
Franklin D. Roosevelt — “The Great Communicator”
The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945

Series 1: Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Political Ascension

File No. 144

1920 August 20

Seattle, WA - Campaign Speech

Seattle Aug 20 =

A

In the past ten days I have come from salt water to salt water again - from one ocean to the other. The campaign really started in Chicago a week ago last Wednesday. Since that time we have visited and held meetings in all of the great States of the Northwest, beginning with Wisconsin and working through Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Idaho and Washington.

Coming down the slopes to the sea this afternoon, I have been thinking of some of the outstanding features of these journeyings. First of all, of course, is the thought which comes to every one as they cross this great Republic of ours, the thought of its magnitude, charm and physical riches; and next perhaps I have thought of the splendid unity of our people who inhabit it. There is, after all, very little difference between us Americans, no matter from what State we come. It is something for us to be very thankful for that we have not merely a common language, but that we have also the same general standards of life and the same ideals of thought. It makes very little difference whether one is in the manufacturing

districts of the Middle West, or in the grain fields of the Dakotas, or in the mining camps of Montana, or in the extraordinary and rich valleys of your own State, reclaimed from a wilderness by the initiative of man. In all these parts we find the same type of rugged, forward-looking Americans, determined to make good and to make their Country a better place to live in.

I have been West many times before. I have been to Seattle in the past, as most of you know, but on this trip I want to impress upon you that I have never before seen such progress and such prosperity. I can remember the days when bread lines existed in many parts of the land. I can remember the days of financial panic. I can remember the days when bank savings in this great land were but a dream for the average citizen. Today this is not the case. You and I know that taking it by and large the Country is prosperous, - not the mere prosperity of a handful of men controlled by privilege, but the prosperity that extends pretty deeply throughout the communities.

We feel very certain this year that the Republicans will

not try to take out a patent in this campaign on the "full dinner pail". The Democratic Party does not adopt the "full dinner pail" as its slogan because, as Governor Cox has so well said, "We are not satisfied with ^{only} the 'full dinner pail' ". Human beings, in the march of civilization must have more than animals. To stop short at satisfying their stomachs is an insult which apparently the present leaders of the Republican Party do not realize. It is an insult because of the simple fact that we Americans have heads and know how to use them, and that we must feed both the head and the heart even more truly than the appetites of the flesh.

It is insufficient for a political party in this day and generation to hand out a mass of words and call it a platform. It is insufficient for a political party to try to catch votes with words that can be read in two ways. It is not merely in the matter of our foreign policy and how we shall restore peace that the Republican platform faces both ways at the same time. It is true of the whole campaign which they are staging.

We notice it in their efforts to throw an old-fashioned Puget Sound fog around the true issues by dragging in dead issues as

they have attempted to do with the tariff: that they are not using their old-fashioned slogan of "Let well enough alone", but they would be if they ^{happened} ~~happened~~ to be in power at the present moment. That kind of slogan is typical of their present leadership.

The Democratic party might have the right to use that slogan of "Let well enough alone" this year because of the unprecedented prosperity of the Nation. But the very fact we are not using it is illustrative of democratic thought. It proves that we ourselves are not satisfied. We worship at the shrine not of the "God of things as they are", but at the shrine of the "God of things as they should be".

It is true that we are prosperous. That is not enough.. We want that prosperity to be of more than mere money - we want it to be a prosperity of better homes, of better living conditions - a prosperity which eliminates the sweat-shop and the overworking of our mothers and our children. We want it to be a prosperity that will give to those who now lack it a bigger share in the opportunities of American life. These cannot come in a day or in a night, but they

can come most quickly through men who believe that they are coming and who will work insistently and unselfishly toward that end.

These are some of the reasons why Governor Cox and I are carrying our case to the people. We are trying to think in terms of the United States, ^Wand we believe that ^{National}the candidates for the Presidency should be "Nationally-minded" ^{not}instead of "Marion-minded".

FROM SPEECH OF HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
SEATTLE, WASH. - AUG. 20, 1920

Continuation
Seattle is a Navy town. It knows what the Navy is for,

and it is, therefore, in this city that I want first to take up the great and vital question of our Army and Navy of the future.

I am not a militarist. There are very few of our fellow-citizens who are, but the great majority of them will agree with me in the demand that the United States shall maintain at all times an Army and a Navy wholly adequate for national defense. That is the starting point. The resulting question immediately arises - What is an adequate Army or Navy? To answer that we must immediately turn our eyes outside of our own boundaries and find out just what armed power could be brought against us - that is the measure of our own needs.

Up to 1914 the world as a whole was on the basis of competitive armament. Just as fast as Germany added another Division to her army, France had to do likewise. The same thing was true of even the smaller states of the world. When Germany began feverishly to build up her navy, Great Britain had to answer with an even greater number of battle ships. In this race the United States was

compelled to keep pace or run the danger of having an inadequate defense. The result was an enormous increase in our Army and especially in our Navy before the war. This increase, in terms of dollars and cents, ran up into the hundreds of millions, and this money came directly from the pockets of the tax-payers.

This year the Army and Navy are costing the people of this Country, and in this I do not include any of the war expenses, just about \$1,000,000,000. People will say why is this necessary in view of the ending of the war. The answer is, first, that we have not ended the war- that we have not yet made peace, and, secondly, that without us the League of Nations can take no steps in that very important part of its functions, that is to say the limitation of armaments by mutual consent among Nations.

Our Navy, for instance, is at the present time in second place. It is very nearly equal to the Navy of Great Britain. It is more powerful than the Navy of France or of Japan.

Let us examine the future. We have three courses open. The first is to reduce our Army and Navy without regard to what the

other Nations of the World are doing. I feel certain that the people of this Country will never stand for the danger that that involves. We believe whole-heartedly in adequate defense.

The second is - We may return to the old pre-war condition of competitive building between the great Nations. That will mean, without question, an increase in the already enormous cost which we are sustaining. Battle-ships that formerly cost Six or Eight Million Dollars, now cost Twenty-five or Thirty Million. We shall have to keep our present rank among the navies of the world, and if competitive armaments continue, I have no hesitation in saying that we shall have to spend in the near future far more than the present Billion Dollars a year which are coming out of the tax-payers' pockets.

The third alternative is the League of Nations itself. The primary purpose of that League is anti-war, and one of its first duties will be the limitation of international armaments. I have no doubt that if the great powers meet around the table, and it is obvious that they all must sit at that table, they will be able to reach an agreement by which a fair relative ratio of the different armies and navies

in the world can be worked out. Under this ratio the United States and Great Britain would undoubtedly have navies superior to those of any other power, but the point is that the size of those navies - the size of all navies, would be materially reduced. Instead of fifty battle-ships we would have twenty-five or even fifteen. Instead of paying out a Billion Dollars every year for armament, we could cut the cost more than in half.

Is this worth while? Is it worth while for America to take part in something which will not merely serve to lift the burden of maintaining armaments from the shoulders of humanity, but which will also immediately reduce the danger of war by reducing the weapons for waging wars in the hands of Nations which might be possible aggressors?

In this connection, I want to say a word about the Navy in its relation to the Pacific Coast.

Even if our fleet were greatly reduced in size, under an international agreement by the League of Nations, we shall still have to improve the Naval facilities for taking care of the fleet on the Pacific Coast. With the existing size of our fleet, we know from the experience of having half of our fleet in the Pacific at this time that our shore facilities at Puget Sound, at San Francisco Bay, and in Southern California, are wholly inadequate. This is a simple matter of common sense. Every child must know that we must have equal facilities in both oceans. Today we could not base the whole American fleet on the Pacific Coast. We have not enough docks. We have not enough repair facilities. We have not enough storehouses. We have not enough water in the channel to get to one of the principal Navy Yards.

It has been a Democratic Administration which has recognized your needs and the national needs on the Pacific. It will be another Democratic Administration which will carry out the splendid work already begun.