occurred during World War I as a result of war needs. This cooperation matured subsequently in response to feared shortages and actual glut during the twenties and the New Deal era. He finds little change since World War II except in the allied field of natural gas, which earlier had been of relatively minor importance and thus had lagged in the formulation of national policy.

Nash has dealt with a large and, at times, controversial subject in a clear and notably evenhanded way. Where arguments have run hot, he has been careful to present both sides. He has also been willing to generalize and to give firm judgments. His discussion of the evolution of national oil policy does not conform to the view of some recent historians who see business interests working their will on society through the instrumentality of the national government, but he might have dealt with this point more explicitly. And on the matter of the tax depletion allowance there obviously continues to be considerably less than total consensus between industry and government.

Not the least of the merits of this book is its annotated bibliography. In his survey of the literature, Nash has pointed to opportunities for a number of more specialized studies which would both supplement and act as a check on his own. One helpful bibliographical item which escaped his net (p. 61) is Peter Reed's article on Standard Oil in Indonesia in the Autumn, 1958, issue of the *Business History Review*. And there are a few small errors, like confusing Senator Elbert Thomas with Elmer Thomas (pp. 221, 268) or reading Appalachian production in 1899 as 93 per cent of the national total instead of about 50 per cent (p. 3). But these are minor matters in a generally very useful and informative book.

*University of California, Irvine*  
Gerald T. White


Edward and Frederick Schapsmeier feel that Henry A. Wallace was remembered by historians mainly as a vice president of the United States and as a presidential candidate on the Progressive party ticket in 1948. They present a study of Wallace's career as a scientist, as a brilliant farm editor and leader, and as successful secretary of agriculture during the first eight years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's presidency.

Members of the Iowa branch of the Wallace family devoted most of their lives to the problems of agriculture. Henry's grandfather started his career in Iowa as a minister, but in 1877 he gave up this calling to become a successful farmer at Winterset. Here he raised purebred livestock and applied scientific principles to his crop production. He also became well known first as a contributor and later as an editor of the *Iowa Homestead*. Henry A.'s father, Henry C., graduated from Iowa State College at Ames, specializing in
dairy science. During his college career he “dropped out” to run one of his father’s farms. He later returned to Ames to complete his degree and become a member of the faculty. During his teaching career he became part owner of *Farm and Dairy* and his father, known as the editor “Uncle Henry,” edited this farm journal. *Farm and Dairy* eventually became *Wallaces’ Farmer*, a family owned paper which became a powerful voice for rural America. Henry C. Wallace left his academic post at Iowa State College in 1895 to assist with the family journal. He became a well known, outspoken farm leader during the Populist and Progressive eras.

Henry A., born in 1888, was, in fact, the son of a farmer, and he grew up in the atmosphere of an effective publishing family. From his grandfather he received a deep religious spirit and an awareness of the need for active social service. From his mother he learned to love flowers and plant life. As a youngster he tagged along with George Washington Carver while Carver conducted his agricultural experiments at Iowa State College. This contact intensified Wallace’s interest in the application of science to agricultural problems. During his college career he experimented with hybrid corn and in later years helped to develop a profitable hybrid corn company. Following college he trained himself in higher mathematics and statistics and deepened his economic theories by studying the writings of Hibbard and Veblen. His attitude toward business abuses is reflected in the fact that all three of the Henrys supported Theodore Roosevelt in his bid for the presidency in 1912.

Henry A. came closer to farm problems while his father worked for increased food production during World War I and later became secretary of agriculture under President Warren G. Harding. The farmer had not recovered from the postwar depression and the work of President Harding and Henry C. Wallace for the relief of the farmer was far from negative according to the authors. Henry C. died in 1924, and at the age of thirty-six, Henry A. became Henry Wallace, the editor of *Wallaces’ Farmer*.

Henry Wallace had written his first book in 1920 urging farmers to emulate big business by curtailing production. He soon saw the need for more vigorous support at state and national levels for the remedy of farm problems. He believed in the superiority of rural life over urban life. As an editor he became one of the foremost agricultural thinkers in America and occupied a place among the eminent spokesmen on farm problems. He fought hard for the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill and was so disappointed over President Calvin Coolidge’s veto of the bill that he campaigned for Al Smith in 1928, even though Herbert Hoover was a native son of Iowa. By 1930 Wallace was an ardent champion of the domestic allotment plan supported by a process tax to aid the farmer. He tried, with no success, to direct the rebellious spirit of John Simpson and Milo Reno into more positive channels.

It was this leadership that led to Franklin D. Roosevelt’s selection of Henry Wallace as secretary of agriculture. The authors present Wallace’s
secretarial career in detail and picture him as a most successful administrator. Wallace's role in the Agricultural Adjustment Association, the retirement of marginal lands, the ever normal granary, his administrative problems, and his ability to blend New Deal ideas into a new philosophy made him an effective and also a marked man in FDR's cabinet. It was Wallace's ability to spell out the philosophy of the New Deal that encouraged Roosevelt to name him as a running mate in 1940.

This is a well researched and scholarly book. It is a genuine contribution to an era of our history. Some historians may not agree that Wallace was the nation's greatest secretary of agriculture, especially since no secretary of agriculture has been loved by the farmer since the early 1920s. The editing of the book is a bit disconcerting, especially if one wishes to check the source for a quotation. On page 23 a long quotation is given, but the number for the footnote follows at the end of an unrelated paragraph. Citations are pushed together. Chapter eleven has nearly fifty citations listed under note number 4. There is an incomplete sentence on page 136.

Kansas State University, Manhattan

A. Bower Sageser


Until recently twentieth century American historians tended to neglect the exciting and eventful decade of the 1920s while concentrating their efforts on the Progressive and New Deal reform eras, which were deemed more significant and relevant. Mitchell's revised doctoral dissertation dealing with Democratic politics in Missouri is one of several recent monographs which have attempted to remedy this neglect by probing the nature of politics at the state and local levels during the twenties.

The Missouri Democracy, a once dominant coalition of rural, old stock citizens and urban Irish, was first rent asunder by the fierce, intraparty battle over the League of Nations. A key element in this conflict was the bitter, personal feud between President Woodrow Wilson and the irascible, irreconcilable senator from Missouri James A. Reed. During the twenties certain divisive domestic issues such as farm relief legislation, the Ku Klux Klan, and, most important, prohibition continued to plague the party and assure its minority status.

The author emphasizes the shift of the Negro vote in Missouri after 1928 as a principal factor in the return to power of the Democratic party. This shift, he insists, began because of Republican indifference and a calculated Democratic campaign to woo black voters long before the Depression shattered the national economy. Since that time the Negro voter has been the most faithful member of the dominant Democratic organization.