallace stepped clear of the sound apparatus, threw up an arm and pointed in the direction of the disturbance, demanding silence. Then, "I have come here to tell you some things you must hear and think about at this time," he said. They became quiet and heard him to the end.

A NEW WORLD, A NEW SPIRIT, A NEW GENERATION

We dedicate here today a magnificent set of new buildings. In them will be housed, I trust, a new spirit for the purpose of serving a new generation. I therefore take my text this morning from Revelations: "I saw a

new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away."

For all who teach the next generation this recognition is the beginning of wisdom; for we do live, very definitely, in a New World. Like all things new, this New World is growing very rapidly and it can be trained in any one of many directions. This New World can become a thing of beauty or a monstrous horror.

Seventy-three years ago the South lay prostrate after a great war. The money was gone and the fields were desolate. A terrible picture confronted the Southern soldiers when, struggling back to their homes, they started farmwork in the spring of 1865. But it was in some ways no more serious than the situation their grandchildren faced when they started farmwork in the spring of 1932.

The problem of the South is still not solved. Small farms, poor soil, poor schools, poverty—all these are too common in the Old South. With fifteen percent of the nation's income (as of 1929), the South is trying to educate about thirty-two percent of the nation's children. Every year around 100,000 young Southerners of production age move to other sections of the country. Assuming an average age of only fifteen and a cost of rearing and educating of only \$100 per year, this annual export of man and woman power by the South to the other regions would be equivalent to about \$150,000,000.

The crowding in the Southeast becomes worse in years of business depression when labor is thrown out of work in the Northern factories. The unemployed then return to their old homes in the South by the hundreds of thousands.

For a hundred years the South has been discriminated against by the tariff policy of the United States. The two leading crops, cotton and tobacco, are more largely on the foreign market than almost any other product produced in the United States. More than any other part of the United States, the South sells on a world market and buys on a protected market.

In brief, it may be said that for several generations the South has shipped people and products out and has failed to receive enough in return to replace the loss. When everything is taken into account it is probably true that the South has in effect been paying tribute to the rest of the nation to the extent of several hundred million dollars every year. I know it is customary in the North for Republicans to feel that Democratic administrations give many unjustified favors to the South. From the standpoint of abstract justice, however, I doubt if anything which we have done

during the past five years has been more than enough to offset the various disadvantages under which the South has long labored.

It is definitely to the advantage of the people in other states that the next generation of children from the small farms of the South should be healthy and well educated. In remedying past defects, I am sure the graduates from an institution like Louisiana State University will play an important part. Graduates of an agricultural college can easily take a narrow attitude with regard to matters outside of their particular field. It is largely because of this danger that I decided to come here today.

There are some things which I am in better position to say than most other people. I myself am a graduate of an agricultural college. My associations both before going to college and after leaving college have been to a rather unusual extent with agricultural-college people. I know them like a book and have the highest esteem for them. They have performed an extraordinary service during the past seventy-five years. The entire nation owes them a tremendous debt of gratitude. The four-horse team composed of the agricultural colleges, the experiment stations, the Extension Service and the Department of Agriculture has plowed many a long furrow in the big field of the public welfare.

But even more important, perhaps, than the new science in agriculture is the new democracy in agriculture. Farmers have learned to work together in community, county and state committees. Today we have a new approach and the farmers themselves are a part of it. But there are many farmers who do not yet realize their responsibility under the approach which has been developed.

When I travel about the country, people sometimes come up to me and say, "I want to thank President Roosevelt and you for what you have done for the farmers." This always disturbs me. It seems to imply an unsound relationship between farmers and government. If the farmers think that the President or the Secretary of Agriculture or the Democratic party or the government is handing out favors to them, there is the likelihood of serious trouble ahead. The government represents all the people. It could not carry on any farm program which consisted merely in handing out favors to farmers. But if the farmers are really informed and in earnest about using governmental power to solve farm problems in a way which is helpful to both agriculture and the entire nation, then I am certain that some such program as that which we now have will continue in effect indefinitely.

From time to time and especially during the next year or two we shall probably see tremendous efforts on the part of certain demagogues to create disunity among the farmers. They try to stir up trouble among the

farmers, hoping by their loud-mouthed talking to win political advancement. They never allow facts to interfere with their tongues. They are long on emotions and short on truth. In the corn belt, they will tell the farmers that the farm program is greatly increasing the corn acreage in the South. On the Pacific Coast they will claim that imports of Chinese eggs are ruining the farmers. Around the edges of the cotton and tobacco belt, where only small quantities of cotton and tobacco have hitherto been grown, and where there may be less understanding of the need for united action among all producers of these commodities, they will clamor for larger cotton and tobacco quotas. They have no interest in the general welfare of all the farmers. They are always hunting for opportunities to create strife between different groups of farmers, and never miss a chance to set producer against producer, region against region, and city men against farmers. Generally speaking, they are only interested in creating a confusion out of which they can arise as heroes or martyrs. Such people are the most dangerous enemies of the farmer.

Against these demagogues and those who stand behind them, the only weapon is education. The fog of prejudice disappears in the full light of the facts. And it is essential, therefore, that agricultural economic democracy be made the very center of any long-continuing program. In other words, the vitality of farm programs depends on the intelligent interest taken by community, county and state committeemen. It is up to these committeemen to awaken the imagination of the farmers with whom they work.

The most important thing of all—and this is where the graduates of new-model agricultural colleges really should come into their own—has to do with the training of leadership for making decisions not merely on the basis of a community or a county or a state or a region but on the basis of the welfare of the entire country.

Consider sugar, for example. You are very much interested in sugar in this part of Louisiana. The graduates of a land-grant college should be able to think clearly and fairly about the social, political and economic aspects of the national sugar problem. Let me tell you about some of the things which are not taught in any university but which have been brought out by our experience in Washington during the past five years.

First, the sugar producers of each state have a special state patriotism of their own. Second, the sugar-beet producers of the West have a different slant from the sugar-beet producers of the East. Third, the sugar-beet producers of Northern United States have a different slant from the cane producers of Louisiana and Florida. Fourth, the sugar producers of the mainland of the United States would like to discriminate against the

sugar produced in Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Fifth, the sugar producers of the mainland of the United States plus the insular possessions would like to discriminate against Cuba and the Philippines. They feel Cuban and Philippine sugar should be shut entirely out of the United States market and that the mainland producers of the United States should be given the right to produce the amount which formerly was produced by Cuba and the Philippines. Sixth, the seaboard refiners want the island sugar to come in but they want laws which in effect will compel Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines to ship most of their sugar to the United States in the raw form rather than in the refined form. Seventh, labor to some extent plays ball with the refiners because it feels that an increase in refining in the islands would reduce employment in the seaboard refineries. Labor is also interested in the status of labor in the sugar-beet fields. Finally, there is the consumer to be thought of. If the warring interests of all these other groups can be composed in order to bring chaos out of a long-suffering industry, we must make sure that the peace and harmony among the producers is not obtained by continually increasing the expense to the consumer.

There are several ways of solving a complicated problem of this sort. One is to respond to the most insistent pressure groups and thus let confusion become worse confounded. Another is to play old-fashioned log-rolling or balance-of-power politics. But the only sound method in the long run is to discover some formula for the general welfare as it can be made to work out in terms of these conflicting sugar forces.

Many efforts will be made by various interested parties to upset this sugar legislation conceived for the general welfare. Florida will say, "We need a bigger quota." Louisiana will say, "We need a bigger quota." Each group will try to get together arguments to prove that it is right. If the contention is carried far enough there will be a return to the old-fashioned sugar chaos. If an effort is made to remedy the situation by increasing tariffs, the result will be to favor Puerto Rico and Hawaii at the expense of the mainland, and at the same time there may be an upset in Cuba of the type to imperil our Latin-American relationships. Throughout the long years ahead I believe the people of the United States will find their best protection against trouble-making dictators to lie in the field of cultivating friendship with the Americas. It is vital to the peace of us and our children that the Americas turn a stony face to the European dictators who are intent on destroying democracy.

The spirit of American democracy, it seems to me, has long been sleeping. The depression beginning in 1930 partially woke it up, but the full awakening has come only with the stirring events overseas during the

past year. We know now that there are nations which despise democracy and which look with longing eyes toward this hemisphere. We know that these nations are conducting propaganda in this hemisphere and even in this nation. We know that they do not scruple to buy newspapers outside of their own land and that they use many devices to create dissension and discord. These nations look with envious eyes at the thinly populated Americas. They covet the trade of the Americas and do not scruple to use methods which we in the United States have not hitherto cared to use.

And now as we stand challenged we see there is much of waste and laziness, inefficiency, greed and shortsightedness in our democracy. We are challenged to free our democracy from anarchy and inefficiency. Too long have we allowed ourselves to be divided into squabbling groups and regions. We do not need to give up freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of science, freedom of art or freedom of religion in order to discover in a democracy a community of purpose.

The people who run the administrative systems of modern democracy must be imbued with a new spirit, the spirit which I trust will be taught not merely by word of mouth in university lectures, but by the contagion of fiery faith.

AN APPROACH TO EUGENICS

. . . I have dwelt at length with the contributions that Indian corn has made to American agriculture, and to our theoretical and experimental knowledge of fundamental principles of heredity. Does our knowledge about corn have any larger message at this time, when a world is being remade before our eyes?

It is easy—and very hazardous—to deduce general principles from our observation of other organisms and to attempt to find analogies in human affairs. The history of corn and its development could easily be worked over into such a sociological bedtime story, which would have very little meaning. Nevertheless, there are a few principles which may throw light on certain aspects of human affairs without straining our analogy to the breaking point.

Perhaps the clearest conclusion to emerge concerns that school of eugenic thought which hopes to bring about the millennium by sterilizations of deficient and defective. The failure of Dr. T. A. Kiesselbach's attempt to improve Hogue yellow dent corn by detasseling the sterile, the smutted and otherwise defected plants convinces me that it is impossible

to bring about genetic improvement of the human race merely through a sterilization program. What we know about the number of generations necessary to produce homozygosity in corn, and the rigorous technique necessary to utilize the principle of controlled heterosis in crossed corn production, renders it most unlikely that human society will countenance the rigid control necessary to utilize directly an effective program of genetic improvement that could be relied upon to change the inborn nature of mankind in any reasonably near future.

These negative conclusions are as far as we can go in reasoning directly from corn to man. Something may be said of a more general nature. Corn growing is not pure genetics. The variety of corn we attempt to breed is adapted to a certain definite environment. There is no one variety of corn that is equally good all over the United States. Either consciously or unconsciously we must accept a certain environment as part of our breeding program. We must make the best of that environment if we are to get a maximum crop. It would be the height of folly to spend years in developing a superior variety of corn, and then to give no thought to culture—preparing and fertilizing the seedbed, and cultivating against weeds. This adaptation to environment, and the need to control environment so far as possible to insure a crop, has clear implication in human affairs, where these same basic truths apply. The development of a high human culture is further complicated by an added dimension which does not concern us when we develop a superior variety of corn and carry it through to the harvest. With corn the problem of the breeder and grower is relatively simple, and the goal quite definite. The farmer has only such definite imponderables as the weather, insect pests, fluctuation in prices, labor difficulties, and the health of himself and his family to consider in bringing a crop to maturity.

The hardy soul who undertakes to direct human evolution must go beyond this and consider not only the genetic make-up of the human race and the environment in which this genetic background is expressed, but he must also give thought to the kind of environment in which the human spirit comes to its best fruition. It is very clear to anyone who has studied and tried to think philosophically about man that a eugenics program to have any significance whatever must be much more than merely applied human genetics. When we consider the almost insuperable difficulties placed in the way of the cattle breeder by such esthetic hurdles as color and indefinite points of conformation, we realize at once that the salvation of the human race cannot come through human genetics applied by a dictator. Our problem is further complicated by the fact that while the breeder has a fairly definite ideal in mind toward which he can select,

by the very nature of the case no such simple program will do for man, where our need is for diversity rather than uniformity.

It is impossible to follow the thought very far at this time, but I cannot close without saying what seems to me to be an inevitable conclusion from the premises: with the tremendously complicated background of civilization, with its varied physical, social and spiritual environments, it would seem utterly foolish to expect any program of human breeding directed by a dictator to have any value. Even though we grant that by decree we might breed for superior genes, even though we concede that physical environment might be improved in such a program, nevertheless is there any possibility that a fine human culture could flower under an authoritarian system? In a high culture a great variety of types and abilities are necessary. We know very little about how such abilities are inherited, or what environment best suits their development. We know that on the mental or spiritual plane, freedom of inquiry and opinion and a definite sense of the dignity of the individual seem to be essential.

It is definitely a false eugenic idea to work toward some standardized preconception of the perfect man, such as the "Aryan Race" of the Nazi mythology. No race has a monopoly on desirable genes and there are geniuses in every race. The fact that the dictator type of mind must inevitably oversimplify its problems, and attempt practical solutions, based on such false premises, can only mean that eugenic progress under a dictatorship will fail in the long run. Man does not live by bread alone, nor by genes alone. Without denying the importance of either, the third priceless intangible (hinted at by the founders of our country in such terms as life, liberty, pursuit of happiness, and the right to worship according to the dictates of one's conscience) is just as real a part of the environment of the civilized man as the physical world in which he lives.

To me, therefore, the democratic ideal, which recognizes the individual as having certain inalienable rights and virtues, seems to offer the only environment in which the type of personality which makes us human beings can flower to maximum development. Only with such a background can we judge genetic and developmental differences which must characterize men and women under a highly specialized civilization. No board of experts can tell a dictator how to breed a genius, nor indicate what kind of children our genius would have—if any. Were this possible, we feel sure that a "genius-breeding" program by decree (even a decree buttressed by 99.75% of the "electorate") could offer only the kind of environment from which the best inheritance would bear bitter fruit. If the eugenic outlook in democracies is today as bad as some eugenicists feel, the solution lies not in an appeal to dictatorship but in the development

of a kind of social environment in which superior individuals feel that life has values and possibilities which it is a privilege to pass on to one's children. This means developing a sense of responsibility and a faith in the future on the part of all our reasonable, capable people. Such an ideal is infinitely more difficult than the false hope of eugenics through dictatorship, but there may be no other solution.

When we consider these few facts bearing on the complicated question of human heredity and environment, it seems clear that the hope of our race lies not in following self-appointed prophets who play on our fears and prejudices but in working toward a culture in which normal people will have the greatest opportunity for developing and leading happy and useful lives. Such a program cannot ignore the knowledge we have gained by genetic research in corn and other organisms. Neither can it go far unless those who undertake to carry it out retain the reality of outlook and the humility of approach which the plant breeder, if he is to succeed, must have. We cannot legislate new varieties of corn or a better race of men. We must appeal to nature and we must apply the best fruits of the human mind and heart if we are to build that better world which is the dream not only of the eugenicist but of all pioneers of the human spirit.

[April 21, 1938.]

VIII: 1939

THE GENETIC BASIS OF DEMOCRACY

I WANT to pay tribute to Dr. Franz Boas. As chairman of the Lincoln's Birthday Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom his leadership has done much to marshal the moral forces of science and to bring us together for this Lincoln's Birthday meeting of scientists in New York City today.

The cause of liberty and the cause of true science must always be one and the same. For science cannot flourish except in an atmosphere of freedom, and freedom cannot survive unless there is an honest facing of