
Franklin D. Roosevelt — “The Great Communicator”

The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945

**Series 2: “ You have nothing to fear but fear itself:” FDR
and the New Deal**

File No. 944

1936 October 10

**Omaha. NE - Western Campaign Trip -
Campaign Address**

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT

OMAHA, NEBRASKA,

OCTOBER 9, 1936.

First a word to you as Nebraskans. I hope it will be heard by the citizens of the other forty-seven States because I know that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean government, representative government.

On this platform sits a man whose reputation for many years has been known in every community -- a man old in years but young in heart -- a man who through all these years has had no boss but his own conscience -- the Senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, given to the Nation by the people of Nebraska -- George W. Norris.

Outside of my own State of New York, I have consistently refrained from taking part in elections in any other State.

But Senator Norris' name has been entered as a candidate for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of non-participation in State elections I have made -- and so long as he lives I always

will make -- one magnificently justified exception.

George Norris' candidacy transcends State and party lines.

In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who like him have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years.

He is one of the major prophets of America.

Help this great American to continue an historic career of service.

Nebraska will be doing a great service, not only to itself but to every other State in the Union and to the Nation as a whole if it places this great American above partisanship and keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States.

[REDACTED]

In 1932 I pledged my Administration to a farm policy that would help the farmer. Tonight every man and woman on an American farm who has read today's market reports knows that we have done what we said we would do.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

What needed to be done?

You know that in March, 1933, after twelve lean years, farm income was disappearing and farm prices had sunk to a bankruptcy level.

In 1932 America's farm population was the greatest in our history, but the farmers' income was the lowest for the quarter century for which we have records. Farmers represented twenty-five per cent of the Nation's population -- but they got only $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the national income.

The spectre of foreclosure stalked the farmer's plow.

American agriculture was on the road to pauperism.

When the World War ended, the nations of Europe whom we had been feeding went back to farming for themselves. Our farmers were left holding the bag -- a bag that bulged with vast quantities of wheat, corn and cotton for which the market had disappeared.

And
That was the farmer's plight. What did Republican leadership do about it?

The best that it could offer was the Farm Board. The Farm Board set an all-time ^{high} ~~low~~ for extravagant futility. It met the problem of unsalable and unexportable surpluses by piling up bigger surpluses.

And To finish the job, the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff robbed the farmer of his last chance for a foreign market.

We found that this conspicuous failure of government to help the farmer had created -- by March, 1933 -- a state of mind in the Nation which, itself, seemed to bar any way out of the farmer's difficulties. There was a defeatist attitude -- a conviction that the farmer could not be helped -- that all efforts were foredoomed to failure -- that any party which dared to substitute action for talk would get its political fingers burned.

Along with this defeatism there was the belief that money spent on the farm problem was money wasted -- that the only excuse for spending it was to keep the farmer in line -- to buy political peace.

That was what had happened to American agriculture when this Administration came into office.

That was the debris of twelve years of failure which we had to clear away before we could begin to lay the basis for a permanent agricultural prosperity.

Tonight you know that the ground has been cleared of that debris. After twelve years in which he had been harrassed and weighed down by the burdens of each succeeding day, the farmer at last has begun to get into the clear, so that he can ~~work~~ ^{start} again to take thought for tomorrow.

Back of what we did was the conviction that the agricultural problem is not a problem for the farmer alone -- that it is a problem for the Nation as a whole. That is the way we attacked it.

And the Nation is now going along with the farmer. Now for the first time in this industrial period of our history the American people understand that there is a definite bond between agriculture and industry -- that the money we have used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment in the restoration of American industry, an underwriting for the wages of American labor, a stimulus for profits in American business.

10 min

The defeatist attitude has at last been defeated.

Back of what we did was a second conviction -- that a sound farm policy must be a policy ~~xxixxxxxxxxxxx~~ run by farmers. Ours is that kind of a policy. The farmers of America moved into the Department of Agriculture on the day that Henry Wallace set up shop there. For the first time, a national farm program was made in conference and with the agreement of ~~xxixxthe~~
^(or it's) farm leaders of all our farm organizations -- a program which came out of the free and open councils of farmers rather than out of the vote-catching schemes of politicians.

With these convictions, this Administration put its hand to the plow. It has not turned, it will not turn back.

I am going to tell you in just seven sentences what we did. Every man and woman on an American farm can expand those seven sentences in terms of the recovery that has come to each of them in the last three and a half years.

1. By our agricultural adjustment act, our monetary policy, our soil conservation program, and our assistance to farm cooperatives, we raised the farmers' net annual income by three and a half billion dollars to a sum three times what it was in 1932.

2. Through the Farm Credit Administration we saved ~~thousands~~ thousands of homes and farms from foreclosure and reduced the staggering burden of the farmers' debts.

3. Through reciprocal trade ~~treaties~~ ^{agreements} and international currency stabilization, we have begun to recover the farmers' foreign markets in the only way in which they can be recovered and held -- by a policy of mutual international advantage which today is bearing fruit in the reopening of markets for American farm products in all of the fourteen countries making these agreements -- by a policy which, for example, within the last ten days has brought about lower tariffs in France, Italy and Switzerland to the benefit of our farmers. A growing trade is making for international peace.

4. By our program to revive business -- to increase employment -- to raise business and professional incomes and the wages of labor -- and by increasing the purchasing power and consumption of the average American family -- we have restored national income, and prepared the way for the steady and long-time expansion of the farmers' home market.

5. By our program of land use and conservation we have ended the policy of immediate glut and eventual waste, and have laid the basis for permanent plenty.

6. By our program of rural electrification -- by our farm-to-market roads — by our aid to rural schools, we have begun to get for the farmer his fair share in the comforts, the advantages, the wider interests and the deeper satisfactions which go to make the good life for himself and for his children.

7. When disastrous drought struck the land in parts of our country, we rushed immediate and direct relief to the farmers and stockmen to save them from want — a policy that some people call waste! — but you and I call wise.

There is the record. In those seven sentences, the farmer and the farmer's family can measure, for themselves, the vast difference between the desperation which was theirs in 1933 and the recovery which is theirs in 1936. From what that record has done and is doing for you -- judge for yourselves our determination and our capacity to carry this program through.

After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer as his condition got worse and worse, what does Republican leadership now offer?

would
First of all, it ~~would~~ scrap the present program, which it has condemned as a "subterfuge" and a "stop-gap". It would junk the farmers' organization to carry it out. It would end the farmers' program of cooperation, and send them back to the "free competition" -- or "rugged individualism" if you will -- that wrecked them in 1932.

Next it would substitute a system of tariff equivalent payments, not for any permanent contribution to farm wealth or national income, but merely as a cash hand-out -- or a dole. These payments would be made only to the producers of exportable farm crops -- specifically on hogs, wheat, cotton and tobacco,

Dairymen, cattlemen, sugar growers and producers of other crops of which there normally is no exportable surplus would be left out.

What about the effect of such a scheme? Would it serve to protect farmers from price collapse under a burden of surpluses? Would it guard them in the future against a disaster like 1932?

No plan could lead the Nation back faster to such a crisis.

The proposed plan of the Republican leaders is a straight subsidy of unlimited farm production. In a year or two of normal weather, it would pile surplus on top of surplus, driving prices down and down. It is the Federal Farm Board all over again.

Finally, to make the parallel with 1932 letter perfect, the Republican leaders now propose to repeal the reciprocal tariff act, and go back to the Smoot-Hawley tariff policy. Once again

as in 1932, the farmers would have price-crushing surpluses at home, and no place abroad to sell them.

What about the cost? It would run to one and a half and even possibly two billion dollars ^{every} a year. This vast sum would be spent not to save agriculture but to wreck it.

Either this plan which they advocate in the West, or the curtailment of expenditures they talk about in the East, would have to be discarded. Both promises cannot possibly be carried out.

For the first time in many cruel years, we are getting the problem of the business of farming well in hand. Do you now want to turn over that problem to the care of those who did nothing about it in the past? Do you want to turn it over to those who now make inconsistent, campaign-devised, half-baked promises which you and they know they cannot keep?

20 min

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
It has been said that the Administration's farm program changes each year like new models of automobiles. I accept that simile.

The automobile of today is the same kind of a vehicle, in principle, as it was twenty years ago. But because the automobile manufacturer did not hesitate to pioneer --- because he was willing to make yearly changes in his model --- the Nation now drives a car that is vastly improved. [Farming too is the same in principle now as it has always been. But] because the farmer has been willing to pioneer --- because, with the aid of scientists, economists and engineers he has been willing, year after year, to change -- because of these things both the product of the farms and the business of farming have been vastly improved. It is the aim of our policy not only to prevent the return of yesterday's model but to make tomorrow's model better than today's. Good as it was for its day, we have passed beyond Model T. farming.

Our long time policy of prudence and farm progress includes a program of conservation against land wastage and soil impoverishment. From the beginning, such a program has been basic in our plans. [On October 25, 1933, months before the action of the Supreme Court on the Triple A, I said publicly that it was the intention of the framers of that act as it was my intention:

"to pass from the purely emergency phases necessitated by a grave national crisis to a long-time more permanent plan for American agriculture."]

We knew that our soil had been recklessly impoverished by crops which did not pay. Because we stand committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty we have set ourselves resolutely against waste -- waste that comes from unneeded production, waste that imperils the Nation's future by draining away the abundance with which God has enriched our soil.

Increasing production alone in an unlimited way appeals to no person who thinks the problem through. Increasing consumption must go hand in hand with it. Here is a simple figure to mull over. If every family in the United States had enough money to live on what the doctors and dietitians call a "Class A Diet", we would need foodstuffs from forty-five million acres more than we are using today. America's diet is better than that of most other nations, but from the point of view of better national health, it is still inadequate. I seek to increase purchasing power so that people can pay for more food and better food, and in turn provide a larger and larger domestic market for the farmer.

It is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. We are preparing legislation, in cooperation with farm leaders, to submit to the Congress in January to help solve this problem. We cannot, as a Nation, be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own farm.

Further -- we propose to give to the farmer and to the consumer -- a sound plan of crop insurance^{in kind} against extreme fluctuations of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations but the speculator. The farmer and the consumer lose together.

That is why crop insurance is a protection for both. At one and the same time it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the farmer's fear of a food surplus. [Until both are protected neither is safe.] The ultimate interests of the farmer and the consumer are the same.

That is why I am not making one kind of a speech to the farmers out here and another kind of speech to consumers in the big cities,^{of the East.} The same speech and the same policy must go for both.

The city dweller has come to know that unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces, he cannot buy the things that are turned out in the shops and factories of the cities.

And so we plan for the future of agriculture--security for those who have spent their lives in farming; opportunity for real careers for young men and women on the farm -- a share for farmers in the good things of life abundant enough to justify and preserve our instinctive faith in the land.

In all our plans we are guided, and will continue to be guided, by the fundamental ~~xmaxx~~ belief that the farmer, ^{American} living on his own land, remains our ideal of self-reliance and of spiritual balance -- the source from which the reservoirs of the Nation's strength are constantly renewed. It is from the men and women of our farms -- living close to the soil, that this Nation -- like the Greek giant Antaeus touches Mother Earth and rises with strength renewed a hundred-fold.

We want to perpetuate that ideal under modern conditions,
so that man may be strong in the ancient virtues and yet lay hold
of the advantages which science and new knowledge offer to a well-
rounded life.

N. B.: The correct date of this speech
is October 10, 1936, as given in The
New York Times Index, 1936, and the
Public Papers and Addresses of F.D.R., 1936.

W.J.N.
8/20/47

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

AKSARBEN COLISEUM, OMAHA, NEBRASKA

October 10, 1936, about 7.30 P.M.

(Mrs. Gilbert M. Hitchcock introduced the
President.)

Mrs. Hitchcock, Governor Cochran, Mr. Mayor, you my
friends of Nebraska and neighboring States:

I am glad to come back to Nebraska after an absence
of only a few weeks, and I am especially glad to come
for the first time to this marvelous Aksarben Coliseum
and to receive your greetings. (Applause)

First of all a word to you as Nebrascans. I hope (it) that this word will be heard by the citizens of the other forty-seven States because I know that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean government, representative government. (Applause)

On this platform sits a man whose reputation for many years has been known in every community -- a man old in years but young in heart -- a man who through all these years has had no boss but his own conscience -- the Senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, given to the Nation by the people of Nebraska -- George W. Norris. (Applause)

Outside of my own State of New York, I have consistently refrained from taking part in elections in any other State.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

This is a transcript made by the White House stenographer from his shorthand notes taken at the time the speech was made. Underlining indicates words extemporaneously added to the speech prepared reading copy text. Words in parentheses are words that were omitted when the speech was delivered, though they appear in the previously prepared reading copy text.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

This is a transcript made by the White House stenographer from his shorthand notes taken at the time the speech was made. Underlining indicates words extemporaneously added to the previously prepared reading copy text. Words in parentheses are words that were omitted when the speech was delivered, though they appear in the previously prepared reading copy text.

But Senator Norris' name has been entered as a candidate for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of non-participation in State elections I have made -- and so long as he lives I always will make -- one magnificently justified exception. (Applause)

George Norris' candidacy transcends State and party lines. In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who like him have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years.

He is one of the major prophets of America.

My friends, help this great American to continue an historic career of service.

Nebraska will be doing a great service, not only to itself but to every other State in the Union and to the Nation as a whole if it places this great American above partisanship and keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States. (Prolonged applause)

(In) I want to take you back four years, four years to 1932. In that year, when I was a candidate for the presidency, I pledged my Administration, if elected, to a farm policy that would help the farmer. And tonight every man and woman on an American farm, East or West, who has read today's market reports knows that we have done what we said we would do. (Applause)

What needed to be done?

You (know) remember that in March, 1933, after twelve

(lean) long years, farm income was disappearing and farm prices had sunk to a bankruptcy level.

In 1932 America's farm population was the greatest in our history, (but) and yet the farmers' income was the lowest for the quarter century for which we have records. Farmers represented twenty-five per cent of the Nation's population -- but they got only 7½% of the national income.

The spectre of foreclosure stalked the farmer's plow.

American agriculture was on the road to pauperism.

When the World War ended, the nations of Europe whom we had been feeding went back to farming for themselves. Our farmers were left holding the bag -- a bag that bulged with vast quantities of wheat, and corn and cotton for which the market had (disappeared) collapsed.

That was the farmer's plight. What did Republican leadership do about it?

The best that it could offer was a contraption called the Farm Board, (The Farm Board) -- a contraption that set an all-time (low) high for extravagant futility. It met the problem of unsaleable and unexportable surpluses by piling up bigger surpluses.

To finish the job, the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff robbed the farmer of his last chance for a foreign market.

We found that this conspicuous failure of government to help the farmer had created -- by March 4, 1933 -- a state of mind in the Nation itself which, (itself), seemed

to bar (the) any way out of the farmer's difficulties. There was a defeatist attitude -- a conviction that the farmer could not be helped -- that all efforts were foredoomed to failure -- that any party which dared to substitute action for talk would get its political fingers burned.

Along with this defeatism there was the belief that money spent on the farm problem was money wasted -- that the only excuse for spending it was to keep the farmer in line -- in order to buy political peace.

Yes, that was what happened to American agriculture when this Administration came into office.

That was the debris of twelve years of failure which we had to clear away before we could begin to lay the basis for a permanent agricultural prosperity.

Tonight you know that the ground has been cleared of that debris. After twelve years in which he had been harrassed and weighed down by the burdens of each succeeding day, the farmer at last has begun to get into the clear, so that he can begin again to take thought for tomorrow.

Back of what we did was the conviction that the agricultural problem is not a problem for the farmer alone -- that it is a problem for the Nation as a whole. That is the way we attacked it.

And today the Nation is (now) going along with the farmer. Now, for the first time in this industrial period

of our history the American people understand that there is a definite bond between agriculture and industry -- that the money we have used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment in the restoration of American industry, an underwriting for the wages of American labor, a stimulus for profits in American business.

In other words, the defeatist attitude has (at last) itself been defeated. (Applause)

Back of what we did was a second conviction -- that a sound farm policy must be a policy run by farmers. Ours is that kind of (a) policy. The farmers of America moved into the Department of Agriculture on the day that Henry Wallace set up shop there. (Applause) And for the very first time, a national farm program was made in conference and with (the) agreement of the farm leaders of all our farm organizations -- a program, get this, a program which came out of the free and open councils of farmers rather than out of the vote-catching schemes of politicians. (Applause)

With these convictions, this Administration put its hand to the plow. It has not turned and it will not turn back. (Applause)

I am going to tell you in just seven sentences what we did. Every man and woman in America, every man and woman on an American farm can expand (those) these seven sentences in terms of the recovery that has come to each of them in the last three and a half years.

(1.) First, by our agricultural adjustment act, our monetary policy, our soil conservation (program) policy, and our assistance to farm cooperatives, we have raised the farmers' net annual income by three and a half billion dollars to a sum three times what it was in 1932. (Applause)

(2.) Second, through the Farm Credit Administration we have saved thousands of homes and farms from foreclosure and reduced the staggering burden of the farmers' debts. (Applause)

(3.) Third, through reciprocal trade treaties and inter-national currency stabilization, we have begun to recover the farmers' foreign markets in the only way in which they can be recovered and held -- by a policy of mutual (international) advantage, mutual international advantage which today is bearing fruit in the reopening of markets for American farm products in all of the fourteen countries making these agreements -- by a policy which, for example, within the last ten days has brought about lower tariffs in France, Italy and Switzerland (to) for the benefit of our farmers. And, my friends, a growing trade is making for international peace. (Prolonged applause)

(4.) Fourth, by our program to revive business -- to increase employment -- to raise business and professional incomes and the wages of labor -- and by increasing the purchasing power and consumption of the average American

family -- we have restored national income, and prepared the way for the steady and long-time expansion of the farmers' home market. (Applause)

(5.) Fifth, by our program of land use and conservation we have ended the policy of immediate glut and eventual waste, and have laid the basis for a permanent plenty. (Applause)

(6.) Sixth, by our program of rural electrification, and you people of Nebraska know what we are doing in this State (applause) -- by our farm-to-market roads -- by our aid to rural schools, (applause) we have begun to get for the farmer his fair share in the comforts, the advantages, the wider interests and the deeper satisfactions which go to make the good life for himself and for his children. (Applause)

(7.) And seventh, when disastrous drought struck the land in many parts of our country, we rushed immediate and direct relief to the farmers and stockmen to save them from want -- a policy that some people call waste -- but that you and I call wise. (Applause)

There, my friends, is the record. In those seven sentences, the farmer and the farmer's family can measure, for themselves, the vast difference between the desperation which was theirs in the Spring of 1933 and the recovery which is theirs in 1936. From what that record has done and is doing for you -- judge for yourselves our determination

and our capacity to carry this program through.

After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer, as his condition got worse and worse, what does Republican leadership now offer? (Applause)

First of all, it would scrap the present program, which it has condemned as a "subterfuge" and a "stop-gap". It would junk the farmers' organization to carry it out. It would end the farmers' program of cooperation, and send them back to the "free competition" -- (or) and the "rugged individualism" if you will -- that wrecked them in 1932. (Applause)

And then, next, it would substitute a system of tariff equivalent payments, I think they are called, not for any permanent contribution to farm wealth or national income, but merely as a cash hand-out -- (or) in other words, a dole. These payments, under their plan, would be made only to the producers of exportable farm crops -- specifically on hogs, wheat, cotton and tobacco.

But dairymen, cattlemen, sugar growers and producers of all the hundred other varieties of crops (of) in which there normally is no exportable surplus would be left out. (Applause)

What about the effect of such a scheme? Would it serve to protect farmers from price collapse under a burden of surpluses? Would it guard them in the future against a

disaster like 1932?

No plan could lead the Nation back faster to such a crisis.

The proposed plan of the Republican leaders is a straight subsidy of unlimited farm production. In a year or two of normal weather, it would pile surplus on top of surplus, driving prices down and down and down. It is the Federal Farm Board all over again and it is 9 cents for corn as it was in 1932. (Applause)

And finally, to make the parallel with 1932 more letter perfect, the Republican leaders now propose to repeal the reciprocal tariff act, and go back to the old Smoot-Hawley tariff policy. Once again, as in 1932, the farmers would have price-crushing surpluses at home, and no place (abroad to sell them) to sell abroad.

And what about the cost? It would run to one and a half and even possibly two billion dollars every year. This vast sum would be spent not to save agriculture but to wreck it and with it the Nation. (Applause)

And remember, my friends, that either this plan which they advocate in the West, or the curtailment of expenditures that they talk about in the East, would have to be discarded. Both promises cannot possibly be carried out at the same time. (Applause)

For the first time in many cruel years, we are getting the (problem of the) business of farming well in hand. Do

you now want to turn over that problem to the care of those who did nothing about it in the past? Do you want to turn it over to those who now make inconsistent, campaign-devised, half-baked promises -- (audience: "No") (which you) and they know they cannot keep them!

It has been said that the Administration's farm program changes each year like new models of automobiles. I accept that simile. (Laughter) The automobile of today is the same kind of a vehicle, in principle, as it was twenty years ago. But because the automobile manufacturer backed by the public, did not hesitate to pioneer -- because he was willing to make yearly changes in his model -- the Nation now drives a car that is vastly improved. (Farming too is the same in principle now as it has always been.) But because the farmer has been willing to pioneer -- because, with the aid of scientists, economists and engineers he has been willing, year after year, to change -- because of these things both the product of the farms and the business of farming have been vastly improved. It is the aim of our policy not only to prevent the return of yesterday's model but to make tomorrow's model better than today's. (Applause) Good as it was (for its day) in the old days, we have passed beyond Model T farming. (Applause)

Our long-time policy of prudence and farm progress includes a program of conservation against land wastage and soil impoverishment. From the beginning, such a program

has been basic in our plans. On October 25, (1933) 1935, months before the action of the Supreme Court on the Triple A, I said publicly that it was the intention of the farmers of that act as it was my intention: "to pass from the purely emergency phases necessitated by a grave national crisis to a long-time more permanent plan for American agriculture." (Applause)

We knew that our soil had been recklessly impoverished by crops which did not pay. Because we stand committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty we have set ourselves resolutely against waste -- waste that comes from unneeded production, waste that imperils the Nation's future by draining away the abundance with which God has enriched our soil.

Increasing production alone in an unlimited way appeals to no person who thinks the problem through. Increasing consumption must go hand in hand with it. Here is a simple figure to mull over. If every family in the United States had enough money, had enough earning capacity, to live on what the doctors and dietitians call a "Class A Diet", we would need foodstuffs from forty-five million acres more than we are using today. America's diet is better than that of most other nations, but from the point of view of better national health, it is still inadequate. I seek to increase purchasing power so that people can pay for more food and better food, and in turn provide a larger and larger domestic

market for the farmer.

It is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. We are preparing legislation, in co-operation with farm leaders, to submit to the Congress in January to help solve this problem. We cannot, as a Nation, be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own farm. (Applause)

Further -- we propose to give to the farmer and to the consumer -- a sound plan of crop insurance in kind against extreme fluctuations of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations (but) except the speculator. The farmer and the consumer lose together. (Applause)

That is why crop insurance is a protection for both. For the farmer and consumer as well, at one and the same time it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the farmer's fear of a food surplus. Until both are protected, neither is safe. The ultimate interests of the farmer and the consumer of America are the same. (Applause)

And that, my friends, is why I am not making one kind of a speech to the farmers out here and another kind of speech to consumers in the big cities of the East. (Prolonged applause) The same speech and the same policy must go for both. (Applause)

It took a lot of education in these last few years
but the city dweller has come to know that unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces, he cannot buy the things that are turned out in the shops and factories of the cities.

And so we plan for the future of agriculture -- security for those who have spent their lives in farming; opportunity for real careers for young men and women on the farms -- a share for farmers in the good things of life abundant enough to (justify) satisfy and preserve our instinctive faith in the land.

In all our plans we are guided, and will continue to be guided, by the fundamental belief that the American farmer, living on his own land, remains our ideal of self-reliance and of spiritual balance. (Applause) He is the source from which the reservoirs of the Nation's strength are constantly renewed. It is from the men and women of our farms -- living close to the soil, that this Nation -- like the Greek giant Antaeus touches Mother Earth and rises with strength renewed a hundred-fold.

We want to perpetuate that ideal, we want to perpetuate it under modern conditions, so that man may be strong in the ancient virtues and yet lay hold of the advantages which science and new knowledge offer to a well-rounded life.

(Prolonged applause)



FARM PLEDGES FULFILLED

Address of
PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
OMAHA, NEBRASKA
October 10, 1936

"After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer as his condition got worse and worse, what does Republican leadership now offer?"

Read

President Roosevelt's

Reply

Issued by

THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
Hotel Biltmore, New York



Farm Pledges Fulfilled

The full text of the address delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt at Omaha, Nebraska, October 10, 1936, follows:

"After twelve years in which he has been harassed and weighted down by the burdens of each succeeding day, the farmer at last has begun to get into the clear, so that he can begin again to take thought for tomorrow.

Back of what we did was the conviction that the agricultural problem is not a problem for the farmer alone — that it is a problem for the nation as a whole. That is the way we attacked it.

And the nation is now going along with the farmer. Now, for the first time in this industrial period of our history, the American people understand that there is a definite bond between agriculture and industry—that the money we have used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment in the restoration of American industry, an underwriting for the wages of American labor, a stimulus for profits in American business.

The defeatist attitude has at last been defeated."

First, a word to you as Nebraskans. I hope it will be heard by the citizens of the other forty-seven States because I know that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean government, representative government.

On this platform sits a man whose reputation for many years has been known in every community—a man old in years, but young in heart—a man who through all these years has had no boss but his own conscience—the senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, given to the nation by the people of Nebraska—George W. Norris.

Outside my own State of New York I have consistently refrained from taking part in elections in any other State.

An Elder Statesman

But Senator Norris's name has been entered as a candidate for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of non-participation in State elections I have made—and so long as I live I always will make—one magnificently justified exception.

George Norris's candidacy transcends State and party lines. In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who, like him, have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years.

He is one of the major prophets of America.

Help this great American to continue a historic career of service.

Nebraska will be doing a great service, not only to itself but to every other State in the Union and to the nation as a whole, if it places this great American above partisanship and keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States.

In 1932 I pledged my administration to a farm policy that would help the farmer. Tonight every man and woman on an American farm who has read today's market reports knows that we have done what we said we would do.

What needed to be done?

You know that in March, 1933, after twelve lean years, farm income was disappearing and farm prices had sunk to a bankrupt level.

In 1932 America's farm population was the greatest in our history, but the farmers' income was the lowest for the quarter century for which we have records. Farmers represented 25 per cent of the nation's population—but they got only 7½ per cent of the national income.

Foreclosure Threats

The spectre of foreclosure stalked the farmer's plow. American agriculture was on the road to pauperism. When the World War ended, the nations of Europe whom we had been feeding went back to farming for themselves. Our farmers were left holding the bag—a bag that bulged with vast quantities of wheat, corn and cotton, for which the market had disappeared.

That was the farmer's plight. What did the Republican leadership do about it?

The best that it could offer was the Farm Board. The Farm Board set an all-time high for extravagant futility. It met the problem of unsalable and unexportable surpluses by piling up bigger surpluses.

To finish the job, the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff robbed the farmer of his last chance for a foreign market.

We found that this conspicuous failure of government to help the farmer had created—by March, 1933—a state of mind in the nation which, itself, seemed to bar any way out of the farmer's difficulties. There was a defeatist attitude—a conviction that the farmer could not be helped—that all efforts

were foredoomed to failure—that any party which dared to substitute action for talk would get its political fingers burned.

Along with this defeatism there was the belief that money spent on the farm problem was money wasted—that the only excuse for spending it was to keep the farmer in line—to buy political peace.

That was what had happened to American agriculture when this administration came into office.

That was the débris of twelve years of failure which we had to clear away before we could begin to lay the basis for a permanent agricultural prosperity.

Debris Cleared Away

Tonight you know that the ground has been cleared of that debris. After twelve years in which he has been harassed and weighted down by the burdens of each succeeding day, the farmer at last has begun to get into the clear, so that he can begin again to take thought for tomorrow.

Back of what we did was the conviction that the agricultural problem is not a problem for the farmer alone—that it is a problem for the nation as a whole. That is the way we attacked it.

And the nation is now going along with the farmer. Now, for the first time in this industrial period of our history, the American people understand that there is a definite bond between agriculture and industry—that the money we have used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment in the restoration of American industry, an underwriting for the wages of American labor, a stimulus for profits in American business.

The defeatist attitude has at last been defeated.

Back of what we did was a second conviction—that a sound farm policy must be a policy run by farmers. Ours is that kind of a policy.

The farmers of America moved into the Department of Agriculture on the day that Henry Wallace set up shop there. For the first time, a national

farm program was made in conference and with the agreement of farm leaders of all our farm organizations—a program which came out of the free and open councils of farmers rather than out of the vote-catching schemes of politicians.

With these convictions, this administration put its hand to the plow. It has not turned, it will not turn back.

What Was Done

I am going to tell you in just seven sentences what we did. Every man and woman on an American farm can expand those seven sentences in terms of the recovery that has come to each of them in the last three and a half years.

1. By our Agricultural Adjustment Act, our monetary policy, our soil-conservation program and our assistance to farm co-operatives we raised the farmers' net annual income by \$3,500,000,000 to a sum three times what it was in 1932.

2. Through the Farm Credit Administration we saved thousands of homes and farms from foreclosure and reduced the staggering burden of the farmers' debts.

3. Through reciprocal trade treaties and international currency stabilization we have begun to recover the farmers' foreign markets in the only way in which they can be recovered and held—by a policy of mutual international advantage which today is bearing fruit in the reopening of markets for American farm products in all of the fourteen countries making these agreements—by a policy which, for example, within the last ten days has brought about lower tariffs in France, Italy and Switzerland to the benefit of our farmers. A growing trade is making for international peace.

4. By our programs to revive business—to increase employment—to raise business and professional incomes and the wages of labor—and by increasing the purchasing power and consumption of the average American family—we have restored

national income, and prepared the way for the steady and long-time expansion of the farmers' home market.

5. By our program of land use and conservation we have ended the policy of immediate glut and eventual waste, and have laid the basis for permanent plenty.

6. By our program of rural electrification—by our farm-to-market roads—by our aid to rural schools, we have begun to get for the farmer his fair share in the comforts, the advantages, the wider interests and the deeper satisfactions which go to make the good life for himself and for his children.

7. When disastrous drought struck the land in parts of our country, we rushed immediate and direct relief to the farmers and stockmen to save them from want—a policy that some people call waste, but you and I call wise.

"There Is The Record"

There is the record. In those seven sentences, the farmer and the farmer's family can measure, for themselves, the vast difference between the desperation which was theirs in 1933 and the recovery which is theirs in 1936. From what the record has done and is doing for you, judge for yourselves our determination and our capacity to carry this program through.

After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer as his condition got worse and worse, what does Republican leadership now offer?

First of all, it would scrap the present program, which it has condemned as a "subterfuge" and a "stop-gap." It would junk the farmers' organization to carry it out. It would end the farmers' program of cooperation, and send them back to the "free competition"—or "rugged individualism" if you will—that wrecked them in 1932.

Next it would substitute a system of tariff equivalent payments, not for any permanent contribu-

tions to farm wealth or national income, but merely as a cash handout—or a dole. These payments would be made only to the producers of exportable farm crops—specifically on hogs, wheat, cotton and tobacco.

Dairymen, cattle men, sugar growers and producers of other crops of which there normally is no exportable surplus would be left out.

What about the effect of such a scheme? Would it serve to protect farmers from price collapse under a burden of surpluses? Would it guard them in the future against a disaster like 1932?

Leads Back to Crisis

No plan could lead the nation back faster to such a crisis.

The proposed plan of the Republican leaders is a straight subsidy of unlimited farm production. In a year or two of normal weather it would pile surplus on top of surplus, driving prices down and down. It is the Federal Farm Board all over again.

Finally, to make the parallel with 1932 letter perfect, the Republican leaders now propose to repeal the Reciprocal Tariff Act and go back to the Smoot-Hawley tariff policy. Once again, as in 1932, the farmers would have price-crushing surpluses at home and no place abroad to sell them.

What about the cost? It would run to one and a half and even possibly two billion dollars every year. This vast sum would be spent not to save agriculture, but to wreck it.

Either this plan which they advocate in the West, or the curtailment of expenditures they talk about in the East, would have to be discarded. Both promises cannot possibly be carried out.

For the first time in many cruel years we are getting the problem of the business of farming well in hand. Do you now want to turn over that problem to the care of those who did nothing about it in the past? Do you want to turn it over to those who now make inconsistent, campaign-devised, half-

baked promises which you and they know they cannot keep?

It has been said that the administration's farm program changes each year like new models of automobiles. I accept that simile. The automobile of today is the same kind of vehicle, in principle, as it was twenty years ago. But because the automobile manufacturer did not hesitate to pioneer—because he was willing to make yearly changes in his model—the nation now drives a car that is vastly improved.

Farming Improved

Farming, too, is the same in principle now as it has always been. But because the farmer has been willing to pioneer—because, with the aid of scientists, economists and engineers he has been willing, year after year, to change—because of these things both the product of the farms and the business of farming have been vastly improved.

It is the aim of our policy not only to prevent the return of yesterday's model but to make tomorrow's model better than today's. Good as it was for its day, we have passed beyond Model T farming.

Our long-time policy of prudence and farm progress includes a program of conservation against land wastage and soil impoverishment. From the beginning such a program has been basic in our plans. On Oct. 25, 1935, months before the action of the Supreme Court on the triple A, I said publicly that it was the intention of the farmers of that act, as it was my intention, "to pass from the purely emergency phase necessitated by a grave national crisis to a long-time, more permanent plan for American agriculture."

We knew that our soil had been recklessly impoverished by crops which did not pay. Because we stand committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty, we have set ourselves resolutely against waste—waste that comes from unneeded production, waste that imperils the nation's future by

draining away the abundance with which God has enriched our soil.

Must Increase Consumption

Increasing production alone in an unlimited way appeals to no person who thinks the problem through. Increasing consumption must go in hand in hand with it. Here is a simple figure to mull over. If every family in the United States had enough money to live on what the doctors and dietitians call a "class A diet," we would need foodstuffs from 45,000,000 acres more than we are using today. America's diet is better than that of most other nations, but from the point of view of better national health, it is still inadequate. I seek to increase purchasing power so that people can pay for more food and better food, and in turn provide a larger and larger domestic market for the farmer.

It is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. We are preparing legislation, in cooperation with farm leaders, to submit to the Congress in January to help solve this problem. We cannot, as a nation, be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own land.

Further, we propose to give to the farmer and to the consumer a sound plan of crop insurance in kind against extreme fluctuations of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations but the speculator. The farmer and the consumer lose together.

That is why crop insurance is a protection for both. At one and the same time it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the farmer's fear of a food surplus. Until both are protected neither is safe. The ultimate interests of the farmer and the consumer are the same.

That is why I am not making one kind of speech to the farmers out here and another kind of speech

to consumers in the big cities. The same speech and the same policy must go for both.

The city dweller has come to know that unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces, he cannot buy the things that are turned out in the shops and factories of the cities.

Plan for Future

And so we plan for the future of agriculture—security for those who have spent their lives in farming; opportunity for real careers for young men and women of the farm—a share for farmers in the good things of life abundant enough to justify and preserve our instinctive faith in the land.

In all our plans we are guided, and will continue to be guided, by the fundamental belief that the American farmer, living on his own land, remains our ideal of self-reliance and of spiritual balance—the source from which the reservoirs of the nation's strength are constantly renewed. It is from the men and women of our farms—living close to the soil, that this nation—like the Greek giant Antaeus, touches mother earth, and rises with strength renewed a hundredfold.

We want to perpetuate that idea under modern conditions so that many may be strong in the ancient virtues and yet lay hold of the advantages which science and new knowledge offer to a well-rounded life.

DRAFT OF FARM SPEECH IN OMAHA

First a word to you as Nebraskans. I hope it will be heard by the citizens of the other forty-seven States because I know that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean government, representative government.

On this platform sits a man whose reputation for many years has been known in every community -- a man old in years but young in heart -- a man who through all these years has had no boss but his own conscience -- ~~whose white plume~~

~~sitting above the battle has heartened hosts of men of good will~~
~~join to the nation by the people of Nebraska~~
the Senior Senator from the State of Nebraska -- George W. Norris.

Outside of my own State of New York, I have consistently refrained from taking part in elections in any other State. ~~and~~ ^{who} in this State ^{of the} legally chosen nominees for the United States Senate ~~and~~ ^{and} running on the Republican ~~and~~ Democratic tickets.
I am in no way expressing antagonism to either of ~~these~~ gentlemen.

But Senator Norris' name has been entered as an Independent candidate for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of non-participation in State elections I have made -- and so long as he lives I always will make -- one magnificently justified exception.

George Norris' candidacy transcends State and party lines.

In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years. ~~Not~~ Only have few men served the public in the Halls of the Congress as long as George Norris -- but none have made themselves more greatly felt in the shaping of constructive legislation. No other Senator has successfully sponsored in his white-haired seventies a vital amendment to the Constitution of the United States and two acts which so breathe the spirit of youth as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Program.

George Norris is one of the major prophets of America. Nebraska will be doing a great service, not only to itself but to every other State in the Union and to the Nation as a whole if it places this great American above partisanship and keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States.

Another Senator, who does not share his or our views, has said that "it is worth a million dollars to get Norris out of the Senate." For the rest of us George Norris could have no higher recommendation than this measure of his danger to our enemies.

H.
George Norris is needed in Washington. You in Nebraska have a notable opportunity to pay tribute to a great American and ~~enable~~ him to continue an historic career of service.

Fried from but do not
actually eat it until .

-3-

In 1933 I pledged my Administration to a farm policy that would help the farmer. Tonight every man and woman on an American farm who has read today's market reports knows that we have done what we said we would do.

What needed to be done?

You know that in March, 1933, ~~the American farmer had~~ after already had twelve lean years, ~~each year harder than the last~~ farm was disappearing and ~~the income had disappeared~~ farm prices had sunk to a bankruptcy level. In 1932 America's farm population was the ~~highest~~ greatest in our history, but the farmers' income was the lowest for ~~anywhere~~ the quarter century for which we have records. ~~The~~ Farmers represented twenty-five per cent of the Nation's population — but they got only $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the national income.

The spectre of foreclosure ~~followed~~ stalked the farmer's plow.

American agriculture was on the road to pauperism.

Farming started down that road immediately after the War. To meet the war cry for food and more food at home and abroad, millions of new acres had been mobilized to provide the greatest outpouring of foodstuffs that the world has ever seen.

When the War ended, Europe went back to farming for ~~the nations of~~ ^{World} ~~whom we had been feeding~~ ^{itself}. Our farmers were left holding the bag — a bag that bulged with vast quantities of wheat, corn and cotton for which the market had disappeared.

That was the farmer's plight. [] What did Republican leadership do about it? During those twelve long, lean years, ⁽¹⁹³⁰⁻³¹⁾ the farmer had not been steered off this road to pauperism - he ^{had} ~~had been~~ pushed along that road by government ^{was} bungling.

The best that ~~the Republican leadership~~ could offer was the Farm Board. The Farm Board set an all-time low for extra-

vagance ~~and~~ futility. Its net out-of-pocket loss was \$750,000,000. It met the problem of unsaleable and unexportable surpluses by agriculture was being smothered with surpluses. The Farm Board did not stop -- on the contrary it only piled up bigger farm surplus -- it speeded up the process of agricultural suffocation.

To finish the job, the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff robbed the farmer of his last chance for a foreign market.

[] We found that this conspicuous failure of government to help the farmer had created -- by March, 1933 -- a state of mind in the nation which, itself, ^{seemed to any} ~~barely~~ the way out of the farmer's difficulties. There was a defeatist attitude -- a conviction that the farmer could not be helped -- that all efforts were foredoomed to failure -- that any party which dared to substitute action for talk would get its political fingers burned.

[] bigger surplus.

Along with this defeatism there was the belief that money spent on the farm problem was money wasted -- that the only excuse for spending it was to keep the farmer in line -- to buy political peace.

That was what had happened to American agriculture when this Administration came into office.

That was the debris of twelve years of failure which we had to clear away before we could begin to lay the basis for a permanent agricultural prosperity [before we would create conditions under which the Nation could be sure of continued plenty and the farmer could be sure of continued security].

Tonight you know that the ground has been cleared of that debris. After twelve years in which he has been harrassed weighed and ~~down~~ down by the burdens of each succeeding day the farmer at last has begun to get into the clear so that he can begin again to take thought for tomorrow. ~~when again there is only to sound foundations.~~

Back of what we did was the conviction that the agricultural problem is not a problem for the farmer alone -- that it is a problem for the Nation as a whole. That is the way we have attacked it [as a national, not a sectional, problem]

And ^{now} the Nation is going along with the farmer. Now for the first time in this industrial period of our history the American people are becoming farm-minded. The industrial worker in New York City may not know the difference between alfalfa and clover but he has begun to see a connection between the permanence of his job, the size of his wages and the price of the farmer's crops.

Today the American people understand ^{that there is a definite bond between agriculture & industry} that the money we have used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment in the restoration of American industry, and underwriting for the wages of American labor; a stimulus for profits in American business.

at last
The defeatist attitude has been defeated.

The lack of what we did was a second conviction — that a sound farm policy must be a policy made by farmers and run by farmers. Ours is that kind of a policy. The farmers of America moved into the Department of Agriculture on the day that Henry Wallace set up shop there. For the first time, a national farm program was made in conference and with the agreement ^{of} the farm leaders of all our farm organizations — a program which came out of the free and open councils of farmers rather than out of the vote-catching schemes of politicians.

With these convictions, this Administration put its hand to the plow. It has not, it will not, turn back.

I am going to tell you in just ~~six~~ sentences what we did. *Given*
Every man and woman on an American farm can expand those ~~six~~ sen-
tences in terms of the recovery that has come to each of them in
the last three and a half years.

1. By our Agricultural Adjustment Act, our monetary policy, our soil conservation program, and our assistance to farm cooperatives, we raised the farmer's *income* ^{by \$4 billion dollars to a sum 3 times what it was in 1932} ~~income~~, ^{and we set up machinery to make sure that the income stays up.}
2. Through the Farm Credit Administration ~~we reduced~~ ^{we saved thousands of farms from} the burden ^{decreasing} of the farmer's debts, ^{and we set up} ~~machinery to make sure that that burden stays down.~~ ^{foreclosure, and}
3. Through ~~the~~ reciprocal trade treaties and international currency stabilization, we have begun to recover the farmer's foreign markets in the only way in which they can be recovered and held -- by a policy of mutual advantage ^{Today is bearing fruit in the reopening of} which ~~we are~~ ^a ~~which~~ ^{is} bringing fruit in the reopening of markets for American farm products in all of the fourteen countries making these agreements -- a policy which, for example, within the last ten days has brought about lower tariffs ^{against our agriculture} ~~against our agriculture~~ in France, Italy and Switzerland ^{in the benefit of our farmers.}

4. By our program to revive business -- to increase employment -- to raise business and professional incomes and the wages of labor -- we [] restored national income, and prepared the way for the steady and long-time expansion of the farmer's ~~domestic~~ home market by increasing the purchasing power and consumption of the average American family.

5. By our program of land use and conservation we have ended the policy of immediate glut and eventual waste, and laid the basis for permanent plenty.

6. By our program for rural electrification -- by our farm-to-market roads -- by our aid to rural schools, we have begun to get for the farmer his fair share in the comforts, the advantages, the wider interests and the deeper satisfactions which go to make the good life for himself and for his children.

Janet A 77-
There is the record. In those ~~few~~ sentences, the farmer and the farmer's family can measure, for themselves, the vast difference between the desperation which was theirs in 1933 and the recovery which is theirs in 1936. From what that record has done for you -- judge for yourselves our determination and our capacity to carry this program through.

B
After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer as his condition got worse and worse, Republican leadership now offers the farmer a program of cash payments to equalize the price of the exportable surplus

in the domestic market

(B)

Smart A.

7. ~~and while showers bring down when~~
disastrous drought struck the land in
parts of our country, we did not hesitate
~~for a moment~~ ^{at immediate and} to rush direct relief to the
farmers and stockmen to save them from
a policy that
want— Some people call ~~waste~~ waste!

~~They must know that this cannot~~

~~will not meet the problem. The chief cause of all the trouble was failure to adjust production to demand. The solution offered by this ~~new~~ program would not bring about ~~this~~ adjustment.~~

~~It would offer the farmer every incentive to raise as much as he possibly could no matter what the demand.~~

To make matters worse, in fact to make matters impossible, we are told that the reciprocal tariff agreements are to be repealed. We are to be led back to the same philosophy which brought agriculture to its knees in 1933 — increase our supply and cut off all foreign markets for that supply.

What about the cost of this proposed program? It has been estimated at the sum of more than two billion dollars annually. You and I know this promise cannot be kept.

As a blunt matter of political realism, judge the sincerity of those who promise you this bounty — judge it ~~first~~

~~only~~ by what they say in other portions of the country before other audiences about ~~and since the farm~~ ~~and since the farm~~ ~~agricultural and social reductions in government expenditures~~ — judge it by the sheer impossibility of spending any such amount annually on any such scheme.

For the first time in many cruel years, we are getting the problem of the business of farming well in hand. Do you now want to turn over that problem to the care of those who did nothing about it in the past ~~and only~~ now make inconsistent promises which

do you want to turn it over to those who

you and they know they cannot keep.

The American farmer has come a long way in the last four years. But he has not reached the end of the road. We propose to see to it that his progress continues.

Our policy for agriculture is not a stand-still policy. It has been said that the Administration's farm program changes each year like new models of automobiles. I accept that simile. The automobile of today is the same kind of a vehicle, in principle, as it was twenty years ago. But because the automobile manufacturer did not hesitate to pioneer -- because he was willing to make yearly changes in his model -- the Nation now drives a car that is vastly improved. Farming too is the same in principle now as it has always been. But because the farmer has been willing to pioneer -- because, with the aid of scientists, economists and engineers he has been willing, year after year, to change -- because of these things both the product of the farms and the business of farming have been vastly improved. It is the aim of our policy not only to prevent the return of yesterday's model but to make tomorrow's model better than today's. Good as it was for its day, we have passed beyond Model T. farming.

(11)

~~of the crisis~~

Over long time

As a further part of this policy of prudence and includes farm progress we have already launched a program of conservation against land wastage and soil impoverishment.

From the beginning, such a program has been basic in our

On Oct 25, 1933;
plans. Months before the action of the Supreme Court on
the AAA, I said publicly that it was the intention of the
framers of that Act as it was my intention: "to pass from
the purely emergency phases necessitated by a grave national
crisis to a long-time more permanent plan for American agri-

culture." *I also said:* "the long time and more permanent adjustment programs will provide positive incentives for soil conservation. The benefit payments can be made on a basis that will encourage individual farmers to adopt sound farm management, crop rotation, and soil conservation methods. [The crop insurance feature afforded by benefit payments will help farmers to maintain these beneficial systems of farming without interruption in poor crop years".

See
P.W.

48 12

[Having laid down that policy of soil conservation we began at once to prepare for its operation. Even before that statement was made we had begun a state-by-state and county-by-county survey to determine the broad outlines of a program which would maintain our soil fertility and our net farm income.]

We knew that our soil had been recklessly impoverished by crops which did not pay. [What had been sold to the American public as a philosophy of plenty was actually speeding us toward the certainty of scarcity.] Because we stand committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty we have set ourselves resolutely against waste -- waste that comes from unneeded production, waste that imperils the Nation's future by draining away the abundance with which God has enriched our soil.

Increasing production alone in an unlimited way appeals to no person who thinks the problem through. Increasing consumption must go hand in hand with it. Here is

~~HB~~ 13

a simple figure to mull over. If every family in the United States had enough money to live on what the doctors and dietitians call a "Class A Diet", we would need food-stuffs from forty five million acres more than we are using today. America's diet is better than that of most other nations, but from the point of view of better national health, it is still inadequate. I seek to increase purchasing power so that people can ~~buy~~ ^{pay for} more food and better food, and in turn provide a larger and larger domestic market ~~for~~ ^{for the farmer.}

It is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy [an evil which only the Democratic platform specifically recognized]. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. [And even now, leaders in the House and the Senate, cooperating with leaders of farm thought in the administrative departments of the government] -- are preparing legislation to submit to the Congress in January to provide help solve further aid in solving this problem. We cannot, as a Nation, be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own farm.

[Because I would eliminate farm tenancy I also would eliminate farms of huge acreage under one operating ownership. It is part of our policy to prevent farm monopoly.]

Further -- we propose to give to the farmer and to the consumer -- a sound plan of the best available crop insurance against extreme fluctuations of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations but the speculator. The farmer and the

consumer lose together. [It does not add to the consumer's food supply when prices will not pay freight rates and the farmer's surplus rots on the ground.]

That is why crop insurance is a protection for both. At one and the same time it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the farmer's fear of a food surplus. Until both are protected neither is safe. Only the Democratic Platform gives specific recognition to the consumer because only the Democratic Party has the vision to see that the ultimate interests of the farmer and the consumer are the same. *That is why*

[In this campaign] I am not making one kind of a speech to the farmers ~~represented in the small towns and~~ *out here* another kind of speech to ~~the~~ consumers in the big cities. The same speech and the same policy ^{must} go for both.

The city dweller has come to know that unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces he cannot buy the things that are turned out in the shops and factories *of* the cities.

~~BB~~ 15

consumer lose together. [It does not add to the consumer's food supply when prices will not pay freight rates and the farmer's surplus rots on the ground.]

That is why crop insurance is a protection for both. At one and the same time it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the farmer's fear of a food surplus. Until both are protected neither is safe. Only the Democratic Platform gives specific recognition to the consumer because only the Democratic Party has the vision to see that the ultimate interests of the farmer and the consumer are the same.

It has is why

[In this campaign] I am not making one kind of a speech to the farmers ~~in the small towns and~~ ^{out here} another kind of speech to ~~the~~ consumers in the big cities. The same speech and the same policy ^{must} go for both.

The city dweller has come to know that unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces, he cannot buy the things that are turned out in the shops and factories *of* the cities.

And so we plan for the future of agriculture —
security for those who have spent their lives in farming;
opportunity for young men and women ~~that will lead them to~~
~~choose to make careers~~ on the farm, ~~for~~ ^{for farmers} a share in the good
things of life ~~sufficient~~ enough to justify our instinctive faith
in the land.

In
A. F. L.
17

→ In all ^{our plans} we are guided and will continue to be
guided by the fundamental American belief that the ~~country~~ ^{farmer}
~~men~~ living on his own land remains our ideal of self-reliance
and of spiritual balance -- the source from ~~the~~ ^{which} the reservoirs
of the Nation's strength are constantly renewed. It is from
the men and women of our farms -- living close to the soil,
that this Nation -- like the Greek giant Antaeus touches
Mother Earth and rises with strength renewed a hundred-fold.

We want to perpetuate that ideal under modern con-

~~EF~~ 18

ditions, so that man may be strong in the ancient virtues
and yet lay hold of the advantages which science and new
knowledge offer to a well-rounded life.

P.P.F. 1820
1936 Campaign

Substitute Second Draft

Four years ago, as a candidate, I came to the distressed Middle West to talk about farming and what I proposed to do about it. Tonight, as President, I am again in the Middle West but in a Middle West now far along on its road to recovery. Even the worst drought in our national history cannot stop that recovery.

I have come to discuss with you what we have done about farming during the last 5½ years, and our program for the future.

The causes of the farm problem four years ago were of course obvious. They had been obvious for years to anyone who was willing honestly to tackle the difficult adjustments their recognition would require. First, an artificial War market and thereafter the prospect of continuance of War prices held out by the land-speculator dragged millions of unneeded new acres into production.

We had needed agricultural export to sell even our pre-War production. But agricultural export disappeared with all other foreign trade. Conditions beyond our control — policies of national self-sufficiency abroad; low standards of living in impoverished Europe made agricultural export difficult even if American policy had been as wise as it could be. But the Republican administration in power was not wise — at least not for the farmer. A new tariff forbade foreign countries from selling our own products here to obtain money with which to buy products of either

our farms or our factories. By our own act we destroyed our agricultural and industrial export together. Millions of new acres in production -- millions of foreign countries without purchasing power because we would not buy their goods in return -- piled up bigger and bigger surpluses, forced lower and lower prices.

The carry over of American cotton (the carry over of American wheat) increased from 4½ million bales in 1929 to 15 million bales in 1932. In every year between 1929 and 1931, the production of American cotton exceeded not only American consumption but world consumption. Year by year the same overwhelming surpluses were built up with tobacco, wheat, rice and the other products of American farms. Lower and lower went the prices.

At the same time there became noticeable a growing disparity between the attractiveness and advantages of life in the city under modern conditions and the life of a farm family unable to obtain modern improvement. That disparity sent to the cities an ever-larger proportion of men and women born on the farms -- and drew down the physical and spiritual reserves which farming as a way of life had always meant to the Nation.

These causes were clear to everyone who had given any thought to the problem. Just as clear were the headaches lying in store for any Administration which was sufficiently concerned with the farmer's welfare to try to remedy those causes after

they had accumulated for several years. If Republican administrations between 1920 and 1932, those twelve long years, had had the farmers' interests really at heart, it would have ~~xxxxxx~~ risked the headaches and tackled these causes.

What did they do?

They not only did not remove the causes; they aggravated them. They encouraged further production by the creation of the Federal Farm Board which stood ready — at high salaries and high commissions — to buy whatever excess was produced. They passed the Hawley-Smoot Tariff which built up a tariff wall to make sure that the foreign countries could not possibly get dollar exchange with which to pay for our wheat and cotton. Instead of building up a sound, self-supporting, balanced system of foreign trade, they intoxicated foreign export by a fantastic planned economy of foreign loans which gave Eastern bankers fat commissions. The inevitable failure of that planned economy disrupted what machinery machinery of normal trade relations still existed. Surpluses grew bigger; prices fell lower; the farmer, over his head in debt under an overlapping and expensive system of farm credit, went bankrupt.

The wide scope of the inter-related problems which resulted was known to me in a practical way as a Georgia farmer. They were also known to me as Governor of the State of New York. Between 1928 and 1932 I instituted and carried out a

comprehensive program for soil survey and land use, reforestation, rural electrification, tax relief of farmers in the state; ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ better farm-to-market roads; increased state aid for rural schools, roads, bridges, and rural health; farm cooperatives and rural credit agencies. The will to do something for the farmer in an immediate and practical way was shown by what we did in New York in those days.

With that background ~~and~~ of experience and after studies made of farming needs throughout the Nation, we formulated a program immediately after the election of 1932. Like all our programs, it was designed not only to meet the price emergencies which then faced the farm population, which would balance with and command the ungrudging support of the industrial sections of the country, but also to build deeply enough to make possible a long-range, self-supporting plan of rehabilitation of rural life on many fronts. The policies finally adopted had their origin in the meetings and deliberations of the best-informed farm leaders, agencies and associations we could find throughout the United States. These farm leaders and farmers' representatives were agreed that our program was most likely to produce not only quick beneficial results but a lasting well-being for the farmers.

The greatest obstacles to an effective program of farm rehabilitation were mental. Two errors were firmly lodged in the minds of many whose sympathetic under-

standing and support were needed for any stable, long-time plan of farm rehabilitation. The first error was a defeatist conviction that the problem of raising farm income was incapable of solution — that nothing could successfully be done about it — that all efforts were foredoomed to failure — that any political party which tried to act rather than talk about farm income was certain to get its fingers burned.

Such things as were attempted by previous administrations like the Federal Farm Board, with its extravagant organization, its speculative purchases in farm surpluses, and its innate inability to increase farm income, only deepened that defeatist impression in the mind of the general public.

The second error grew out of the first. It was a lack of understanding of the national inter-relationship between the welfare of the farming population and of the industrial population, a lack of understanding that we are at the same time the greatest agricultural nation and the greatest industrial nation -- that the industrial worker contributes to his own welfare whatever he pays in taxes or in food prices for the welfare of the farmer -- that we must all hang together or we will all hang separately. With it went a feeling that every benefit extended the farmer was money wasted by non-farmers as the price of political peace -- the kind of antagonism the Republicans are now trying to resurrect in the East by their market basket campaign to induce housewives to criticize the Administration because food prices have risen since 1952.

We were the first to realize that a program of relief to be of permanent success must be one which could be made a conspicuous practical success — and would be wholeheartedly appreciated and commended not only by the farmer but by the citizenry of America as a whole.

The foundation of our program rested in the belief that our plan for the farmer must be a plan for the city dweller as well — that whatever its political difficulties one plan must adjust to all the complexities, national and international, involved in the farmers' problems.

The greatest accomplishment of this Administration for the farmer has been to show that it is possible not only to carry out a sound program but to make it work with equal benefit to the farmers and to the rest of the country. What had always been considered an unworkable dream in an air of defeatism has been translated into positive and successful action.

This country is and must continue to be a united nation, its interests interlaced, the welfare of each dependent upon the welfare of all. The happiness and prosperity of others dwelling far away, their problems, their catastrophes of drought or floods, their lack of markets, their low wages, their labor difficulties — all have a direct and immediate effect upon each of us, no matter where we may be or what we may do.

Just as we cannot think of agriculture as unrelated to industry or labor or commerce, similarly we cannot segregate the problems of special groups of farmers in our agricultural policies. The dairy interests must be considered with those of other livestock producers. Both have a close relation with farmers who have devoted their fields to the growing of feeds, as they have with those who are concerned with the great staple fibres and their by-products. These like the truck farmers, the fruit growers and orchardists, must find their common final outlet in the great centers of consumption or points of export.

We achieve prosperity only by maintaining a reasonable balance between these mutually dependent groups. For that reason I do not come before you promising larger subsidies, and go before the people in the east to promise lower taxes. For that reason I do not come before you to guarantee higher prices for farm commodities, and at the same time go before the consumers of the east to promise lower prices for farm commodities.

To make such inconsistent statements shows a lack of understanding of the relationship of the farm problem to the rest of our economy, and shows that little has been learned from the disaster of the past. No permanent program of a balanced, self-supporting national economy can be built upon such shifting opportunism.

The lessons of the past years have taught us that it was not possible to have a nation half-boom and half-broke. The so-called prosperity between 1922 and 1926,

Graham?

C. W. M.

In 1932 I entered into an agreement with the farmers of America. It was a ~~very~~ ^{simply} plain and understandable agreement. It pledged my administration to farm ~~an~~ ^{farm} ~~agricultural~~ policy that would work. ~~Tonight~~ Every man and woman on ~~an~~ ^{our} ~~farm~~ ^{farm} who has read today's market reports knows that we have done what we said we would do.

I have come to discuss with you ~~what we have done about~~ ^{our problem} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~directions we have taken~~ ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ ^{last} three and one-half years, and ~~our~~ ^{new} ~~program~~ ^{for} the future.

The causes of the farm problem had been obvious for years to anyone who was willing honestly to tackle the remedy, the difficulties of which were equally ~~obvious~~.

During the war the cry was for food and more food at home and abroad. American agriculture mobilized millions of new acres to meet that need with the greatest outpouring of food-stuffs that the world had ever seen.

When the war ended, the nations of Europe went back to farming again, determined to increase their own agricultural production so that they would not again have to rely upon imports for their food supply. Our war market disappeared. Even our pre-war market began to disappear. The farmers of this country were left holding the bag -- a bag filled with vast quantities of cotton ^{that, even} ~~no one had the money to buy~~ and soon ~~at which they could no longer sell~~.

In 1932 the total farm population of the United States was the highest in our history -- but in that same year the total farm income was the lowest in any year for which we have a record. Surpluses grew bigger; prices fell lower; the farming ^{community} ~~over its head~~ in debt under an overlapping and ^{unjust} ~~expensive~~ system of farm credit, went bankrupt.

CONTINUING

At the same time the attractiveness and advantages of life in the city with its modern improvements drew from the old farm homes an ever-increasing number of ^{young men} whose ^{young} physical and spiritual reserves which farming, as ^{meant for} a way of life, had built up in the Nation.

Now this disaster to agriculture did not develop because previous administrations were lacking in expressions of sympathy for the farmer. For during eleven lean years the farmers of the Nation had the most eloquent sympathy that an ingenious Republican leadership could devise. That sympathy was written into every Republican platform from 1920 to 1932. It was echoed in every Republican campaign speech. Yet with all this verbal ministry the farm depression grew steadily worse.

These continued expressions of sympathy and this continued refusal to do anything to reorganize agriculture on a dignified self-supporting basis created a feeling toward the farm problem of the rest of the country which was the greatest obstacle toward the solution of ^{the} that problem.

Two fixed ideas had become firmly lodged in the minds of many whose sympathetic understanding and support were needed for any stable, long-time plan of farm rehabilitation. The first was a defeatist conviction that the ^{problem of} raising farm income could not be solved — ~~that nothing could successfully be done~~

----- that all efforts were foredoomed to failure -- that any political party which tried to act rather than to talk about farm income was certain to get its fingers burned.

Such things as were attempted by previous administrations like the Federal Farm Board, with its extravagant organization, its speculative purchases in farm surpluses, and its ~~inevitable~~ inability ^{to increase farm income}, only deepened that defeatist ~~attitude~~ impression ^{in the mind of the general public}.

Secondly, there was a lack of ^{general} understanding of the national inter-relationship between the welfare of the farming population and of the industrial population.

[There was a lack of appreciation that we are at the same time the greatest agricultural nation and the greatest industrial nation -- that the industrial worker contributes to his own welfare whatever he pays out in taxes or in food ~~for~~ prices for the benefit of the farmer -- that we must all hang together or we will all hang separately.] With it there had grown up a feeling that every ^{present} ~~benefit extended to~~ the farmer was money wasted ~~by non-farmers~~ as the price of political peace ~~or~~

the kind of antagonism now being attempted by the Republican National Committee

^{in the large cities of} a market-basket campaign to ~~frighten~~ ^{overturn} housesizes because

the ^{in need of} ~~feed~~ prices have risen since 1930.

W. O. Riley

The Republican answer to the farm problem was the Redwood Farm Board and the Smoot-Hawley tariff. The Farm Board did not end, it added to the farmer's ills— Agriculture was already suffering from over-production. The Farm Board — by its wholesale purchases — encouraged the farmers to greater production. The Smoot-Hawley tariff robbed the farmer of his last remaining chance to ~~regain his export market~~ ^{see the annotations} by making it impossible for his foreign customers to sell anything of their own in this country.

As a result the downward spiral of farm prices were speeded and the spectre of bankruptcy and foreclosure followed the farmer's plow.

The wide scope of the inter-related problems which resulted was known to me in a practical way as a Georgia farmer. They were also known to me as Governor of the State of New York. Between 1928 and 1932 I instituted and carried out a comprehensive program for soil survey and land use, reforestation, rural electrification, better farm-to-market roads; increased state aid for rural schools, roads, bridges, and rural health; farm cooperatives and rural credit agencies; tax relief of farmers.

The will to do something for the farmer in an immediate and practical way was shown by what ~~was~~ ^{time} done in New York in those days.

With that background of experience and after studies made of existing needs throughout the Nation, we formulated a program immediately after the election of ^{Purdey October 26th 1932} ~~which~~

1932. Like all our programs, it was designed not only to meet the immediate emergencies which ~~faced~~ the farm population but to provide the basis ^{for} of which ~~could~~ a long-range, self-supporting plan of rehabilitation of rural life on many fronts, which would balance with ~~and command the unyielding support of the~~ ~~industrial sections of the country.~~

There were ^{two} requisites for success in any such program. The first was to convince the rest of America that their prosperity depends directly upon the farmers' prosperity -- that the problems of agriculture were the problems of a Nation.

For the first time in this industrial period of our history the American people are becoming farm-minded. The industrial worker in New York City may not be able ~~to tell~~ ^{to see} the difference between alfalfa and clover, but he ~~has begun to~~ learn that there is a connection between the permanence of his job and the size of his wages and the price ~~that~~ the farmer gets ~~for his~~ crops.

The American people know that ~~the money~~ used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment ~~for~~ the restoration of American in-

dustry; it has been an underwriting for the workers' wages; it has been a stimulus to the small business.

We should have learned a long time ago -- We are beginning to learn now -- that American economy is not a sectional economy -- but it is a single, inter-related economy -- that when our farmers are broke, the nation is broke.

This country is and must continue to be a united nation, with its interests interlaced, and the welfare of each dependent upon the welfare of all. The happiness and prosperity of others dwelling far away, their problems, their catastrophes of drought or flood, their lack of markets, their low wages, their labor difficulties -- all have a direct and immediate effect upon each of us, no matter where we may be or what we may do.

Just as we cannot think of agriculture as unrelated to industry or labor or commerce, similarly we cannot segregate the problems of special groups of farmers, of the dairymen, the ~~interests~~ in our agricultural policies. The cattle interests must be considered with those of other livestock producers. Both have a close relation with farmers who have devoted their fields to the growing of feeds, as they have with those who are engaged in farmers who grow concerned with the great staple fibres and their by-products. These like the truck farmers, the fruit growers and orchardists, will find their common final outlet in the great centers of consumption or points of export.

We achieve lasting prosperity only by maintaining a reasonable balance between these mutually dependent groups. For that reason I do not come before you promising larger subsidies, and go before the people in the east to promise lower taxes.

For that reason I do not come before you to guarantee higher prices for farm commodities, and at the same time go before the consumers of the east to promise lower prices for farm commodities.

Report for Success in

Report will

The second essential was that the program should spring from and be
operated by the farmer who produced the crop and not the handlers who ~~were~~
~~riched by it.~~

We believed in 1933 - we believe in 1936 - that a farm policy ~~that~~ works

must be farmer-made and farmer-operated. ~~If you'll be an aggressor or what the~~
~~President does about agriculture.~~

Our farm policies - what we have done for agriculture - what we propose
to do for agriculture - are a result of what the best available farm opinion agreed
should be done. The American farmer not only determined our policies - he has
administered them. The AAA and soil conservation program have been operated exclusively
through farmers committees in each county. They furnish the most outstanding ex-
ample of farm co-operative enterprise in American history. We have restored Ameri-
can agriculture to the hands of the American farmer. Its future is safest in his
hands. We propose to keep it there.

During the first months of the new administration we did exactly what
the prudent manufacturer - in the same situation - would do. Since we had pro-
duced more than our customers could possibly buy we moved to ~~excessive~~ production. ^{about} to demand

Due to war-expansion we had too much of new land under cultivation. We moved at

- 7 -

once to take a big slice of it out of cultivation.

And out of those acres we plowed under in 1933, out of the pigs and
~~sheep~~ which were killed, we raised a different kind of crop - probably the
richest crop in the history of American agriculture. It was not a crop of cotton
or corn or wheat - but of better incomes for the farmer, less fear and more
happiness for the farm home. More than that, we produced a crop of square meals
for hundreds of thousands of hungry men and women. Not one pound of pork ~~and~~
~~beef~~ in the curtailment program was wasted. Every edible pound was turned into
food and shipped to the empty shelves and bare tables of our impoverished unem-
ployed.

In our program we had to choose between saving the farmer and saving
a part of the farmer's crops - saving these crops so they could rot on the ground.
We chose to save the farmer.

- 6 -

Only a lack of understanding of the national scale and national implications of the farm problem can lead anyone to call our program a policy of scarcity. Ours is a policy of plenty - a sensible policy of plenty which guarantees to consumers over the years an adequate supply of food, feed and fibre at prices which they can reasonably pay and which at the same time returns a profit to the producer. Ours is a policy of plenty which seeks for its object through the years, an abundance of everything to everybody at reasonable prices. It is a policy which saves the fertility of our soil by not mining it out by crops we do not need.

We have had enough of plenty rotting on the grounds of the farmer. We have had enough of the doctrine of plenty which had deprived the city laborer of the wages with which he might have bought the food which was going to rot. What advocates of unlimited production call a policy of plenty is a policy of waste. To have continued over-production, to have piled annual surpluses upon already depressing surpluses would have been a policy of plenty which would in turn have produced a fact of famine.

We did not stop at raising farmers' incomes. For the first time since the depression the government loaned its resources, to lighten the

burden of debt. The high interest rate, the amortisation payments could not be met on millions of farms. These farms have been saved.

It is all very pretty to speak of a farmer being a lord of his own farm. But the first essential is that he have a farm to lord over.

The fact is that the Farm Credit Administration was set up by my administration just in time to save hundreds of thousands of farms from foreclosure. Over a third of the farms in the country were mortgaged. The interest on these mortgages had reached a point where ten percent of everything that these farmers had had to go to meet it. [In 1932 forty farms out of every thousand were being foreclosed.]

We did not wait for farmers in debt to come to us for help. The emergency was so pressing that I asked the

farmers of the nation, who were in immediate danger of foreclosure, to telegraph me at Washington. Thousands did so. Immediate contact was made with their creditors to get them to withhold foreclosure until a refinancing loan could be made. Over 700,000 of such loans were made. This was 150,000 more loans than had been made during the entire prior sixteen years of operation of Federal Land Banks. Farm interest has been cut by forty million dollars a year. The percentage which a farmer has to take out of his gross income to pay the interest on his mortgage has been cut in half.

This wholesale reduction of old debts and fixed charges had an electric effect. Hundreds of country banks got liquid funds for their frozen assets. Delinquent taxes and bills, long overdue, were paid. Money began to run again through the arteries of agriculture and business.

That was the emergency job which the Farm Credit Administration undertook and accomplished.

But it went further -- on to a far-range policy of providing credit for farm production and for farm cooperatives. A nation-wide system of production credit associations was created to lend government money on crops and live stocks where private credit was no longer available. The American farmer has been enabled to finance crop production under favorable terms. Money was loaned to encourage and stabilize cooperative associations of farmers in marketing their

merchandise and in purchasing the things they need. Loans have been made to over 1200 cooperative associations totaling 144 million dollars.

We have not been content with merely keeping farmers in their homes. We have sought to provide those homes with those modern conveniences of electricity which have taken much of the drudgery out of the city home. To give to the farmer and his family a share in the more leisurely and less arduous life which their city neighbors enjoy, to keep mom boys and girls on the farm has seemed to us to be a national policy well worth paying for. With these objectives in view, we have embarked upon a vast program of rural electrification.

Better roads, Little schools

[The blunt fact is that private utility companies have been unwilling ~~to~~ on their own initiative to go into rural electrification.] ~~fixme~~

the
Of course ~~in~~ program of raising farm prices has raised consumers' prices.
But the intelligent consumer is glad to pay his share of the cost of making agriculture self-supporting instead of depending upon the dole of subsidies.

The city dweller has come to know that, unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces, he cannot buy the things which are turned out in the shops and factories of the city dweller.

Lamb chops at 40¢ a pound were not ~~much~~ good to the person who did not have the 40¢. If that person now has a dollar, lamb chops mean something to him, even

though they have risen to 60¢ a pound. Two lamb chops in the window at 40¢ a pound are not worth as much to a housewife as two lamb chops in her kitchen at 60¢ a pound.

Which would you rather have -- lamb chops or low prices?

Having been realistic about reducing surpluses, we set about to tackle the other end of the problem. We determined to substitute realism for sentiment in reestablishing our foreign markets for our farm products.

With that in mind we set about to reestablish a foreign trade of all kinds -- import and export, industrial and agricultural. World trade had fallen to about one-third of its former value. Our own foreign trade had fared even worse.

about
It had declined to ~~about~~ one-fourth of its value in 1929.

Foreign trade, like domestic trade, is all of one piece. You cannot divide it arbitrarily into foreign trade in agriculture and foreign trade in manufactures. There cannot be a revival of foreign exports without a ~~and~~ revival in foreign imports. There cannot be more foreign agricultural trade without more of all kinds of foreign trade.

We entered into trade agreements with fourteen foreign countries for mutual help to each other. There was no question of winning or losing any treaty. We sought no undue advantage over any other country. We were seeking a basis for mutual advantage. Only in mutual advantage could our own trade benefit.

The effects of these agreements are already being felt. Our exports have increased during the first half of 1956 as compared with 1955, by 155 million dollars.

The best customer which America has under these trade agreements is our neighbor Canada. During the first six months of our trade agreement with her the United States exports to Canada grew from 158 million to 182 million. What were some of the commodities which went to make up this increase? The exports of fresh vegetables to Canada rose within the first six months of this year by \$600,000. Canned tomatoes rose by \$_____. Tobacco rose by \$_____. Citrus fruits rose by \$_____. Motor vehicles practically doubled. Industrial machinery rose \$_____. Manufactured iron and steel products rose \$_____. Electrical apparatus and machinery rose by 52%. Electric refrigeration rose by 161%. Business machines and equipment rose by 46%.

To get trade concessions we granted trade concessions. But we did it in such a way that American industry and American agriculture was bound to benefit by increased trade.

Sc. 74 you ^{are} ~~are~~ saving your markets being flooded with farm imports such as Canadian cattle and cheese. You know that just isn't so -- there has been no flooding. The slight increase coming in has not been large enough to make a dent on our prices. On the contrary, cattlemen and dairymen are now getting a larger price for their cattle and cheese than they got under the high protection of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff. Every farmer knows by bitter experience that high tariff walls do not make high farm prices. Prices sank to their lowest when tariffs were at their highest. Farm prices are now on the up-grade as we begin to use a little common sense and world vision instead of narrow politics ~~to~~ relative to tariffs.

The reason is plain. By increasing trade at home and abroad we have increased the purchasing power of Americans who need and buy cattle and cheese. Isn't it clear that when ^{we} double the automobiles, refrigerators, machinery and other things we send to Canada, we increase the income of all the Americans who produce and handle those exports. As the price Canada pays us for those industrial exports is released into the stream of our domestic trade, it turns over and over to create purchasing power far in excess of the original selling price of those exports. Having more dollars, ^{they} are now able to buy more from the dairyman and the cattlemen -- more meat and more cheese. When we gave the Canadian farmers a small export market in this country we gave our own farmers a vastly increased domestic market.

It was primarily to restore trade and to revive industry and em-

ployment that we entered into these trade agreements. But in doing so, we played the role of good neighbor not only in trade but in the larger field of world peace.

Peace cannot be kept merely by getting sentimental about it. It depends so much upon day-by-day economic cooperation between the nations. Reciprocal trade agreements are a practical rather than a sentimental step toward international peace through international trade. Peace saves and makes money for everybody. A prosperous world has no room in it for dictatorships and war. Enlightened self-interest is justification for the steps we are taking in recreating a prosperous world by these agreements.

And now what of the future? Our first efforts in xxx the emergency were directed toward raising prices and extending credit -- toward improving the farmers immediate cash position. But we were not content with that. Months before the AAA was declared unconstitutional -- on October 25, 1935 -- I said in a public release which is a matter of record:

"There are people in this country who can see no room for further progress in agricultural adjustment. Of these, some would be content to continue the adjustment programs exactly as they are. There are even a few supporters of the AAA so well satisfied with what has been done that they would like to call the job complete and finished.

"But it never was the idea of the men who framed the Act, of those in Congress who revised it, nor of Henry Wallace nor Chester Davis that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration should be either a mere "emergency operation or a static agency."

"It was their intention--as it is mine-- to pass from the purely emergency phases necessitated by a grave national crisis to a long time, more permanent plan for American agriculture.

"Such a long time program is developing naturally out of the present adjustment efforts. As I see it, this program has two principal objectives:

"First, to carry out the declared policy of Congress to maintain and increase the gains thus far made, thereby avoiding the danger of a slump back into the conditions brought about

by our national neglect of Agriculture.

"Second, to broaden present adjustment operations so as to give farmers increasing incentives for conservation and efficient use of the nation's soil resources.

"The long-time and more permanent adjustment program will provide positive incentives for soil conservation. The benefit payments can be made on a basis that will encourage individual farmers to adopt sound farm management, crop rotation and soil conservation methods. The crop insurance feature afforded by benefit payments will help farmers to maintain these beneficial systems of farming without interruption in poor crop years."

Even in advance of this public announcement, as early as the spring of 1935, we had started a state-by-state and county-by-county survey to determine the broad outlines of an agricultural program which would best maintain our soil fertility and our net farm income. The lessons of the past had shown us how prodigal we had been with the fertility of our soil. Land had been ruined by ~~continuous~~ continuous use. What had been thought to be a philosophy of plenty was carrying us toward a fact of scarcity. Our soil had been recklessly sired by products ~~which~~ which did not pay. A true philosophy of continuous plenty required a stop to the waste of the future abundance stored in our soil -- and an affirmative program of conservation. ⁴ We therefore expanded our original AAA program into an effective soil conservation program -- this time again operated by the farmers' own township and county committees. We are paying the farmer to use ~~his~~ his property only in a way which will preserve our ~~greatest~~ heritage of agricultural abundance and will maintain the advantages of a balanced national economy. Any-one who gives the matter a moment's thought knows that ~~maximize~~ the gain to the nation from such a policy is worth hundreds of times what it costs. A balanced use of our agricultural resources -- a national economy balanced between industry and agriculture require stability

of supply and of prices. Where these fluctuate no one wins but the speculator. The danger of fluctuations of supply and of prices which constantly hangs over the head of the farmer and consumer alike requires that the government should -- for the protection of both -- provide the farmer with some form of crop insurance payable in kind. Surplus bumper in any bumper year would be used as premiums to be ~~paid~~ returned to the farmers in kind, /years when for any reason the crops fall below normal demand.

It is sound policy to provide agriculture with the same insurance against unforeseeable loss that is enjoyed by any other business. Until private insurance companies are willing to do it, Federal Government should do it. It would banish the consumer's fear of food shortage; it would banish the farmer's fear of a food surplus.

A balanced use of agricultural resources -- a national economy balanced between industry and agriculture -- the American concept of the place of the farm in our way of life -- all require that those who run the farms should own the farms. The increase in farm tenancy since 1880 has been alarming. ~~in~~ 42% -- almost half of our farms -- were tenant-operated in 1932. Therefore, just as we have saved farmers from becoming tenants through foreclosure, we shall use the funds of government to help tenants become farm owners. Only the Democratic Platform had vision enough to recognize the problems of farm tenancy. An enduring agricultural civilization must be built on the firm foundation of home and farm ownership.

The tenant farmer moves from place to place. His children go from school to school. It is hard for them to ~~or his wife~~ ^{him} fix roots in any one community. What interest can you expect ~~them~~ to have in preserving the fertility of the fields he works -- or the condition of the home she keeps? "hy ~~shameless~~ shouldn't they think their best bet is to

ruin a farm by growing every year as much as the land can possibly bear.

Every tenant farmer looks forward to the day when he can own a farm. All that he needs is a stake. The Federal Government should lend its funds to qualified tenant farmers at low rates of interest for this purpose under adequate restrictions and safeguards.

⁴⁴ You on American farms who can breathe easily once again know that the program the Democratic Party has prepared for you has worked. You also know that the Republican Party has never prepared a plan for you like that would work.

Perhaps there is a reason why they never could make things work for you. The first essential of doing a job well is the will to have it done. It is an old saying that where there is a will there is a way. ~~Since 1921 Republican leaders~~ Since 1921 Republican leaders have protested that they had the will but could not find the way. In 1933 we found a way. Isn't that a pretty good test as to which Party really had the will?

~~After having neglected~~ After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer as his condition got worse and worse, the Republican Platform now offers the farmer a program of cash payments to equalize the price of the exportable surplus with the domestic price.

The American people should look at this program from two points of view: First, of its effectiveness to meet the problem, and secondly its cost to the Nation.

How effectively will it meet the problem? Let's look back at the causes. The chief cause was failure to adjust production and consumption. The solution offered by this new program would not bring about this adjustment. It would offer the farmer every incentive to raise as much as he possibly could no matter what the demand. With the

illusionary prospect of getting in the world market the same price that he would get in a protected domestic market, each farmer would hurry to raise as much as he could.

To make matters worse, in fact to make matters impossible, we are told that the reciprocal tariff agreements are to be repealed. We are to be led back to the same philosophy which brought agriculture to its knees in 1933 -- increase our supply and cut off all foreign markets for that supply.

Secondly, look at the cost. I am not one to urge before a farm audience a program which would be so costly that the government could not undertake it. I am not one to couple that program with a promise of reduced governmental expenditures when I address another audience. I have shown by action rather than by words my conviction that the continued prosperity of our farmers is essential to the continued prosperity of America. It has been estimated, however, that the cost of this foreign subsidy program would reach the sum of 2 billion dollars annually for only five commodities. You and I know this promise could not be kept.

As a matter of political realism you just judge the ~~sincerity~~ of those who promise you this bounty not only by what they say in other portions of the country in other audiences, but also by the sheer impossibility of spending any such amount annually in any such scheme.

For the first time in many cruel years, we are getting the problems of the business of farming well in hand. Do you now want to turn over that problem to the care of those who did nothing about it in the past and only now make double-barrelled promises which you and they know they cannot keep.

What we have tried to do is to view this problem from all angles,

tp take into consideration all of the forces which go into its making and all the forces which should go into its solution. We do not risk the future of our ideal of farm life in this country by the comfortable shortsightedness of refusing to recognize the complexities of the problem. Whether minute-by-minute it is easy or not, the American farm problem is only a portion of the whole American economic problem; and the American economic problem is a part of the economic problem of the whole world.

In our program, we were guided by a fundamental of American life -- that the countryman living on his own land is still our ideal of self-sufficiency and spiritual balance, the source from which our reservoirs of physical and spiritual strength are constantly renewed. It is through its population, living on the soil that this Nation, like the Greek giant daily touches its Mother Earth and rises with strength renewed a hundredfold. We want to perpetuate that ideal under modern conditions so that the retention of the ancient virtues ~~will~~^{need} mean loss of nothing which science and knowledge give to the fully rounded modern man.

In the course of this program we have followed the old American adage that all landowners, large and small, must be treated alike. We have extended the benefits of our program to the large as well as to the small. We make no apology for it. The obligations of citizens toward government should be proportionate to ability to pay. But the obligations of government to its citizens to treat all equally -- the large with the small -- the mighty with the weak. We expect the large landowner to contribute in accordance with his ability to pay. We do not, at the same time, urge that the large landowner shall be ignored by his government. Any program to ~~realize~~ realize fundamentals must itself be fundamentally honest.

WESTERN UNION PRESS MESSAGE

R. S. WHITE
PRESIDENT

HERCULES CARLTON
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

J. C. WILLEVER
FIRST VICE PRESIDENT

Four years ago tonight I sat here in my study. Then as now there was the conviction that four years of great responsibility confronted me. Then as now I dedicated myself to to the service of a cause, a solemn covenant with myself that my every act would be motivated by a single impulse, the guarantee and a safe-guarding of the rights of all our people.

Tonight I have been searching my soul. I come before you ~~inxxdgumkx~~ humbly again offering myself to carry on the task undertaken four years ago. The record of these years is open for you to read. As the midnight approaches, the mad clamor of the campaign has died down, the hysteria of the past few weeks has disappeared, the claims and charges are behind us and ~~xxx~~ in a few hours the Nation will record its decision at the polls.

In my own heart I know that much has been done in accomplishing the high aims and ideals we set before us. Many mistakes have been made but today that nation can look back over the four year trek and realize how much nearer the goal it is, socially, economically and may I reverently add ~~xxitgxmxkx~~ spiritually.

But the task to which we dedicated ourselves is not yet done and we await tomorrow your mandate to "Carryon", confident in the belief, yes even the conviction that a leadership backed by the people as a whole can go ahead to the day when the ideals of the founders of the Republic will become a living actuality.

The forum speaks us at enough
mt - 22 minutes -
commttee office, T.A.,

First a word to you as Nebraskans. I hope it will be heard
by the citizens of the other forty-seven States because I know
that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great
majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean govern-
ment, democratic government.

On this platform sits a man whose reputation has for many years
been known in every community -- a man old in years but young in
heart -- a man who through all these years has had no boss but his
own conscience -- whose white plume waving above the battle has
heartened hosts of men of good will -- the Senior Senator from the
State of Nebraska -- George W. Norris.

Outside of my own State of New York, I have consistently re-
frained from taking part in elections in any other State. And
in this State legally chosen nominees for the United States Senate
are running on the Republican and Democratic tickets. I am in no
way expressing antagonism to either of those gentlemen. But
Senator Norris' name has been entered as an Independent candidate
for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of non-participation in
State elections I have made -- and so long as he lives I always

will make -- one magnificently justified exception.

George Norris' candidacy transcends State and party lines.

In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years. Not only have few men served the public in the Halls of the Congress as long as George Norris -- but none have made themselves more greatly felt in the shaping of constructive legislation. No other Senator has successfully sponsored in his white-haired seventies a vital amendment to the Constitution of the United States and two acts which so breathe the spirit of youth as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Program.

George Norris is one of the major prophets of America.

Nebraska will be doing a great service, not only to itself but to every other State in the Union and to the Nation as a whole if it places this great American above partisanship and keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States.

Another Senator, who does not share his or our views, has

said that "it is worth a million dollars to get Norris out of the Senate". For the rest of us George Norris could have no higher recommendation than this measure of his danger to our enemies.

Regardless of who is chosen as the Chief Executive of the Nation for the next four years, George Norris is needed in Washington.

In 1932 I pledged my administration to a farm policy that would help the farmer. Tonight every man and woman on an American farm who has read today's market reports knows that we have done what we said we would do.

What needed to be done?

You know that in March, 1933, the American farmer had already had eleven lean years -- each year leaner than the last -- his income had disappeared -- farm prices had sunk to a bankruptcy level. In 1932 America's farm population was the highest in our history -- but the farmers' income was the lowest for any year of which we have records. The farmers represented twenty-five percent of the Nation's population. But they got only 7.5 percent of the national income. The spectre of foreclosure followed the farmer's plow. American agriculture was on the road to pauperism.

Agriculture started on that road immediately after the War. To meet the war cry for food and more food at home and abroad, millions of new acres had been mobilized to provide the greatest outpouring of foodstuffs that the world has ever seen.

When the War ended Europe went back to farming for itself.

Our farmers were left holding the bag -- a bag that bulged with vast quantities of wheat, corn and cotton for which the market had disappeared.

That was the farmer's plight in March, 1933. What did Republican leadership do about it during those twelve long, lean years? The farmer had not been steered off this road to pauperism -- he had been pushed along that road by governmental fumbling.

The best that the Republican leadership could offer was the Farm Board. The Farm Board set an all-time low for extravagance and futility. Its net out-of-pocket loss was \$600,000,000. Agriculture was being smothered with surpluses. The Farm Board did not stop -- on the contrary it only piled up bigger farm surpluses -- it speeded up the process of agricultural suffocation. To finish the job, the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff robbed the farmer of his last chance for a foreign market.

Moreover, we found that this conspicuous failure of government to help the farmer had created -- by March, 1933 -- a state of mind

in the nation which, itself, barred the way out of the farmer's difficulties. There was a defeatist attitude -- a conviction that the farmer could not be helped -- that all efforts were foredoomed to failure -- that any party which dared to substitute action for talk would get its political fingers burned.

Along with this defeatism there was the belief that money spent on the farm problem was money wasted -- that the only excuse for spending it was to keep the farmer in line -- to buy political peace.

That was what had happened to American agriculture when this Administration came into office.

That was the debris of twelve years of failure which we had to clear away before we could begin to lay the basis for a permanent agricultural prosperity before we could create conditions under which the Nation could be sure of continued plenty and the farmer could be sure of continued security.

Tonight you know that the ground has been cleared of that debris. After fourteen years in which he has been harrassed and borne down by the burdens of each succeeding day the farmer at last

has begun to get into the clear so that he can begin again to take thought for tomorrow. American agriculture is back to sound foundations.

Back of what we did was the conviction that the agricultural problem is not a problem for the farmer alone -- that it is a problem for the Nation as a whole. That is the way we have attacked it -- as a national, not a sectional, problem. The Nation is going along with the farmer. Now for the first time in this industrial period of our history the American people are becoming farm-minded. The industrial worker in New York City may now know the difference between alfalfa and clover but he has begun to see a connection between the permanence of his job, the size of his wages and the price of the farmer's crops.

Today the American people understand that the money we have used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment in the restoration of American industry; an underwriting for the wages of American labor; a stimulus for profits in American business.

The defeatist attitude has been defeated.

Also back of what we did was a second conviction -- that a sound farm policy must be a policy made by farmers and run by farmers. Ours is that kind of a policy. The farmers of America moved into the Department of Agriculture on the day that Henry Wallace set up shop there. For the first time, a national farm program was made in conference and with the agreement of all the farm leaders of all our farm organizations -- a program which came out of the free and open councils of farmers rather than out of the vote-catching schemes of politicians.

With these convictions, this Administration put its hand to the plow. It has not, it will not, turn back.

I am going to tell you what we did in just six sentences. Every man and woman on an American farm can expand those six sentences in terms of the recovery that has come to each of them in the last $2\frac{1}{2}$ years.

One: By our Agricultural Adjustment Act and our Soil Conservation program/we raised the farmer's cash income, and we set

up machinery to make sure that that income stays up.

Two: Through the Farm Credit Administration we reduced the burden of the farmer's debts, and we set up machinery to make sure that that burden stays down.

Three: Through the Reciprocal Trade Treaties and currency stabilization we have begun to cover the farmer's foreign markets in the only way in which they can be recovered and held -- by a policy of mutual advantage which has borne fruit in the reopening of markets for American farm products in all of the fourteen countries making these agreements -- a policy which only within the last ten days has brought about lower tariffs against our agriculture in France, Italy and Switzerland.

Four: By our program to revive business -- to increase employment -- to raise business and professional incomes and the wages of labor -- we have restored national income and prepared the way for the steady and long-time expansion of the farmer's domestic market by increasing the purchasing power and consumption of the average American family.

Five: By our program of Land use and conservation we have ended the policy of immediate glut and eventual waste, and laid the basis for permanent plenty.

Six: By our program for rural electrification -- by our farm-to-market roads -- by our aid to rural schools we have begun to get for the farmer his fair share in the comforts, the advantages, the wider interests and the deeper satisfactions which go to make the good life for himself and for his children.

There is the record. In those six sentences, the farmer and the farmer's family can measure, for themselves, the vast difference between the desperation which was theirs in 1933 and the recovery which is theirs today. From what that record has done for you -- judge for yourselves our determination and our capacity to carry this program through.

The American farmer has come a long way in the last four years. But he has not reached the end of the road. We propose to see to it that his progress continues. Our policy for agriculture is not a stand-still policy.

It has been said that the Administration's farm program changes

each year like new models of automobiles. I accept that simile. The automobile of today is the same kind of a vehicle, in principle, as it was twenty years ago. But because the automobile manufacturer did not hesitate to pioneer -- because he was willing to make yearly changes in his model -- the Nation now drives a car that is vastly improved. Farming too is the same in principle now as it has always been. But because the farmer has been willing to pioneer -- because, with the aid of scientists, economists and engineers he has been willing, year after year, to change -- because of these things both the product of the farms and the business of farming have been vastly improved. It is the aim of our policy not only to prevent the return of yesterday's model but to make tomorrow's model better than today's. Good as it was for today, we have passed beyond Model T. farming.

In our plans for that better farm future, we are proceeding with the conviction that the overwhelming majority of self-respecting farmers recognize that theirs is a competitive business -- that they do not desire handouts from their government -- that they want only

an equal chance with the rest of the country to win their own way to prosperity. We propose to continue a balanced economy which will assure them that equal chance.

It is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy, an evil which only the Democratic Platform specifically recognized. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. And even now, leaders in the House and the Senate, cooperating with the administrative departments of the government -- are preparing legislation to submit to Congress in January to provide further aid in solving this problem. We cannot, as a Nation be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own farm.

Because I would eliminate farm tenancy I also would eliminate huge aggregations of acreage under one ownership. It is a part of our policy to prevent farm monopoly.

Further -- we propose to give to the farmer and to the consumer -- the best available crop insurance against extreme fluctua-

tions of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations but the speculator. The farmer and the consumer lose together. *Insert A.*

Insert A. page 10

It does not add to the consumer's food supply when prices will not pay freight rates and the farmer's surplus rots on the ground. ~~and short-
are pro-~~
tected neither is safe. Only the Democratic platform gives specific recognition to the consumer because only the Democratic Party has the vision to see that the ultimate interests of the farmer and consumer are the same.

As a further part of this policy of prudence and farm progress we have already launched a program of conservation against land wastage and soil impoverishment. From the beginning, such a program has been basic in our plans. Months before the action of the Supreme Court on the AAA, I said publicly that it was the intention of the framers of that Act as it was my intention: "to pass from the purely emergency phases necessitated by a grave national crisis to a long-time more permanent plan for American agriculture. The long time and more permanent adjustment programs will provide positive *Conservatively*

tions of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations but the speculator. The farmer and the consumer lose together. *Frank A.*

That is why crop insurance is a protection for both. At one and the same time it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the farmer's fear of a food surplus. Until both are protected neither is safe. Only the Democratic platform gives specific recognition to the consumer because only the Democratic Party has the vision to see that the ultimate interests of the farmer and consumer are the same.

As a further part of this policy of prudence and farm progress we have already launched a program of conservation against land wastage and soil impoverishment. From the beginning, such a program has been basic in our plans. Months before the action of the Supreme Court on the AAA, I said publicly that it was the intention of the framers of that Act as it was my intention: "to pass from the purely emergency phases necessitated by a grave national crisis to a long-time more permanent plan for American agriculture. The long time and more permanent adjustment programs will provide positive

continuity

incentives for soil conservation. The benefit payments can be made on a basis that will encourage individual farmers to adopt sound farm management, crop rotation, and soil conservation methods. The crop insurance feature afforded by benefit payments will help farmers to maintain these beneficial systems of farming without interruption in poor crop years.

Having laid down that policy of soil conservation we began at once to prepare for its operation. Even before that statement was made we had begun a state-by-state and county-by-county survey to determine the broad outlines of a program which would maintain our soil fertility and our net farm income.

We knew that our soil had been recklessly impoverished by crops which did not pay. What had been sold to the American public as a philosophy of plenty was actually speeding us toward the certainty of scarcity. Because we stand committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty we have set ourselves resolutely against waste -- waste that comes from unneeded production, waste that imperils the Nation's future by draining away the abundance with which God has

enriched our soil.

In all this we are guided and will continued to be guided by the fundamental American belief that the countryman, living on his own land remains our ideal of self-reliance and of spiritual balance -- the source from which the reservoirs of the Nation's strength are constantly renewed. It is from the men and women on our farms -- living close to the soil, that this Nation -- like the Greek giant Antaeus touches Mother Earth and rises with strength renewed a hundred-fold.

We want to perpetuate that ideal under modern conditions, so that man may be strong in the ancient virtues and yet lay hold of the advantages which science and new knowledge offer to a well-rounded life.

And so we plan for the future of agriculture -- security for those who have spent their lives in farming; opportunity for young men and women that will lead them to choose to make careers on the farm; for a share in the good things of life full enough to justify our instinctive faith in the land.

Winant - diversity

Besse

-11-

Pearson - Islands by Ritter -

like two Sennarines

D. G. Vining -

to reading all of Guanajaco still has bearing even on side like at

Bethel's 7 miles SW.

also no marshy savannas and sand hills scattered throughout odd

-- considered favorable to have consideration to Ischbi two saltern basal rock

Chichen - Widmer -

etc. diagnostic savanna and low elevation and saline soil common and

-- several trees no bottom trees here but more at SI . however glaucomes

just south of town -- saline soil and like all of coastal valley

Dromopholis - Purpurae late - by D. G. Vining

however not all sections of valley bottom scattered among

Quaker - Saturday night OK

Dunek - (12). Sunday . Molasses

on east side of valley below Ischbi and stretching off from all

Oct 14 Corals - South of Oct 14 morning -

to bird very few new species found and no signs of man near here

S. L. Morris - Jefferson mammal + fossil

here a lot of old bones seen here some old shell fragments also

(Body morning - Oct 14. Barry - Chagall - meteorite 30 mm

Oct 15 - 5 miles SW. - Purpurae - Purpurae + Chichen -

has new name and village name - and the other hatching of Mayan

Oct 15 - 5 miles - Chichen - 10 miles - 10 minutes

just east of village of Chichen - here there are two villages of ancient like still to smaller houses and no signs of old

Oct 16 Pocimina V.

smaller size of ancient civilization

Chichen - 5 miles south -

for the new work.

do not go west
at the next station
and then go back
and then go west

STATEMENTS FILE
Shorthand By Kanner

We knew that our soil had been recklessly impoverished by crops which did not pay. Because we stand committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty we have set ourselves resolutely against waste -- waste that comes from unneeded production, waste that imperils the Nation's future by draining away the abundance with which God has enriched our soil.

Increasing production alone in an unlimited way appeals to no person who thinks the problem through. Increasing consumption must go hand in hand with it. Here is a simple figure to mull over. If every family in the United States had enough money to live on what the doctors and dietitians call a "Class A Diet", we would need foodstuffs from forty-five million acres more than we are using today. America's diet is better than that of most other nations, but from the point of view of better national health, it is still inadequate. I seek to increase purchasing power so that people can pay for more food and better food, and in turn provide a larger and larger domestic market for the farmer.

It is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. We are preparing in isolation, in cooperation with farm leaders, to submit to the Congress in January to help solve this problem. We cannot, as a Nation, be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own farm.

Further -- we propose to give to the farmer and to the consumer -- a sound plan of crop insurance in kind against extreme fluctuations of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations but the speculator. The farmer and the consumer lose together.

That is why crop insurance is a protection for both. At one and the same time it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the farmer's fear of a food surplus. Until both are protected neither is safe. The ultimate interests of the farmer and the consumer are the same.

That is why I am not making one kind of a speech to the farmers out here and another kind of speech to consumers in the big cities. The same speech and the same policy must go for both.

The city dweller has come to know that unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces, he cannot buy the things that are turned out in the shops and factories of the cities.

And so we plan for the future of agriculture -- security for those who have spent their lives in farming; opportunity for real careers for young men and women on the farm -- a share for farmers in the good things of life abundant enough to justify and preserve our instinctive faith in the land.

In all our plans we are guided, and will continue to be guided, by the fundamental belief that the American farmer, living on his own land, remains our ideal of self-reliance and of spiritual balance -- the source from which the reservoirs of the Nation's strength are constantly renewed. It is from the men and women of our farms -- living close to the soil, that this Nation -- like the Greek giant Antaeus touches Mother Earth and rises with strength renewed a hundred-fold.

We want to perpetuate that ideal under modern conditions so that man may be strong in the ancient virtues and yet lay hold of the advantages which science and new knowledge offer to a well-rounded life.

STATEMENTS FILE

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT
St. Louis and By Kanner

OMAHA, NEBRASKA,

OCTOBER 10, 1936.

First a word to you as Nebraskans. I hope it will be heard by the citizens of the other forty-seven States because I know that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean government, representative government.

On this platform sits a man whose reputation for many years has been known in every community — a man old in years but young in heart — a man who through all these years has had no boss but his own conscience — the Senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, given to the Nation by the people of Nebraska — George W. Norris.

Outside of my own State of New York, I have consistently refrained from taking part in elections in any other State.

But Senator Norris' name has been entered as a candidate for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of non-participation in State elections I have made — and so long as he lives I always

will make — one magnificently justified exception.

George Norris' candidacy transcends State and party lines.
In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who like him
have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the
wisdom of years.

He is one of the major prophets of America.

Help this great American to continue an historic career
of service.

Nebraska will be doing a great service, not only to
itself but to every other State in the Union and to the Nation as
a whole if it places this great American above partisanship and
keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States.

In 1932 I pledged my Administration to a farm policy
that would help the farmer. Tonight every man and woman on an
American farm who has read today's market reports knows that we
have done what we said we would do.

WILLIAM D. BOYD

What needed to be done?

You know that in March, 1933, after twelve ^{long} years, farm income was disappearing and farm prices had sunk to a bankruptcy level.

In 1933 America's farm population was the greatest in our history, but the farmers' income was the lowest for the quarter century for which we have records. Farmers represented twenty-five per cent of the Nation's population — but they got only $\frac{7}{15}$ of the national income.

(1) ✓
Beg 2
The spectre of foreclosure stalked the farmer's plow.

American agriculture was on the road to pauperism.

When the World War ended the nations of Europe whom we had been feeding went back to farming for themselves. Our farmers were left holding the bag — a bag that bulged with vast quantities of wheat, corn and cotton for which the market had disappeared.

That was the farmer's plight. What did Republican leadership do about it?

-4-

The best that it could offer ~~was~~) the Farm Board. The ~~high~~
Farm Board set an all-time ~~high~~ for extravagant futility. It met
the problem of unsaleable and unexportable surpluses by piling
up bigger surpluses.

To finish the job, the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff
robbed the farmer of his last chance for a foreign market.

We found that this conspicuous failure of government
to help the farmer had created — by March, 1933 — a state of
mind in the Nation which, ~~itself~~, seemed to bar the way out of
the farmer's difficulties. There was a defeatist attitude — a
conviction that the farmer could not be helped — that all efforts
were foredoomed to failure — that any party ~~which~~ dared to
substitute action for talk would get its political fingers burned.

Along with this defeatism there was the belief that
money spent on the farm problem was money wasted — that the only
excuse for spending it was to keep the farmer in line — to buy
political peace.

That was what had happened to American agriculture when
this Administration came into office.

That was the debris of twelve years of failure which we had to clear away before we could begin to lay the basis for a permanent agricultural prosperity.

Tonight you know that the ground has been cleared of that debris. After twelve years in which he had been harrassed and weighed down by the burdens of each succeeding day, the farmer at last has begun to get into the clear, so that he can begin again to take thought for tomorrow.

Back of what we did was the conviction that the agricultural problem is not a problem for the farmer alone — that it is a problem for the Nation as a whole. That is the way we attacked it.

And the Nation is now going along with the farmer. *Never* for the first time in this industrial period of our history the American people understand that there is a definite bond between agriculture and industry — that the money we have used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment in the restoration of American industry, an underwriting for the wages of American labor, a stimulus for profits in American business.

The defeatist attitude has ~~had~~ been defeated.

Back of what we did was a second conviction — that a sound farm policy must be a policy [redacted] run by farmers. Ours is that kind of policy. The farmers of America moved into the Department of Agriculture on the day that Henry Wallace set up shop there. For the first time, a national farm program was made in conference and with the agreement of [redacted] farm leaders of all our farm organizations — a program which came out of the free and open councils of farmers rather than out of the vote-catching schemes of politicians.

(W) 2 With these convictions, this Administration put its hand to the plow. It has not turned, it will not turn back.

Rey I am going to tell you in just seven sentences what we did. Every man and woman on an American farm can expand these seven sentences in terms of the recovery that has come to each of them in the last three and a half years.

1. By our agricultural adjustment act, our monetary policy, our soil conservation program, and our assistance to farm cooperatives, we raised the farmers' net annual income by three and a half billion dollars to a sum three times what it was in 1933. (C)

① 2. Through the Farm Credit Administration we saved thousands of homes and farms from foreclosure and reduced the staggering burden of the farmers' debts.

② 3. Through reciprocal trade treaties and international currency stabilization, we have begun to recover the farmers' foreign markets in the only way in which they can be recovered and held — by a policy of mutual international advantage which today is bearing fruit in the reopening of markets for American farm products in all of the fourteen countries making these agreements — by a policy which, for example, within the last ten days has brought about lower tariffs in France, Italy and Switzerland to the benefit of our farmers. Growing trade is making for international peace.

③ 4. By our program to revive business — to increase employment — to raise business and professional incomes and the wages of labor -- and by increasing the purchasing power and consumption of the average American family -- we have restored national income, and prepared the way for the steady and long-time expansion of the farmers' home market.

④ 5. By our program of land use and conservation we have ended the policy of immediate glut and eventual waste, and have laid the basis for permanent plenty.

Cap. By our program of rural electrification — by our farm-to-market roads — by our aid to rural schools, we have begun to get for the farmer his fair share in the comforts, the advantages, the wider interests and the deeper satisfactions which go to make the good life for himself and for his children.

When disastrous drought struck the land in parts of our country, we rushed immediate and direct relief to the farmers and stockmen to save them from want — a policy that some people call waste! — but you must tell me.

There is the record. In those seven sentences, the farmer and the farmer's family can measure, for themselves, the vast difference between the desperation which was theirs in 1933 and the recovery which is theirs in 1936. From what that record has done and is doing for you — judge for yourselves our determination and our capacity to carry this program through.

~~Mr. B~~ After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer, as his condition got worse and worse, what does Republican leadership now offer?

First of all, it ~~would~~ scrap the present program, which it has condemned as a "subterfuge" and a "stop-gap". It would junk the farmers' organization to carry it out. It would end the farmers' program of cooperation, and send them back to the "free competition" — or "rugged individualism" if you will — that wrecked them in 1932.

Next it would substitute a system of tariff equivalent payments, not for any permanent contribution to farm wealth or national income, but merely as a cash hand-out — on a dole. These payments would be made only to the producers of exportable farm crops — specifically on hogs, wheat, cotton and tobacco.

Dairymen, cattlemen, sugar growers and producers of other crops of which there normally is no exportable surplus would be left out.

What about the effect of such a scheme? Would it serve to protect farmers from price collapse under a burden of surpluses? Would it guard them in the future against a disaster like 1932?

No plan could lead the Nation back faster to such a crisis.

The proposed plan of the Republican leaders is a straight subsidy of unlimited farm production. In a year or two of normal weather, it would pile surplus on top of surplus, driving prices down and down. It is the Federal Farm Board all over again. ¹⁶⁹⁴ Finally, to make the parallel with 1932 ^{late} perfect, the Republican leaders now propose to repeal the reciprocal tariff act, and go back to the Smoot-Hawley tariff policy. Once again

as in 1932, the farmers would have price-crushing surpluses at home,
+ sell abroad
and no place abroad to sell them.

What about the cost? It would run to one and a half and
even possibly two billion dollars ^{fully} a year. This vast sum would be
spent not to save agriculture but to wreck it. 1932

Either this plan which they advocate in the West, or
the curtailment of expenditures they talk about in the East, would
have to be discarded. Both promises cannot possibly be carried out.
In

For the first time in many cruel years, we are getting
the problem of the business of farming well in hand. Do you now
want to turn over that problem to the care of those who did nothing
about it in the past? Do you want to turn it over ~~to those who~~
^{Campaign-drawn, draft-backed}
now make inconsistent promises, ^{which} you and they know they cannot
keep?

~~Every day the administration is changing its policies.~~
It has been said that the Administration's farm program changes
each year like new models of automobiles. I accept that simile.

The automobile of today is the same kind of a vehicle, in principle, as it was twenty years ago. But because the automobile manufacturer did not hesitate to pioneer -- because he was willing to make yearly changes in his model -- the Nation now drives a car that is vastly improved. ~~Farming too is the same in principle now as it has always been.~~ But because the farmer has been willing to pioneer -- because, with the aid of scientists, economists and engineers he has been willing, year after year, to change -- because of these things both the product of the farms and the business of farming have been vastly improved. It is the aim of our policy not only to prevent the return of yesterday's model but to make tomorrow's model better than today's. Good as it was for its day, we have passed beyond Model T, farming.

Our long time policy of prudence and farm progress includes a program of conservation against land wastage and soil impoverishment. From the beginning, such a program has been basic in our plans. [On October 25, 1935, months before] the action of the Supreme Court on the Triple A, I said publicly that it was the intention of the framers of that act as it was my intention:

"to pass from the purely emergency phases necessitated by a grave national crisis to a long-time more permanent plan for American agriculture." (S)

We know that our soil had been recklessly impoverished by crops which did not pay. Because we stand committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty we have set ourselves resolutely against waste -- waste that comes from unneeded production, waste that imperils the Nation's future by draining away the abundance with which God has enriched our soil.

Increasing production alone in an unlimited way appeals to no person who thinks the problem through. Increasing consumption must go hand in hand with it. Here is a simple figure to mull over. If every family in the United States had enough money to live on what the doctors and dietitians call a "Class A Diet", we would need foodstuffs from forty-five million acres more than we are using today. America's diet is better than that of most other nations, but from the point of view of better national health, it is still inadequate. I seek to increase purchasing power so that people can pay for more food and better food, and in turn provide a larger and larger domestic market for the farmer. (S)

It is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. We are preparing legislation, in cooperation with farm leaders, to submit to the Congress in January to help solve this problem. We cannot, as a Nation, be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own farm.

Further — we propose to give to the farmer and to the consumer — a sound plan of crop insurance against extreme fluctuations of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations but the speculator. The farmer and the consumer lose together.

That is why crop insurance is a protection for both. At *the* *same* *time* it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the farmer's fear of a food surplus. Until both are protected neither is safe. The ultimate interests of the farmer and the consumer are the same.

That is why I am not making one kind of a speech to the farmers out here and another kind of speech to consumers in the big cities. The same speech and the same policy must go for both.

The city dweller has come to know that unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces, he cannot buy the things that are turned out in the shops and factories of the cities.

And so we plan for the future of agriculture, security for those who have spent their lives in farming; opportunity for real careers for young men and women on the farm; -- a share for farmers in the good things of life abundant enough to justify and preserve our instinctive faith in the land.

In all our plans we are guided, and will continue to be guided, by the fundamental ~~assumption~~ belief that the farmer, ^{American} living on his own land remains our ideal of self-reliance and of spiritual balance — the source from which the reservoirs of the Nation's strength are constantly renewed. It is from the men and women of our farms — living close to the soil, that this Nation — like the Greek giant Antaeus touches Mother Earth and rises with strength renewed a hundred-fold.

We want to perpetuate that ideal under modern conditions,
so that man may be strong in the ancient virtues and yet lay hold
of the advantages which science and new knowledge offer to a well-
rounded life. (L)
