
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. 889

1936 August 14

Chautauqua, NY – Address [Peace]

Reading Copy -
Aug 14, 1936
Chautauqua

As many of you who are here tonight know, I formed the excellent habit of coming to Chautauqua more than twenty years ago. After my Inauguration in 1933, I promised Mr. Bestor that during the next four years I would come to Chautauqua again; it is in fulfillment of this that I am with you tonight.

A few days ago I was asked what the subject of this talk would be and I replied that for two good reasons I wanted to discuss the subject of peace: First, because it is eminently appropriate in Chautauqua and, secondly, because in the hurly-burly of domestic politics it is important that our people should not overlook problems and issues which, though they lie beyond our borders, may, and probably will, have a vital influence on the United States of the future.

Many who have visited me in Washington in the past few months may have been surprised when I have told them that personally and because of my own daily contacts with all manner of difficult situations, I am more concerned and less cheerful about international world conditions than about our immediate domestic prospects.

I say this to you not as a confirmed pessimist but as one who still hopes that envy, hatred and malice among nations have reached their peak and will be succeeded by a new tide of peace and good will -- I say this as one who has participated in many of the decisions of peace and war before, during and after the World War; one who has traveled much and one who has spent a goodly portion of every twenty-four hours in the study of foreign relations.

Long before I returned to Washington as President of the United States, I had made up my mind that pending what might be called a more opportune moment on other continents, the United States could best serve the cause of a peaceful humanity by setting an example. That is why on the fourth of March, 1933, I made the following declaration:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor -- the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others -- the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

This declaration represents my purpose, but it represents more than a purpose, for it stands for a practice. To a measurable degree it has succeeded: the whole world now knows that the United States cherishes no predatory ambitions. We are strong: but less powerful nations know that they need not fear our strength. We seek no conquest: we stand for peace.

In the whole of the western hemisphere our good neighbor policy has produced results that are especially heartening.

The noblest monument to peace and to neighborly economic and social friendship in all the world is not a monument in bronze or stone, but the boundary which unites the United States and Canada -- 3000 miles of friendship with no barbed wire, no gun or soldier, and no passport on the whole frontier.

Mutual trust made that frontier -- to extend the same sort of mutual trust throughout the Americas was our aim.

The American Republics to the south of us have been ready always to cooperate with the United States on a basis of equality and mutual respect, but before we inaugurated the good neighbor policy there was among them resentment and fear, because certain administrations in Washington had slighted their national pride and their sovereign rights.

In pursuance of the good neighbor policy, and because in my younger days I had learned many lessons in the hard school of experience, I stated that the United States was opposed definitely to armed intervention.

We have negotiated a Pan American Convention embodying the principle of non-intervention. We have abandoned the Platt Amendment which gave us the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba. We have withdrawn American Marines from Haiti. We have signed a new Treaty which places our relations with Panama on a mutually satisfactory basis. We have undertaken a series of trade agreements with other American countries to our mutual commercial profit. At the request of two neighboring Republics, I hope to give assistance in the final settlement of the last serious boundary dispute between any of the American nations.

Throughout the Americas the spirit of the good neighbor is a practical and living fact. The twenty-one American Republics are not only living together in friendship and in peace; they are united in the determination so to remain.

To give substance to this determination, a conference will meet on December 1, 1936, at the Capitol of our great southern neighbor, Argentina, and it is, I know, the hope of all Chiefs of State of the Americas that this will

result in measures which will banish wars forever from this vast portion of the earth.

Peace, like charity, begins at home; that is why we have begun at home. But peace in the western world is not all that we seek.

It is our hope that knowledge of the practical application of the good neighbor policy in this hemisphere will be borne home to our neighbors across the seas.

For ourselves we are on good terms with them -- terms in most cases of straightforward friendship, of peaceful understanding.

But, of necessity, we are deeply concerned about tendencies of recent years among many of the nations of other continents. It is a bitter experience to us when the spirit of agreements to which we are a party is not lived up to. It is an even more bitter experience for the whole company of nations to witness not only the spirit but the letter of international agreements violated with impunity and without regard to the simple principles of honor. Permanent friendships between nations, as between men, can be sustained only by scrupulous respect for the pledged word.

In spite of all of this we have sought steadfastly to assist international movements to prevent war. We cooperated to the bitter end -- and it was a bitter end -- in the work of the General Disarmament Conference. When it failed we sought a separate treaty to deal with the manufacture of arms and the international traffic in arms. That proposal also came to nothing. We participated -- again to the bitter end -- in a conference to continue naval limitations -- and when it became evident that no general treaty could be signed because of the objections of other nations, we concluded with Great Britain and France a conditional treaty of qualitative limitation which, much to my regret, already shows signs of ineffectiveness.

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations; but I am glad to say that we have cooperated wholeheartedly in the social and humanitarian work at Geneva. Thus we are a part of the world effort to control traffic in narcotics, to improve international health, to help child welfare, to eliminate double taxation and to better working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.

We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war. Yet we must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war.

I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running from the wounded. I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs. I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. I have seen two hundred limping, exhausted men come out of line -- the survivors of a regiment of one thousand that went forward forty-eight hours before. I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.

I have passed unnumbered hours, I shall pass unnumbered hours thinking and planning how war may be kept from this Nation.

I wish I could keep war from all nations; but that is beyond my power. I can at least make certain that no act of the United States helps to produce or to promote war. I can at least make clear that the conscience of America revolts against war and that any nation which provokes war forfeits the sympathy of the people of the United States.

Many causes produce war. There are ancient hatreds, turbulent frontiers, the "legacy of old forgotten, far-off things, and battles long ago." There are new-born fanaticisms, convictions on the part of certain peoples that they have become the unique depositories of ultimate truth and right.

A dark old world was devastated by wars between conflicting religions. A dark modern world faces wars between conflicting economic and political fanaticisms in which are intertwined race hatreds. To bring it home, it is as if within the territorial limits of the United States, 48 nations with 48 forms of government, 48 customs barriers, 48 languages and 48 eternal and different verities were spending their time and their substance in a frenzy of effort to make themselves strong enough to conquer their neighbors or strong enough to defend themselves against their neighbors.

In one field, that of economic barriers, the American policy may be, I hope, of some assistance in discouraging the economic source of war and, therefore, a contribution towards the peace of the world. The trade agreements which we are making are not only finding outlets for the products of American fields and American factories but are also pointing the way to the elimination of embargoes, quotas and other devices which place such pressure on nations

not possessing great natural resources that to them the price of peace seems less terrible than the price of war.

We do not maintain that a more liberal international trade will stop war but we fear that without a more liberal international trade war is a natural sequence.

The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

Nevertheless -- and I speak from a long experience -- the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to

a few men; for the nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the west plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war plowed areas.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches -- fools' gold -- would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you -- and unfortunately their views would get wide publicity -- that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond -- to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer -- must answer -- "we choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day to day decisions.

At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the great war in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "No" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

Of all the nations of the world today we are in many ways most singularly blessed. Our closest neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood.

We seek to dominate no other nation. We ask no territorial expansion. We oppose imperialism. We desire reduction in world armaments.

We believe in democracy. We believe in freedom. We believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish our friendship look us in the eye and take our hand.

E n d

Chautauqua, N.Y.
August 14, 1936.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
CHAUTAUQUA, NEW YORK
August 14, 1936, 8 P.M., E.D.S.T.

Dr. Bestor, ladies and gentlemen:

I am always appreciative of that well-bred and
splendid salute.

As many of you who are here tonight know, I formed the excellent habit of coming to Chautauqua more than twenty years ago. (Applause) And it was after my Inauguration in 1933 that I promised (Mr.) Dr. Bestor that during the next four years I would come to Chautauqua again (it is in fulfillment of this that I am with you tonight) and here I am. (Applause)

A few days ago (I was asked what) some of my friends of the Press asked me the subject of this talk (would be;) tonight, and I replied that for two good reasons I wanted to discuss the subject of peace: First, because it is eminently appropriate in Chautauqua (applause) and, secondly, because in the hurly-burly of domestic politics it is important that our people should not overlook problems and issues which, though they lie beyond our borders, may, and probably will, have a vital influence on the United States of the future.

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.

~~the world - it's just so self-evident you have to~~

~~understand~~

I think I'd better wait one day not to speak about anything else but to stick to what I said yesterday and let me say again that I think we're in a better position now than we were a week ago. I mean now we've got our first real indication of how things I think must soon get much better and I think also to insist that at all times we must remember that we're fighting for freedom now as we were then. (State radio now 17 min with out a
stop will be available for an urgent report on the situation)
Now we're very much better off than we were. (1st alarm)
Report comes to Franklin and myself of Defense Department's supersecret air force which informed us of a supposed
to bomb-plant and oil refinery (Refugees from Ismailia
would already be back to Egypt at approximately afternoon
and were ordered to leave except for those who had been sent
back to Egypt. The Egyptian has been ordered not longer
detained but to return back to Egypt as soon as possible)

Many people who have visited me in Washington in the past few months may have been surprised when I have told them that personally and because of my own daily contacts with all manner of difficult (situations) problems I am more concerned and less cheerful about international world conditions than about our immediate domestic prospects. (Applause)

I say this to you not as a confirmed pessimist but as one who still hopes that envy, hatred and malice among nations have reached their peak and will be succeeded by a new tide of peace and good will -- I say this as one who has participated in many of the decisions of peace and war (before) during and after the World War; as one who has traveled much, (and) as one who has spent a goodly portion of every twenty-four hours in the study of foreign relations.

Long before I returned to Washington as President of the United States, I had made up my mind that pending what might be called a more opportune (moment) time on other continents, the United States could best serve the cause of a peaceful humanity by setting an example. (Applause) And that (was) is why on the 4th of March, 1933, I made

the following declaration:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor -- the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and because he does so, respects the rights of others -- the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

(This) That declaration represents represented my purpose then, it represents my purpose now, but it represents more than a purpose now, for it stands for a practice. To a measurable degree (it) the practice has succeeded; and the whole world now knows that the United States cherishes no predatory ambitions. (Applause) We are strong: but less powerful nations know that they need not fear our strength. We seek no conquest: we stand for peace. (Applause)

In the whole of the western hemisphere our good neighbor policy has produced results that are especially heartening.

The noblest monument to peace, (and to neighborly) the noblest monument to economic and social friendship in

all the world is not a monument on bronze or stone, (but) it is the boundary which unites the United States and Canada -- 3000 miles of friendship with no barbed wire, no gun, (or) no soldier, and no passports on the whole frontier. (Prolonged applause)

What made it?

Mutual trust (made that frontier) -- to extend the same sort of mutual trust throughout the Americas was our aim.

The American Republics to the south of us have been ready always to cooperate with the United States on a basis of equality and mutual respect, but before we inaugurated the good neighbor policy there was among them resentment and fear, because certain administrations in Washington had slighted their national pride and their sovereign rights.

In pursuance of the good neighbor policy, and because in my younger days I had learned many lessons in the hard school of experience, I stated that the United States was opposed definitely to armed intervention. (Applause)

And so, in those four years, we have negotiated

a Pan-American Convention embodying the principle of non-intervention. We have abandoned the Platt Amendment which gave us the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba. We have withdrawn American Marines from Haiti. We have signed a new Treaty which places our relations with Panama on a mutually satisfactory basis. We have undertaken a series of trade agreements with other American countries to our mutual commercial profit. And finally, at the request of two neighboring Republics, I hope to give assistance in the final settlement of the last serious boundary dispute between any of the American nations. (Applause)

Yes, throughout the Americas the spirit of the good neighbor is a practical and living fact. The twenty-one American Republics are not only living together in friendship and in peace; they are united in the determination so to remain.

To give substance to this determination a conference will meet on December 1 (1936) of this year at the Capitol of our great southern neighbor, Argentine, and it is, I know, the hope of all Chiefs of State of

the Americas that this will result in measures which will banish wars forever from this vast portion of the earth. (Applause)

I have always thought that peace, like charity, begins at home; (Laughter, applause) that is why we have begun at home, here in North, South and Central America. But peace in the western world is not all (that) we seek.

It is our hope that knowledge of the practical application of the good neighbor policy in this hemisphere will be borne home to our neighbors across the seas.

For ourselves we are on good terms with them - terms in most cases of straightforward friendship, (of) and peaceful understanding.

But, of necessity, we are deeply concerned about tendencies of recent years among many of the nations of other continents. It is a bitter experience to us when the spirit of agreements to which we are a party is not lived up to. It is an even more bitter experience for the whole company of nations to witness not only the spirit but the letter of international

agreements violated with impunity and without regard to the simple principles of honor. Permanent friendships (between) among nations as between men can be sustained only by scrupulous respect for the pledged word. (Applause)

In spite of all this we have sought steadfastly to assist international movements to prevent war. We cooperated to the bitter end -- and it was a bitter end -- in the work of the General Disarmament Conference. When it failed we sought a separate treaty to deal with the manufacture of arms and the international traffic in arms. That proposal also came to (nothing) nought. We participated -- again to the bitter end -- in a conference to continue Naval limitations, and when it became evident that no general treaty could be signed because of the objections of other nations, we concluded with Great Britain and France a conditional treaty of qualitative limitation which, much to my regret, already shows signs of ineffectiveness.

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations; but

I am glad to say that we have cooperated wholeheartedly in the social and humanitarian work at Geneva. Thus we are a part of the world effort to control traffic in narcotics, to improve international health, to help child welfare, to eliminate double taxation and to better working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.

No, we are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves (completely) from war. (Applause) Yet we must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger (that) even to the nation which most ardently desires peace, danger that it also may be drawn into war.

I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running from the wounded. I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs. I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. I have seen two hundred limping, exhausted men come out of line -- the survivors of a regiment of one thousand that went forward forty-eight hours before. I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war. (Prolonged applause, cheers)

Yes, I have passed unnumbered hours and
I shall pass unnumbered hours thinking and planning
how war may be kept from (this Nation) the United
States of America.

I wish I could keep war from all nations;
but that is beyond my power. I can at least make
certain that no act of the United States helps to
produce or to promote war. I can at least make clear
that the conscience of America revolts against war
and that any nation which provokes war forfeits the
sympathy of the people of the United States. (Pro-
longed applause)

There are many causes that produce war.
There are ancient hatreds, turbulent frontiers, the
"legacy of old forgotten, far off things, and battles
long ago." There are new-born fanaticisms, convictions
on the part of certain peoples that they have become
the unique depositories of ultimate truth and right.

A dark old world was devastated by wars bet-
ween conflicting religions. A dark modern world faces

wars between conflicting economic and political fanaticisms in which are intertwined race hatreds.

To bring it home to us, it is as if within the territorial limits of the United States, forty-eight nations with forty-eight forms of government, forty-eight customs barriers, forty-eight languages and 48 eternal and different verities, were spending their time and their substance in a frenzy of effort to make themselves strong enough to conquer their neighbors or strong enough to defend themselves against their neighbors.

In one field, that of economic barriers, the American policy may be, I hope, of some assistance in discouraging the economic source of war and therefore a contribution towards the peace of the world. The trade agreements which we are making are not only finding outlets for the products of American fields and American factories but are also pointing the way to the elimination of embargoes, quotas and other devices which place such pressure on nations not possessing great natural resources that to (them) those nations the price of peace sometimes seems less terrible than

the price of war.

We do not maintain that a more liberal international trade will stop war but we do fear that without a more liberal international trade, war is a natural sequence.

The Congress of the United States, as you know, has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

Nevertheless -- and I speak from a long experience -- the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give

immense fortunes to a few (men); but for the nation as a whole we know that it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the west plow up prairie land that (should) ought never to have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. And today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war plowed (areas) fields.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationships between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches -- fools' gold -- would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. (Governor Lehman entered at this point and there was applause for him.)

They would tell you -- and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity, by methods that you can understand as readily as I do -- that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other

article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

My friends, it would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond -- to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. (Applause)

And so if we face the choice of profits or peace, (the) this Nation will answer -- this Nation must answer -- "we choose peace." (Applause) And it is the duty of all of us, each and every one of us, men, women and children, to encourage such a body of public opinion (in this country) throughout this Nation that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide

approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or (in) the Department of State; we need the meditation, we need the prayer, and we need the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace. (Applause)

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality (legislation) laws, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day to day decisions.

At this late date, many years after, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the great war in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would (let us go to) get us into war. (Applause, prolonged)

Of all the nations (of) in the world today we are in many ways most singularly blessed. Our closest neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood. (Applause)

They know we seek to dominate no other nation, that we ask no territorial expansion, that we oppose imperialism, and that we desire reduction in world armaments.

We believe in democracy; (applause) we believe in freedom; we believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish our friendship look us in the eye and take our hand. (Prolonged applause)

[1936 - Aug. 14?]

P.P.E.
1829

b34/19

DRAFT OF A SPEECH ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Three years ago, in May, I addressed to the Chiefs of State of fifty-four nations an appeal for political and economic peace. I said, "The furtherance of durable peace for our generation in every part of the world is the only goal worthy of our best efforts". Despite the fact that in the years which have followed we have passed through a period when international morality has fallen to a lowest ebb, when the predatory instinct of nations has again been aroused and the spectre of war rising out of suspicion and confusion has become dangerously rampant, the will for peace, in the political and economic field, has remained constant as the driving power of this country's foreign policy. We have not deviated from the road. Faced with a repetition of the selfish folly which not so many years ago plunged the nations of the world into chaos and cataclysm, this country has adhered firmly and faithfully to the determination to place fair dealing and friendliness in international relations above narrowly exclusive national advantage; it has not waivered in its decision to replace distrust

distrust and international sharp practice with the ideals
of confidence and good faith.

War is the fountain-head from which the streams of
military and economic armaments descend in devastating
torrents upon a helpless civilization. This country wants no
part in war. We have no imperial ambitions. We wish to
live - and be allowed to live - on good terms with our
neighbors, in collaboration for fairness and justice, in
cooperation in overcoming hostility and greed. We not only
commit ourselves to peace but pledge that no matter what may
happen in other continents this country will remain free of
entanglement, with all its great forces directed toward
elimination of those perils which might involve us in conflict
with our neighbor nations of the world.

Since my appeal to the 54 Chiefs of State, we have
practiced not preached our profound belief in peace.
Wherever it was possible this country has contributed its
share, a full share toward the practical realization of the
ideal of international understanding which it has so ardently
espoused.

We have thrown our full influence behind all international movements to prevent war before its outbreak. With this object in mind we cooperated to the utmost, as long as the General Disarmament Conference was in active session, to bring about a limitation and reduction of world armaments which would reduce the heavy burdens of taxation inherent in the upkeep of large military establishment and lessen fear and suspicion growing out of a competitive armaments race. We did more. When we came to the conclusion that, due to the quarrels of other nations with which we were not concerned there would, for the present, be no General Disarmament Convention, we sponsored a separate treaty dealing with the manufacture of and the international traffic in arms. We attached particular importance to attacking the armaments problem from this angle and had we had the support to which we believed we were entitled we would have been in a position to deal constructively through our proposed treaty with the evils of this trade.

Our next approach to the problem of international armaments was that of naval limitation. In 1934 we took part in conversations with the British Government preliminary to a Naval Conference and from December 1935 to March 1936 an American delegation cooperated with the representatives

sentatives of the British Commonwealth of Nations, France, Italy and Japan for the purpose of framing a new treaty of naval limitation to take the place of the Washington Naval Treaty, 1921, and the London Naval Treaty, 1930, which ~~was~~ expire at the end of this year. As a result of this Conference a new naval treaty was completed on March 25, between the Governments of Great Britain, France and the United States - to be left open for future adherence by Italy and Japan and bilateral approval by Soviet Russia, Germany and other Powers. Italy collaborated in the formulation of the treaty and it is hoped that Italian signature is imminent. Japan, unfortunately, has notified its inability in present conditions to be governed by its provisions. It may be hoped, however, that in future construction Japan will not depart from the ~~new~~ ^{Treaty} ~~is~~ ^{and types} limits of sizes of naval vessels ~~as~~.

While the new Treaty, which this country was the first to ratify, does not include provisions for the direct limitation by quantity of naval armaments - and this the American delegation deeply deplored - the qualitative

qualitative limits it provides, as well as the detail system for exchange of information, will serve to reduce competitive construction in naval armaments,⁷⁰ remove the elements of uncertainty - too often the sources of international friction - and to safeguard against any sudden development of naval building as to type or number which would seriously challenge confidence or disturb the balance of relative security. Thus, dangerous rivalry in the construction of new naval types, perhaps the most harmful and costly kind of naval competition, is eliminated.

These efforts may be placed in the credit column as contributions of this country toward the prevention of war by the reduction and limitation of armaments in time of peace.

All American citizens are equally concerned with the position in which we might find ourselves in the event that through a collapse of ordinary international morality war actually does break out between two or more countries. We recall vividly the trials and difficulties which this country encountered in the first years of the great war and the circumstances which eventually drew it into

the conflict as a belligerent. We are determined to avoid a repetition of this history and to take steps, and to take them now, providing adequate and effective safeguards of American neutrality.

With this object in view the State Department a year or so ago undertook, in cooperation with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, an exhaustive analysis and study of this problem. This resulted first, in the passage by Congress on August 31, 1935, of a Joint Resolution providing (1) that upon the outbreak of war the President should proclaim the fact, whereupon it would automatically become unlawful to export arms, ammunition or implements of war, as enumerated by the President, from the United States to any belligerent; (2) that a National Munitions Control Board should be set up and that the Secretary of State should have the duty of registering all manufacturers, exporters and importers of arms and munitions of war; (3) that the export and import of such articles should be licensed; (4) that upon the issue of the President's proclamation at the outbreak of war, it should be unlawful for American vessels to transport arms, ammunition or implements of war to belligerent countries; (5) that safeguards should be placed

placed against the possible use by belligerent warships of American ports as a base of supply; (6) that special regulations were to be imposed, in the President's discretion, upon the use of American ports by belligerent submarines; and finally (7) that, when the President should so proclaim, American citizens should refrain from traveling on the vessels of a belligerent nation except at their own risk.

The first section of this Resolution placing an embargo upon arms shipments to belligerent countries expired in February of this year, but was extended by Act of Congress to May 1, 1937, and an important provision was added to the effect that when an arms embargo becomes effective, no loan or credit may be extended to belligerent governments, and their obligations issued after the date of proclamation will not be purchased or sold in this country. The President, however, shall have the power, if the interests of the country should require, to exempt from this prohibition short term obligations in the aid of legal transactions and of commercial credits. The Republics of this hemisphere

were

were also exempted from the operation of the law.

This matter of neutrality legislation is of such vital importance to every man, woman and child in this country that any loopholes which now exist must be closed if we are to feel unchallenged in our security. It is to be hoped, therefore, that before the expiration of the present law the Congress will continue its consideration of the problem and contribute to the cure of any defects which may at present exist.

Unhappily, we have had occasion in recent months to study the operation of our neutrality provisions in an actual conflict between two nations with which we were on friendly and neighborly terms. Despite the fact that many governments sought to find a solution of their difficulties and that the Secretary of State on behalf of this Government drew the attention of Italy to its obligations under the Briand-Kellogg Treaty for the Renunciation of War and on behalf of the American ^{people} I appealed to the two countries to find an amicable solution of their dispute and to preserve peace, Italy and Ethiopia resorted to arms.

There

There was war, then, and immediately I performed the duty devolving upon me under the terms of the Neutrality Act by issuing Proclamations prohibiting the export of arms to Ethiopia and Italy and warning American citizens that if they should travel on the vessels of belligerent nations they would do so at their own risk. At the same time, I pointed out that any American citizen who voluntarily engaged in transaction with any character with either belligerent did so at his own risk. Moreover, the Secretary of State and I both publicly expressed the belief that the American people would not wish, in order to swell their profits abnormally, to contribute ~~materially~~ to the prolongation of the struggle. Clearly the excessive shipment of war materials, resulting in war profits vastly beyond peace-time profits and assisting in the furtherance of war, would serve to fan the flames of the conflict which we, in the fear that the conflagration might spread, were anxious by every means to quench. Only by this policy of prudent self-denial could the freedom of this country from entanglement be definitely assured.

Frank and Leitch

These steps during the Italo-Ethiopian conflict were taken independently of the action of other nations and in strict harmony with the basic policy of this Government to stand aloof from international conflict and to contribute in no way to the prolongation of hostilities. Still acting independently I ascertained toward the close of June that the conditions which caused me to issue my Proclamations relating to the conflict between Ethiopia and Italy no longer existed. I therefore, on June 20, revoked the Proclamation in accordance with the law, thus recognizing the obvious fact that war had ceased but not thereby acknowledging in any way a change in the political status of Ethiopia.

No question of war or neutrality is involved in the tragic upheaval which is convulsing the Spanish Republic. The United States, in conformity with its well-established policy is scrupulously refraining from any form of interference. ~~However,~~ it is the duty of this Government to protect American citizens who may be in peril while traveling abroad. In this instance, our diplomatic and consular representatives

representatives have done everything that was humanly possible to assist Americans in the danger zones and the USS OKLAHOMA, the USS QUINCY and the Coast Guard Cutter CAYUGA were diverted from their routine activities to help in the evacuation. Together with the steamships EXETER AND EXOCORDIA of the American Export Line, which volunteered to cooperate with the State Department, they have provided a means for all Americans (except those who of their own free will wish to remain) to leave Spain, thereby fulfilling this Government's primary obligation - the protection of American lives. As a secondary obligation, our Embassy and Consuls have taken every measure to protect American property from unwarranted molestation or illegal seizure.

In the general sphere of our foreign relations we have preached, and will most certainly continue to preach, the gospel of the "good neighbor".

The announcement of the "good neighbor" policy produced enthusiasm and hope among the American Republics. These countries, our nearest neighbors, harbored painful memories. They did not forget the bitter experience which some of them had suffered at the expense of their sensibilities and sovereign rights, nor could they overlook the ruthless effects of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act upon their economy. Suspicion and resentment clouded our relations with them. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the American Republics have always been ready to cooperate with this country on a basis of equality and mutual respect and consideration.

Evidences of this Administration's intention to conduct its relations on that basis were not slow in forthcoming. Nearly a year ago I stated that "This country seeks no conquest. We have no imperial designs". I have likewise emphatically stated that "the definite policy of

the

the United States ... is one opposed to armed intervention". This Government, together with the other Governments of this hemisphere, negotiated a convention which embodies this principle of non-intervention. In pursuance of this policy and in order to live up to the spirit of this treaty, the Platt Amendment with Cuba, which gave this country the right of intervention, was eliminated, the Marines were withdrawn from Haiti and a new treaty signed with Panama designed to put our relations on a mutually satisfactory basis. We have entered into several trade agreements which already have had a favorable effect in expanding our commerce with the other American countries.

These steps, and I have mentioned only a few, although essential and necessary, may be considered in a sense merely corrective. They accomplished their purpose in clearing away the dead weight of our accumulated distrust which has been replaced by a spirit of cordial friendship and cooperation.

Confidence in our motives having been restored, in February of this year it seemed opportune that positive

steps

steps be taken to safeguard the happy circumstances in which this hemisphere finds itself. Although war clouds unfortunately hover over other parts of the world, in this continent the American Republics are at peace with one another and are determined to remain at peace. Believing in the advisability of consultation I addressed a communication to the other chiefs of state suggesting that an extraordinary conference be convened to give consideration to the adoption of measures designed to maintain peace inviolate in this hemisphere. This initiative met with an enthusiastic response. The Conference will meet on December 1 at the capital of our great Southern neighbor, Argentina. The opportunity for the American Republics to make an outstanding contribution to world peace is presented. What better example could this conference give to the world than the reinforcement of existing peace machinery and the adoption of other constructive measures designed to banish forever the scourge of war from this continent.

the policy of the United States

In regard to the Far East, our policy is one of non-aggression
as in regard to the rest of the world. The efforts of the American Government there as elsewhere are motivated by the desire to be a "good neighbor". The people of this country have always desired to have there as elsewhere equality of commercial opportunity, and they have always sympathized with the efforts there as elsewhere of independent nations to remain free and independent.

Our policy in relation with countries of the Far East is fully a policy of non-aggression. We do not seek to impose our views upon other countries. We do not intend to intrude in domestic or local controversies in any region. We do not desire to place obstacles in the way of arrival by other countries at satisfactory solutions of their own problems. We do not take sides. Some, however, of the difficult problems which confront each of several nations of the Far East are problems wherein the rights and interests of other countries, including the United States, are involved. Where such is the case, we seek sympathetically to understand the interests, the rights, the obligations

and

and the policies of all concerned, and, while endeavoring to safeguard our own rights and interests, at the same time to perform our obligations, with full respect for the rights and interests of the other countries.

At the Washington Conference, all of the principal powers pledged themselves by treaty:

"To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;

"To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government;

"To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China; and

"To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights and privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly States, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such States."

In the same treaty, the same powers committed themselves to the principle of consultation in regard to

situations

situations which might develop and policies which might be followed in relations with and concerning China. We believe in these pledges and the principles upon which they rest.

Although we maintain some naval forces in Far Eastern waters and some landed forces on Far Eastern soil -- as do several other countries -- our such forces are not there for the purpose of coercing any Far Eastern government or people. They are there solely for the purpose of contributing to the maintenance of conditions of order and security in the regions where they are stationed.

The course which we are following with regard to the Philippines is clearly indicative of our attitude toward situations wherein a nation desires an independent national existence and shows capacity to maintain itself in such a state. It shows that we not only do not seek to extend our political authority into and over territories and peoples in the Far East but that there as elsewhere we are willing to withdraw such degree of authority

authority as we have been brought by circumstances temporarily to exercise, when and as the need for our presence in exercise of such authority ceases to exist. Steps are being taken, measures are being devised to facilitate the evolution of Philippine independence. We wish, of course, and the people of the Philippines wish, that the separation of the Philippines from this country be accomplished with the least possible of injury to the interests of any person or group of persons of either nation. This gives rise to many problems, some of which are not easy of solution. These problems are being given the most solicitous attention of both Governments, in the spirit of reciprocal good will. Furthermore, neither we nor the Filipinos have any desire, while looking after our mutual and reciprocal interests, to disregard the interests which may be affected of other countries. Nowhere can political changes be made, for the better, without there being made some sacrifices by those who are in the long run to benefit by the changes. But

here

here as elsewhere we are working for the general good
and we believe that general support of the measures which
are being devised will result in ultimate gains which will
more than offset any initial losses.

Our relations with Russia also deserve mention.

In 1933, after a lapse of sixteen years, diplomatic relations were established with the Soviet Government with a view to furthering our aim to preserve peace and strengthen the foundations on which peace is built. Relations were established only after we had been assured in our conversations with Mr. Litvinoff that a basis for such relations had been laid. The agreements reached at that time were broad in scope and unambiguous in intent and meaning.

Subsequently difficulties arose in connection with debts and claims and interference from Moscow in our internal affairs. In the matter of debts and claims negotiations have come to a complete standstill, despite the liberality of our offer which proposed a method of settling debts and claims and at the same time a means of increasing trade through the granting by the Export-Import Bank of Washington of loans or credits to American manufacturers and producers accepting Soviet orders. In the matter of interference in our affairs our position has been made amply clear

by Secretary Hull, who stated that our relations with the Soviet Union cannot but be seriously impaired if the Soviet Government pursues a policy of permitting activities on its territory involving interference in our internal affairs, instead of preventing such activities according to its written pledge.

Notwithstanding the difficulties mentioned, and despite special factors which apply to trade with the Soviet Union, it was found feasible to conclude a commercial agreement with that country as a result of which trade between the two countries greatly increased in the twelve months covered by the agreement, which ended last month. The renewal of the agreement for another year ensures at least a continuance of the increase thus effected.

Our political relations with the other countries of Eastern Europe have progressed normally. In the economic field our efforts have been devoted here, as elsewhere, to endeavoring to remove the barriers which impede the free flow of trade.

Finland continues to be the only country which meets promptly the payments due on the intergovernmental indebtedness. We have recently negotiated a trade agreement with Finland which it is expected will increase appreciably the volume of trade between the two countries and reinforce the friendly trade and other relations existing between Finland and the United States.

In our relations with the League of Nations there is no change. We cooperate, and are prepared to continue our cooperation to the fullest, in the social and humanitarian efforts of the nations working through this organization. Officials of this Government take part regularly in the work of the Opium Advisory Committee in Geneva which supplements and coordinates the efforts of individual governments to control the illicit narcotic traffic. Government officials also cooperate with the Health Committee of the League of Nations and we have sent delegates to many conferences under League auspices, notably on child welfare,

double

double taxation, international tourist problems, et cetera. This Government also participates in the work of the International Labor Office, which is intended to improve standards of working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.

Thus, clearly while we are scrupulous to avoid any entanglement in political affairs which are not our concern, we neglect no opportunity to take a full part with other nations in the furtherance of social and humanitarian wellbeing.

In my communication to the Chiefs of State I did not, however, appeal alone for political peace. I appealed as well for economic peace. Economic armaments are the tools of economic nationalism just as political armaments are the tools of political nationalism - and the nationalisms when examined closely are found to be one, with a common ancestor. And that ancestor is War.

War creates vested interests which on the return to peace demand national protection. Restrictions in trade result. The fear of future war leads to the demand not only

only for armaments in anticipation of conflict but for economic independence brought about by a sweeping interference with the channels of trade.

This ~~country~~ country in its firmly rooted desire for peace is committed, consequently, to the good neighbor policy in economic as well as in political relations. Many times in the past I have publicly referred to our domestic economy as being in the nature of a seamless economic web, the various parts so closely interwoven that adversity or disaster cannot fall upon any one part without transmitting its effects to every other part. I am convinced that this state of affairs finds a close parallel in world economy. When industries are inactive and millions of people idle in foreign lands because nations cannot find outlets for their productive capacity either at home or abroad, the adverse effects inevitably are transmitted to this country. Similarly, depression and unemployment in this country must have untoward results upon the prosperity of other countries.

Since our world economy is no less a seamless web than is our domestic economy, there can be no complete and

and sustained economic recovery in this country while the rest of the world is being harassed by depression or war.

The policy of the good neighbor must strive to promote peaceful political relations between the United States and the rest of the world, and between other countries, for economic as well as humanitarian reasons. But it must also strive to bring about closer economic cooperation in peace time, in the interest of greater prosperity for all nations, if this nation itself is to enjoy a full measure of prosperity. By means of such cooperation it is possible to relieve the economic stresses and strains which frequently create grave social problems, undermine the structure of government, and lead to civil or international conflict.

It was with full appreciation of the practical side of this problem of international cooperation that this Administration embarked upon the trade agreements program. The state of international trade had been going rapidly from bad to worse until total world trade had fallen to about one-third of its former value. Tariffs and other trade restrictions had risen to prohibitive levels, markets for exportable surpluses had been cut off

off, and the purchasing power of nations for the products of other nations had in consequence dwindled. Our own foreign trade had declined in terms of gold value to only about one-fourth of its 1929 value and to only about 60 percent of its 1929 volume. Even our share of the declining world trade had fallen from about 14 percent to less than 10 percent.

Something had to be done. We could not stand idly by and see vast portions of both our agricultural and manufacturing industries left helpless in the face of collapsed foreign markets for their surpluses. There was never any prospect that foreign markets could be immediately and fully restored, and that is why, in the agricultural field, it was necessary to plan adjustments of production to meet the emergency situation. It was possible, however, to set about in an orderly way gradually to repair the tremendous damage which had been inflicted on our foreign trade as the result of rising trade barriers and other factors contributing to the world depression and to the collapse of international trade.

As the chief mode of attack upon this problem, I recommended to the Congress the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act. In so recommending, I distinctly pointed out, among other things, that quick results were not to be expected and that the successful building up of trade without injury to American producers would depend upon a cautious and gradual evolution of the entire program.

Enacted in June, 1934, the Trade Agreements Act has now been in effect a little over two years. During that time trade agreements have been concluded with fourteen foreign nations.

In view of the tremendous difficulties inherent in carrying a program of this sort forward at all, I think it must be admitted that excellent progress has been made. Those who have not understood these difficulties or have been inclined to minimize them may contend otherwise. Spectacular results such as would make it an immediate major factor in economic recovery were not to be expected. The program was in the nature of a long-run attack on an

acute

acute problem of fundamental maladjustment in our economic relations with the rest of the world, and I am convinced that it has gone forward in a manner calculated to promote the real and the permanent economic interests of this country.

It is far too early to measure finally the results even of what has thus far been accomplished since many of the trade agreements have been in force only a short time. However, there are striking evidences already of constructive results in preserving and expanding foreign markets for many of our products of farm and factory. Those who would have us present detailed and comprehensive statistical proof that the millenium has already been reached in the way of reviving our exports in consequence of the trade agreements already made are simply attempting to stack the cards against us. They know, and you and I know, full well that the removal of existing prohibitive barriers to trade cannot but have, sooner or later, a wholesome and a highly important effect in the way of restoring

restoring international commerce and world prosperity.

Those who have been endeavoring to tear down and destroy what we have striven so earnestly to accomplish are simply refusing honestly to face the facts. They cavil at our efforts to rebuild our foreign trade either without understanding the importance of restoring foreign trade or without in the least comprehending the true nature of the problem involved in setting about to restore it. They show no signs whatever of understanding the tremendous cost to the American people of a failure to bring about a more liberal adjustment of our trade relations with the rest of the world. They seem to think that we can force other countries to make concessions to us without making anything but the most worthless concessions to them. Yet they were unwilling to countenance any planned adjustment of our domestic economy to meet the emergency situation which was forced upon us by curtailed foreign markets and would be most reluctant to face the far greater adjustments which would be inevitable

if

if no effort were to be made to restore those markets.

They would have their cake and eat it. They profess to dislike anything remotely suggestive of regimentation, while, on the other hand, support policies which would leave us no alternative.

Foremost among these critics are those very interests which have been responsible for the Smoot-Hawleyism which did so much to demolish our foreign trade and contributed so heavily to the onset of the depression. These same groups, never content with reasonable tariff subsidies but always insistent upon one of prohibitive tariffs, now seek to discredit the trade agreements program. They are endeavoring to make the farmers believe that the program has not been conducted in their interest, notwithstanding that it was they themselves who did most to destroy our foreign markets for American agricultural products. They seize upon the fact that certain agricultural imports have increased in an attempt to alarm farmers against the program. They grotesquely exaggerate the significance of the imports and wholly ignore the true causes which have given rise to them. They blame

the trade agreements program for these increases, notwithstanding the fact that it has had very little to do with them. Could anything be more ironical than this spectacle of the very group which has done most to injure the farmer now posing as his best friend and endeavoring to frustrate the efforts of this Administration to deal in a constructive way with one of the most important phases of the farm problem?

I return to my original theme. The good neighbor policy is one that cannot but promote world peace and world prosperity. It is not a mere sentiment but a thing of real substance. If we are to have peace and prosperity we must study carefully the factors that obstruct peace and prosperity and endeavor constructively to deal with them. This trade agreements program represents such a constructive endeavor. Either we must be prepared to cooperate with the rest of the world economically and practically or we must be prepared to face the heavy costs of failure to do so. In our own practical self-interest, we must first try to cooperate.

In conclusion, I feel it a solemn duty to stress that in the world today the balance between the forces that make for war and the forces which make for peace is a delicate one. At any time the scales may be tipped and grave decisions will be taken. The nations are at a crossroads and they must choose.

It will go the way of peace. This country has ~~already~~ made its choice. / As President of the United States I reiterate my appeal of May, three years ago; that all nations of the world may carry to victory the common struggle against economic and political chaos. The happiness, the well-being, the very lives of the peoples of all countries are bound up in the decisions which will be made by Governments in the near future. If these decisions lead to cataclysm it will be clear where the responsibility for failure lies. Either the nations of the world will head toward chaos or they will turn to collaboration - collaboration which will bring about the reign of peace where civilization can advance unhampered and mankind reach new heights.

CHATHAMQUIN

1ST DRAFT

MICROFILM PAGES

~~7, 8, 9,~~
10, 11, 12, 13,
14, 15.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On the fourth of March 1933, I made the following declaration with regard to foreign relations:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor - the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and because he does so, respects the rights of others - the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

I repeat this declaration because it represents the policy we have followed in foreign affairs, the policy we are following and the policy we shall follow.

We have practised the good neighbor policy for more than three years, and it has worked. The whole world knows today that this Nation cherishes no predatory ambitions. We are strong; but less powerful nations know they need not fear us. We seek no conquest. We stand for peace.

In the Western Hemisphere our good neighbor policy has produced especially heartening results.

One of our immediate neighbors has known for a long time that we were to be trusted. The noblest monument to peace and neighborly friendship in the world is not a monument in bronze or stone but the boundary which unites and does not divide the United States and Canada - three thousand miles of friendship with no fort, no barbed wire, no gun, no soldier on the whole frontier!

That frontier stands for mutual trust. To extend the same sort of mutual trust throughout the Americas was our aim.

The American Republics to the south of us have been ready always to cooperate with the United States on a basis of equality and mutual respect. But before we inaugurated the good neighbor policy there was in some of them resentment because certain administrations in Washington had slighted their national pride and their sovereign rights, and had injured their national economies ruthlessly by such measures as the Smoot-Hawley Tariff.

In

In pursuance of the good neighbor policy, I stated that the United States was opposed definitely to armed intervention. We signed a Pan-American convention embodying the principle of non-intervention. The Platt Amendment to the Cuban Constitution, which gave us the right of intervention was abandoned. The Marines were withdrawn from Haiti. We signed a new treaty which placed our relations with Panama on a mutually satisfactory basis. We began to negotiate trade agreements with other American countries, and our mutually profitable commerce began to revive.

As a result of these and many other measures, crusted distrust has been replaced by friendship and cooperation. Today all our American neighbors know they can trust us. Throughout the entire Western Hemisphere there is the spirit of the good neighbor. The twenty-one American Republics are living together in friendship and peace. They are determined to remain at peace.

To give form to this determination I suggested a

conference

conference to consider measures to ensure the maintenance of peace in this Hemisphere. The conference will meet on December 1, 1936, at the capital of our great Southern neighbor.—Argentina.

It is my hope, and it is, I know, the hope of all the other Chiefs of State of the Americas that the conference will result in measures which will banish war forever from this vast portion of the earth.

Peace, like charity, begins at home. Peace in the western world is not all that we seek. But peace in the western world is far better than no peace.

We have attempted and are attempting to extend the good neighbor policy not only to our neighbors of this Hemisphere but also to our neighbors across the seas.

If any proof were needed of the sincerity of our good will toward other peoples, the proof is provided by our policy with regard to the Philippines. We believe in independence not only for ourselves but also for others. We are not seeking to extend our political authority over territories and peoples in the Pacific or anywhere else. We are ready to abandon authority in the interest of freedom.

We believe with complete conviction in the old principle of live and let live. Since the Philippines desire to leave us, we wish them God speed. We want friends not subjects. We want peace not empire.

I shall not attempt to discuss in detail the vast and intricate subject of our relations with all the nations of Europe and Asia. For our part, we have desired the relations of the good neighbor with them all. If our relations with some have been more neighborly than our relations with others, it is because some have been more ready than others to deal with us on the basis of straightforward friendship, and to respect their agreements with us.

We do not make agreements that we do not intend to respect. And it is still a bitter experience to us when agreements to which we are a party are torn up by others.

But in spite of a series of broken agreements during the past five years, we have steadfastly attempted to assist international movements to prevent war.

We cooperated to the bitter end - and it was a bitter end - in the work of the General Disarmament Conference. When it became evident that, because of objections

of other nations, there would be no general disarmament convention, we sponsored a separate treaty to deal with the manufacture of arms and international traffic in arms. That proposal also came to nothing.

We participated - also to the bitter end - in the London Naval Conference, and when it became evident that no general treaty of naval limitation could be signed because of the objections of other nations, we signed with Great Britain and France a treaty of qualitative limitation of armaments.

We shun all political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars and have, of course, avoided any connection with the political activities of the League of Nations; but we have cooperated in the social and humanitarian work of the League.

Officials of our Government take part regularly in the work of the Opium Advisory Committee in Geneva which coordinates the efforts of individual governments to control traffic in narcotics. We cooperate with the Health Committee

of the League, and we have sent delegates to League conferences on Child Welfare, Double Taxation, and other world problems. We also participate in the work of the International Labor Office which strives to improve working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world. We are not isolationists except insofar as we are determined to isolate ourselves completely from war.

So long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war.

I have seen war. I have seen blood running from the wounded, the muddy dead, men coughing out their gassed lungs, the agony of mothers and wives. I have seen cities destroyed and children starving. I hate war.

I have passed unnumbered hours and shall pass unnumbered hours thinking how war may be kept from this Nation.

I wish I could keep war from all nations. But that is beyond my power. I can at least make certain that no act

of the United States helps to promote war. I can at least declare that that the whole conscience of America is revolted by war, and that any nation which provokes war forfeits the sympathy of the United States.

What are the sources of war? They are many and have been many since the world began: economic, political, religious.

There are nations today which are rich in energy and intelligence but so poor in natural resources and so surrounded by tariff barriers that they feel themselves condemned to steadily declining standards of living. To them the price of peace seems more terrible than the price of war.

The policy which this Administration has adopted with regard to foreign trade may be, I hope, of some assistance in eliminating this source of war. Our Trade Agreement program has been motivated not only by desire to find outlets for the products of American fields and factories but also by the conviction that the compression of nations within cramping tariff walls tends to produce an explosion of war. I have attempted and am attempting to persuade many other nations to join the United States in releasing the countries which

do not possess great natural resources from the pressure which crushes them today. I do not maintain that freer international trade will stop war but I am certain that without freer international trade war is inevitable.

In addition to economic causes, there are many others which produce war. There are ancient hatreds, aching frontiers, - the legacy of "old, forgotten, far-off things and battles long ago". There are new-born fanaticisms. Convictions on the part of certain peoples that they have become the unique repositories of ultimate truth and right. Once the world was devastated by wars between conflicting religions. Today the world faces war between conflicting economic and political fanaticisms.

More than a year ago the Department of State undertook, in cooperation with the Congress, a study of the problem of providing effective safeguards of American neutrality in case of war. As a result, Congress passed on August 31, 1935, a joint resolution providing that upon the outbreak of war it would become unlawful to export arms, ammunition and implements of war from the United States to any belligerent; that

that a National Munitions Control Board should be set up, that the Secretary of State should have the duty of registering all manufacturers, exporters, and importers of arms and ammunition, and that the export and import of such articles should be licensed; that it should be unlawful for American vessels to transport arms, ammunition, or implements of war to belligerent countries; that American ports should be safeguarded against use as a base of supply by belligerent warships; that special regulations should be imposed in the President's discretion on the use of American ports by belligerent submarines; that when the President should so proclaim, American citizens should refrain from travelling on vessels of a belligerent nation except at their own risk.

This year the Congress extended the embargo on shipments of arms to belligerent countries, and added that no loan or credit should be extended to a belligerent government; and that bonds or other obligations of belligerent governments should not be sold or purchased in this country.

On

On the 5th of October 1935, I stated that American transactions of any character with belligerents would be at the risk of the trader. I indicated clearly that the Army and Navy would not be used to protect that trade. I believe that this declaration should become a part of the permanent policy of the United States. So long as I am President, it will be a part of our policy.

It is clear that this policy and the legislation passed by the Congress will reduce war profits. But I believe, and I know that the conscience of the American people has determined that war profits are blood money. Furthermore, they are illusory profits, disastrous profits. Production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men but for the nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the lure of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up the prairie land that never should have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas. It

was

was the lure of profits which caused the bloated expansion of American industry that resulted in the panic of 1920. It was war trade which drove prices in this country so high in the years from 1914 to 1920 that the whole normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed. And one of the many causes which drew us into war in 1917 was war trade.

Nevertheless, if the world again should come to war, you would find in this country not merely thousands but millions of Americans who, seeking immediate riches - fool's gold - would attempt to break down our neutrality legislation.

To resist the clamor of that greed will require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. I ask you to form now such a body of opinion in this country that, if we face the choice - profits or peace - the Nation will answer with one voice, "We choose peace".

I have thought long and hard about many other proposals that have been made to me with regard to the problem of keeping the United States at peace. That wise and experienced

perienced man who is our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, whose statesmanship has met with general approval, has thought long and hard; and the members of the Congress have thought long and hard. But I do not feel that all the wisdom in America is to be found in the White House or the Department of State or the Congress, and I ask every American who has suggestions as to methods for keeping the United States at peace to write me his suggestions. We can not put too much meditation on this problem. The fires of war cannot be quenched by a trickle of thought.

Even after we have prepared neutrality legislation which satisfies us all, there will be an unpredictable series of events uncovered by such legislation. It is impossible to draft laws to cover every contingency. It is impossible to imagine how future events may shape themselves. In spite of all possible forethought and the wisest legislation, there will be a vast uncharted area. There the issue will depend on the knowledge, experience, and wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. It will depend on their

day-to-day

day-to-day decisions.

At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, it is possible to trace the tragic series of small steps which led us into war in 1917. To watch each day's small steps with unceasing vigilance and experienced knowledge of the whole complex of international relations is essential if we are to avoid involvement in another cataclysm.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to be able to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war, and if they possess a passionate determination to keep out of war.

Of all nations of the world today, we are most singularly blessed. Our closest neighbors are good neighbors, and if there are remoter neighbors who wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; that we can and will defend ourselves and our neighborhood.

We

We believe in democracy, we believe in freedom,
we believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world
the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish
our friendship take our hand. Our friendship is not
without value.

MICROFILM

CHAUTAUQUA

2nd draft

Pages ~~6, 7, 8, 9,~~

10

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
THE UNDER SECRETARY

Thursday

W

Dear Mr. President:

I thank you for letting
me see this draft. I
have taken the liberty of
making a few pencilled suggestions.
It seems to me a fit
the needs & ought appropriate
for that audience.

(W)

MY FRIENDS:

As many of you who are here tonight know, I formed the excellent habit of coming to Chautauqua more than twenty years ago. After my Inauguration in 1933, I promised Mr. Bestor that ~~during~~ the next four years I would come to Chautauqua ~~and~~ ^{again} more; it is in fulfillment of this that I am with you tonight.

A few days ago I was asked what the subject of this talk would be; and I replied that for ^{these} good reasons I wanted to discuss the subject of peace: First, because it is eminently appropriate in Chautauqua and, secondly, because in the hurly burly of domestic politics it is important that our people should not overlook problems and issues which, though they lie beyond our borders, may, and probably will, have a vital influence on the United States of ~~tomorrow~~. ^{the future}

Many who have visited me in Washington in the past few months may have been surprised when I have told them that personally and because of my own daily contacts with all manner of difficult situations, I am more concerned and less cheerful about international world conditions than about our immediate domestic prospects.

A
G
C
O

I say this to you not as a confirmed pessimist but as one who still hopes that envy, hatred and malice among nations have reached their peak and will be succeeded by a new tide of peace and good will -- I say this as one who has participated in many of the decisions of peace and war before, during and after the World War; one who has traveled much and one who ~~during the past four years~~ has spent a ~~longer~~ *greedy* portion of every twenty-four hours in the study of foreign relations, ~~than most of you would guess.~~

Long before I returned to Washington as President of the United States, I had made up my mind that pending what might be called a more opportune moment on other continents, the United States could best serve the cause of a peaceful humanity by setting an example. That was why on the 4th of March, 1933 I made the following declaration:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor - the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and because he does so, respects the rights of others - the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

This declaration represents ~~the~~ *policy*: but it represents more than a ~~policy~~ for it stands for a practice. To a measurable degree it has succeeded: ~~for~~ the whole world now knows that the United States cherishes no predatory ambitions. We are strong: but less powerful nations know that they need not fear our strength. We seek no conquest: we stand for peace.

In the whole of the western hemisphere our good neighbor policy has produced results that are especially heartening.

The noblest monument to peace , and to neighborly economic and social friendship in all the world is not ~~the~~ ^A monument in bronze or stone, but ~~the~~ ^A boundary which unites the United States and Canada - 3000 miles of friendship with no barbed wire, no gun or soldier, and no passport on the whole frontier.

AxTowd
Mutual trust made that frontier - ^A the same sort of ~~the~~ mutual trust ~~immeasurably~~ throughout the Americas was our aim.

The American ~~Republikan~~ Republics to the south of us have been ready always to cooperate with the United States on a basis of equality and mutual respect, but before we inaugurated the good neighbor policy there was among them resentment and fear, because certain administrations in Washington had slighted their national pride and their sovereign rights.

In pursuance of the good neighbor pllicy, and because in my younger days I had learned many lessons in the hard school of experiance, I stated that the United States was opposed definitely to armed intervention.

We have negotiated a Pan American Convention embodying the principle of non-intervention. We have abandoned the ~~the~~ Platt Amendment which gave us the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba. We have withdrawn American Marines from Haiti. We have signed a new Treaty which places^j our relations with Panama on a mutually satisfactory basis. We have undertaken a series of trade agreements with other American countries to ^{the} ~~the~~ ^A mutual profit, ^{for commercial} ~~of commerce~~ between^j us. At the request of two neighboring Republics, I hope to give assistance in the final settlement of the last serious boundary dispute between any of the American nations.

Throughout the Americas the spirit of the good neighbor is a practical and living fact. The twenty-one American Republics are not only living together in friendship and in peace; they are united in the determination so to remain.

To give substance to this determination a conference will meet on December 1, 1936 at the Capitol of our great southern neighbor, Argentina, and ~~it is~~, I know, the hope of all Chiefs of State of the Americas that this will result in measures which will banish wars forever from this vast portion of the earth.

Peace, like charity, begins at home; that is why we have begun at home. But peace in the western world is not all that we seek~~g even though peace in the western world be~~ ^{an} ~~far better than no peace at all.~~

It is our hope that knowledge of the practical application of the good neighbor policy in this hemisphere will be borne home to our neighbors across the seas.

~~If~~^{xx} proof were needed of the sincerity of our good will toward ~~them~~ other peoples, that proof is provided in our policy with regard to the Phillipines. It is not enough to express our belief in independence for ourselves and others; we have shown our readiness to abandon authority in the interest of freedom. Since the Phillipines desire independence, we wish them God-speed. We want friends, not subjects; we want peace, not empire.

I repeat that it has been my hope that the example of the application of the policy of the good neighbor would bear fruit among the nations of other continents. For ourselves we are on good terms with them - terms in most cases of straightforward friendship, of peaceful understanding.

But, of necessity, we are deeply concerned about tendencies of recent years among many of the nations of other continents. It is a bitter experience to us when ~~the spirit of~~ ^{the spirit of} agreements to which we are a party ^{is} not lived up to, ~~according to the spirit of these agreements.~~ It is an even more bitter experience for the whole company of nations to witness not only the spirit but the letter of international agreements violated with impunity and without regard to the simple ~~as~~ principles of honor. Permanent friendships between nations as between men, can ~~never~~ ^{never} be sustained only by scrupulous respect for the pledged word.

In spite of all this we have steadily sought to assist international movements to prevent war. We cooperated to the bitter end -- and it was a bitter end -- in the work of the General Disarmament Conference. When it failed we sought a separate Treaty to deal with the manufacture of arms, International traffic in arms. That proposal also came to nothing. We participated -- ~~again~~ to the bitter end -- in a conference to continue Naval limitations -- and when it became evident that no general treaty could be signed because of the objections of other nations, we ~~agreed~~ ^{negotiated} with Great Britain and France a conditional treaty of qualitative limitation which, much to my regret, already shows signs of ineffectiveness.

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations; but I am glad to say that we have cooperated wholeheartedly in the social and humanitarian work at Geneva. Thus we are a part of the world effort to control traffic in narcotics, to ~~cooperate in~~ ^{improve} conferences affecting international health, child welfare, double taxation and ~~to better~~ ^{to better} working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.

not
We are isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war, ~~we~~. Yet we must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war.

I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running from the wounded. I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs. I have seen two hundred limping, exhausted men come out of line -- the survivors of a regiment of one thousand that went forward forty-eight hours before. I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.

I HAVE PASSED unnumbered hours, I SHALL PASS UNNUMBERED HOURS thinking and planning how war may be kept from this nation.

I WISH I COULD KEEP war from all nations; but that is beyond my power. I CAN AT LEAST MAKE CERTAIN that no act of the UNITED STATES helps to produce or to promote war. I CAN AT LEAST make clear that the conscience of AMERICA revolts against war and that any nation which provokes war forfeits the sympathy of the ~~great~~ majority of the people of the UNITED STATES.

MANY causes produce war. ^{are} THE ancient ~~many~~ hatreds, turbulent frontiers, the legacy of old forgotten, far-off things, and battles long ago. THERE are new-born fanaticisms, convictions on the part of certain peoples that they have become the unique depositories of ultimate truth and right.

A DARK old world was devastated by ~~many~~ wars between conflicting religions, ^{and} A dark ^{modern} world faces wars between conflicting economic and political fanaticisms in which are intertwined race hatreds. TO bring it home, it is as if within

the territorial limits of the UNITED STATES, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxx=now~~
48 Nations with forty-eight forms of government, 48 customs barriers, 48

languages, and 48 eternal and different verities, ~~which~~
spending their time and their substance in a frenzy of effort
to make themselves strong enough to conquer their neighbors
~~or any neighbor~~
or defend themselves against their neighbors.

~~We~~ do not maintain that ~~some~~ international trade will stop war but ^{we} fear that without ~~more~~ international trade war is ~~inevitable~~ a natural alternative.

~~Consequently~~ The Congress of the United States has given
me ~~the~~ ^{certain} authority ~~to~~ to provide safeguards of
American neutrality in case of war; ~~this authority was~~
~~extended at the recent session of the Congress.~~

The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority ~~in the~~^{to} conduct ~~our~~ international relations, ~~is thus in large part~~
~~the~~^{has been given new} ~~and~~ ~~with which to maintain the~~
~~implemented in the~~ maintenance of neutrality.

Nevertheless -- and I speak from a ~~long~~ long experience -- the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment happens to occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

IT IS CLEAR that our present policy and the ~~beginning~~ ^{last} legislation passed by the CONGRESS would in the event of a war on some other ~~NATION~~, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to AMERICAN citizens. INDUSTRIAL and agricultural production for a war market may give immense ^{fortunes} ~~futures~~ to a few men; for the nation ~~and~~ as a whole it produces disaster. IT WAS the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the west plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. TODAY we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war plowed areas.

IT WAS THE prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

NEVERLESS, if another continent should come again in ~~our~~, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country not merely thousands, but millions, of AMERICANS who, seeking ~~the~~ immediate riches - fools' GOLD ⁱⁿ would attempt to break down ~~frontiers~~ or evade our neutrality.

THEY WOULD tell you that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of AMERICA would all find work. THEY WOULD tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the UNITED STATES to build homes and factories and pay our debts. THEY WOULD tell you that AMERICA once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I FEAR, to look beyond, to realize the inevitable ~~penalties~~ penalties, the inevitable day of

xxxxxxing reckoning that ~~will~~ come from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unwavering support of all Americans who love peace.

If we ~~xxx~~ face the choice of profits or peace, the nation will answer -- must answer -- "we choose peace." ~~It is the duty of all of us to influence~~ such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. IN spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. ~~Safe sailing will~~ ^{Please will depend on} ~~This way to way decisions~~ still depend on day to day decisions based on experience and on fundamental objectives.

At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, ^{we} find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the great war in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international

affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day
do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess
~~the courage to say "no" to those who deliberately or unconsciously would~~
~~make war upon us.~~

Of all the nations of the world today we are
in many ways most singularly blessed. ~~ourselves~~ Our closest
neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations ~~that~~
~~who show us no good but ill,~~ they know that we are strong;
they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our
neighborhood.

We seek to dominate no other nation. We
oppose imperialism. ~~We ask no territorial expansion.~~ We
desire reduction in world armaments.

We believe in democracy, we believe in freedom,
we believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world
the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish our
friendship look us in the eye and take our hand. ~~Our friends~~
~~China is not a place to value.~~

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

WASHINGTON

(

August 12, 1936.

My dear Mr. President:

" In accordance with your request of yesterday, I am enclosing herewith a few suggested paragraphs for the Chautauqua speech, which I think are along the lines we spoke of two days ago.

Believe me

Faithfully yours,

[Handwritten signature]

Enclosure.

The President,

The White House.

PPF 1020
Wells Aug 12

At the outbreak of the rebellion in Spain it is estimated that there were between 1200 and 1500 American citizens in that country. As conditions became more and more serious and it was apparent that the lives of all foreigners in Spain might be jeopardized, we lost no opportunity of impressing upon our fellow citizens through our diplomatic and consular officials that in the opinion of their Government they should leave Spanish territory at the earliest feasible moment. Up to the present time more than 687 have been evacuated. In certain cases absence of financial resources would have made it difficult if not impossible for these Americans to leave Spain, had it not been for the assistance given by the Red Cross, which in deserving cases has provided funds for transportation to the nearest seaport and for maintenance for a reasonable period. In a few instances such as in the case of a group of Americans in the city of Granada, no safe means of evacuation to the seacoast has yet been found. In the case of those other Americans still remaining in Spain, it has been made clear to them that if they continue in Spain it must be upon their own responsibility, and that while this Government is

prepared to do its utmost to facilitate their departure, conditions may at any time arise which may make such assistance impossible.

In the work of evacuation three American naval vessels were sent to Spanish waters. They have not only evacuated Americans, but citizens of many other countries as well, and I am glad to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of this Government for the assistance rendered to American citizens by the ships and by the authorities of many other foreign governments. That sort of cooperation between the United States and other governments in the work of rescuing foreigners in actual peril in Spain is a fine and practical example of the good neighbor spirit. The presence of our warships in Spanish waters cannot be remotely construed as indicating any intention or desire on the part of this Government to intervene in the internal concerns of Spain. It was a step taken to rescue our own citizens from danger and to lend a hand at the same time in rescuing the citizens of other foreign countries.

The ~~enacted~~ neutrality law recently passed by the Congress has no application in the situation now existing in Spain, since the provisions of that law apply only to a war between or among nations. There is no power vested under that law in the Executive to prevent

the shipment of arms or implements of war to Spain. This Government will, however, scrupulously refrain from any form of interference, direct or indirect, in the domestic concerns of the Spanish people. It is my hope that the people of the United States will support this policy of their Government both in spirit and in act.

Under our Constitution the Congress alone is entrusted with the power to declare war. But to the President no more far reaching powers are granted by the Constitution than the powers given him to direct our foreign relations. The President is vested with the responsibility of guiding the foreign relations of this country in such a manner that the United States will not be drawn into war. Pressure may be brought to bear upon him by the manufacturers of munitions or by other interests who foresee profits to be derived from war abroad, whether civil or international, and who may advance the specious argument that through such business men may be put back to work and the number of unemployed thereby reduced. The President must be a man who can resist such pressure. There is no greater fallacy than the fallacy that permanent prosperity can be attained out of the profits of war.

As many of you who are here tonight know, I formed the excellent habit of coming to Chautauqua more than twenty years ago. After my Inauguration in 1933, I promised Mr. Bestor that during the next four years I would come to Chautauqua again; it is in fulfillment of this that I am with you tonight.

A few days ago I was asked what the subject of this talk would be and I replied that for two good reasons I wanted to discuss the subject of peace: First, because it is eminently appropriate in Chautauqua and, secondly, because in the hurly-burly of domestic politics it is important that our people should not overlook problems and issues which, though they lie beyond our borders, may, and probably will, have a vital influence on the United States of the future.

Many who have visited me in Washington in the past few months may have been surprised when I have told them that personally and because of my own daily contacts with all manner of difficult situations, I am more concerned and less cheerful about international world conditions than about our immediate domestic prospects.

I say this to you not as a confirmed pessimist but as one who still hopes that envy, hatred and malice among nations have reached their peak and will be succeeded by a new tide of peace and good will -- I say this as one who has participated in many of the decisions of peace and war before, during and after the World War; one who has traveled much and one who has spent a goodly portion of every twenty-four hours in the study of foreign relations.

Long before I returned to Washington as President of the United States, I had made up my mind that pending what might be called a more opportune moment on other continents, the United States could best serve the cause of a peaceful humanity by setting an example. That is why on the fourth of March, 1933, I made the following declaration:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor -- the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others -- the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

This declaration represents my purpose, but it represents more than a purpose, for it stands for a practice. To a measurable degree it has succeeded: the whole world now knows that the United States cherishes no predatory ambitions. We are strong: but less powerful nations know that they need not fear our strength. We seek no conquest: we stand for peace.

In the whole of the western hemisphere our good neighbor policy has produced results that are especially heartening.

The noblest monument to peace and to neighborly economic and social friendship in all the world is not a monument in bronze or stone, but the boundary which unites the United States and Canada -- 3000 miles of friendship with no barbed wire, no gun or soldier, and no passport on the whole frontier.

Mutual trust made that frontier -- to extend the same sort of mutual trust throughout the Americas was our aim.

The American Republics to the south of us have been ready always to cooperate with the United States on a basis of equality and mutual respect, but before we inaugurated the good neighbor policy there was among them resentment and fear, because certain administrations in Washington had slighted their national pride and their sovereign rights.

In pursuance of the good neighbor policy, and because in my younger days I had learned many lessons in the hard school of experience, I stated that the United States was opposed definitely to armed intervention.

We have negotiated a Pan American Convention embodying the principle of non-intervention. We have abandoned the Platt Amendment which gave us the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba. We have withdrawn American Marines from Haiti. We have signed a new Treaty which places our relations with Panama on a mutually satisfactory basis. We have undertaken a series of trade agreements with other American countries to our mutual commercial profit. At the request of two neighboring Republics, I hope to give assistance in the final settlement of the last serious boundary dispute between any of the American nations.

Throughout the Americas the spirit of the good neighbor is a practical and living fact. The twenty-one American Republics are not only living together in friendship and in peace; they are united in the determination so to remain.

To give substance to this determination, a conference will meet on December 1, 1936, at the Capitol of our great southern neighbor, Argentina, and it is, I know, the hope of all Chiefs of State of the Americas that this will

result in measures which will banish wars forever from this vast portion of the earth.

Peace, like charity, begins at home; that is why we have begun at home. But peace in the western world is not all that we seek.

It is our hope that knowledge of the practical application of the good neighbor policy in this hemisphere will be borne home to our neighbors across the seas.

For ourselves we are on good terms with them -- terms in most cases of straightforward friendship, of peaceful understanding.

But, of necessity, we are deeply concerned about tendencies of recent years among many of the nations of other continents. It is a bitter experience to us when the spirit of agreements to which we are a party is not lived up to. It is an even more bitter experience for the whole company of nations to witness not only the spirit but the letter of international agreements violated with impunity and without regard to the simple principles of honor. Permanent friendships between nations, as between men, can be sustained only by scrupulous respect for the pledged word.

In spite of all of this we have sought steadfastly to assist international movements to prevent war. We cooperated to the bitter end -- and it was a bitter end -- in the work of the General Disarmament Conference. When it failed we sought a separate treaty to deal with the manufacture of arms and the international traffic in arms. That proposal also came to nothing. We participated -- again to the bitter end -- in a conference to continue naval limitations -- and when it became evident that no general treaty could be signed because of the objections of other nations, we concluded with Great Britain and France a conditional treaty of qualitative limitation which, much to my regret, already shows signs of ineffectiveness.

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations; but I am glad to say that we have cooperated wholeheartedly in the social and humanitarian work at Geneva. Thus we are a part of the world effort to control traffic in narcotics, to improve international health, to help child welfare, to eliminate double taxation and to better working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.

We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war. Yet we must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war.

I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running from the wounded. I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs. I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. I have seen two hundred limping, exhausted men come out of line -- the survivors of a regiment of one thousand that went forward forty-eight hours before. I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.

I have passed unnumbered hours, I shall pass unnumbered hours thinking and planning how war may be kept from this Nation.

I wish I could keep war from all nations; but that is beyond my power. I can at least make certain that no act of the United States helps to produce or to promote war. I can at least make clear that the conscience of America revolts against war and that any nation which provokes war forfeits the sympathy of the people of the United States.

Many causes produce war. There are ancient hatreds, turbulent frontiers, the "legacy of old forgotten, far-off things, and battles long ago." There are new-born fanaticisms, convictions on the part of certain peoples that they have become the unique depositaries of ultimate truth and right.

A dark old world was devastated by wars between conflicting religions. A dark modern world faces wars between conflicting economic and political fanaticisms in which are intertwined race hatreds. To bring it home, it is as if within the territorial limits of the United States, 48 nations with 48 forms of government, 48 customs barriers, 48 languages and 48 eternal and different verities were spending their time and their substance in a frenzy of effort to make themselves strong enough to conquer their neighbors or strong enough to defend themselves against their neighbors.

In one field, that of economic barriers, the American policy may be, I hope, of some assistance in discouraging the economic source of war and, therefore, a contribution towards the peace of the world. The trade agreements which we are making are not only finding outlets for the products of American fields and American factories but are also pointing the way to the elimination of embargoes, quotas and other devices which place such pressure on nations

not possessing great natural resources that to them the price of peace seems less terrible than the price of war.

We do not maintain that a more liberal international trade will stop war but we fear that without a more liberal international trade war is a natural sequence.

The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

Nevertheless -- and I speak from a long experience -- the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to

a few men; for the nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the west plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war plowed areas.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches -- fools' gold -- would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you -- and unfortunately their views would get wide publicity -- that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond -- to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer -- must answer -- "we choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day to day decisions.

At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the great war in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "No" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

Of all the nations of the world today we are in many ways most singularly blessed. Our closest neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood.

We seek to dominate no other nation. We ask no territorial expansion. We oppose imperialism. We desire reduction in world armaments.

We believe in democracy. We believe in freedom. We believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish our friendship look us in the eye and take our hand.

B n d

Chautauqua, N.Y.
August 14, 1936.

COPY OF ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

AT CHAUTAUQUA, N. Y.
AUGUST 14, 1936.

file

As many of you who are here tonight know, I formed the excellent habit of coming to Chautauqua more than twenty years ago. After my Inauguration in 1933, I promised Mr. Bestor that during the next four years I would come to Chautauqua again; it is in fulfillment of this that I am with you tonight.

A few days ago I was asked what the subject of this talk would be and I replied that for two good reasons I wanted to discuss the subject of peace: First, because it is eminently appropriate in Chautauqua and, secondly, because in the hurly-burly of domestic politics it is important that our people should not overlook problems and issues which, though they lie beyond our borders, may, and probably will, have a vital influence on the United States of the future.

Many who have visited me in Washington in the past few months may have been surprised when I have told them that personally and because of my own daily contacts with all manner of difficult situations, I am more concerned and less cheerful about international world conditions than about our immediate domestic prospects.

I say this to you not as a confirmed pessimist but as one who still hopes that envy, hatred and malice among nations have reached their peak and will be succeeded by a new tide of peace and good will -- I say this as one who has participated in many of the decisions of peace and war before, during and after the World War; one who has traveled much and one who has spent a goodly portion of every twenty-four hours in the study of foreign relations.

Long before I returned to Washington as President of the United States, I had made up my mind that pending what might be called a more opportune moment on other continents, the United States could best serve the cause of a peaceful humanity by setting an example. That is why on the fourth of March, 1933, I made the following declaration:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor -- the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others -- the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

This declaration represents my purpose, but it represents more than a purpose, for it stands for a practice. To a measurable degree it has succeeded: the whole world now knows that the United States cherishes no predatory ambitions. We are strong; but less powerful nations know that they need not fear our strength. We seek no conquest; we stand for peace.

In the whole of the western hemisphere our good neighbor policy has produced results that are especially heartening.

The noblest monument to peace and to neighborly economic and social friendship in all the world is not a monument in bronze or stone, but the boundary which unites the United States and Canada -- 3000 miles of friendship with no barbed wire, no gun or soldier, and no passport on the whole frontier.

Mutual trust made that frontier -- to extend the same sort of mutual trust throughout the Americas was our aim.

The American Republics to the south of us have been ready always to cooperate with the United States on a basis of equality and mutual respect, but before we inaugurated the good neighbor policy there was among them resentment and fear, because certain administrations in Washington had slighted their national pride and their sovereign rights.

In pursuance of the good neighbor policy, and because in my younger days I had learned many lessons in the hard school of experience, I stated that the United States was opposed definitely to armed intervention.

We have negotiated a Pan American Convention embodying the principle of non-intervention. We have abandoned the Platt Amendment which gave us the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba. We have withdrawn American Marines from Haiti. We have signed a new Treaty which places our relations with Panama on a mutually satisfactory basis. We have undertaken a series of trade agreements with other American countries to our mutual commercial profit. At the request of two neighboring Republics, I hope to give assistance in the final settlement of the last serious boundary dispute between any of the American nations.

Throughout the Americas the spirit of the good neighbor is a practical and living fact. The twenty-one American Republics are not only living together in friendship and in peace; they are united in the determination so to remain.

To give substance to this determination, a conference will meet on December 1, 1936, at the Capitol of our great southern neighbor, Argentina, and it is, I know, the hope of all Chiefs of State of the Americas that this will

result in measures which will banish wars forever from this vast portion of the earth.

Peace, like charity, begins at home; that is why we have begun at home. But peace in the western world is not all that we seek.

It is our hope that knowledge of the practical application of the good neighbor policy in this hemisphere will be borne home to our neighbors across the seas.

For ourselves we are on good terms with them -- terms in most cases of straightforward friendship, of peaceful understanding.

But, of necessity, we are deeply concerned about tendencies of recent years among many of the nations of other continents. It is a bitter experience to us when the spirit of agreements to which we are a party is not lived up to. It is an even more bitter experience for the whole company of nations to witness not only the spirit but the letter of international agreements violated with impunity and without regard to the simple principles of honor. Permanent friendships between nations, as between men, can be sustained only by scrupulous respect for the pledged word.

In spite of all of this we have sought steadfastly to assist international movements to prevent war. We cooperated to the bitter end -- and it was a bitter end -- in the work of the General Disarmament Conference. When it failed we sought a separate treaty to deal with the manufacture of arms and the international traffic in arms. That proposal also came to nothing. We participated -- again to the bitter end -- in a conference to continue naval limitations -- and when it became evident that no general treaty could be signed because of the objections of other nations, we concluded with Great Britain and France a conditional treaty of qualitative limitation which, much to my regret, already shows signs of ineffectiveness.

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations; but I am glad to say that we have cooperated wholeheartedly in the social and humanitarian work at Geneva. Thus we are a part of the world effort to control traffic in narcotics, to improve international health, to help child welfare, to eliminate double taxation and to better working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.

We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war. Yet we must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war.

I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running from the wounded. I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs. I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. I have seen two hundred limping, exhausted men come out of line -- the survivors of a regiment of one thousand that went forward forty-eight hours before. I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.

I have passed unnumbered hours, I shall pass unnumbered hours thinking and planning how war may be kept from this Nation.

I wish I could keep war from all nations; but that is beyond my power. I can at least make certain that no act of the United States helps to produce or to promote war. I can at least make clear that the conscience of America revolts against war and that any nation which provokes war forfeits the sympathy of the people of the United States.

Many causes produce war. There are ancient hatreds, turbulent frontiers, the "legacy of old forgotten, far-off things, and battles long ago." There are new-born fanaticisms, convictions on the part of certain peoples that they have become the unique depositories of ultimate truth and right.

A dark old world was devastated by wars between conflicting religions. A dark modern world faces wars between conflicting economic and political fanaticisms in which are intertwined race hatreds. To bring it home, it is as if within the territorial limits of the United States, 48 nations with 48 forms of government, 48 customs barriers, 48 languages and 48 eternal and different verities were spending their time and their substance in a frenzy of effort to make themselves strong enough to conquer their neighbors or strong enough to defend themselves against their neighbors.

In one field, that of economic barriers, the American policy may be, I hope, of some assistance in discouraging the economic source of war and, therefore, a contribution towards the peace of the world. The trade agreements which we are making are not only finding outlets for the products of American fields and American factories but are also pointing the way to the elimination of embargoes, quotas and other devices which place such pressure on nations

not possessing great natural resources that to them the price of peace seems less terrible than the price of war.

We do not maintain that a more liberal international trade will stop war but we fear that without a more liberal international trade war is a natural sequence.

The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

Nevertheless -- and I speak from a long experience -- the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to

a few men; for the nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the west plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war plowed areas.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches -- fools' gold -- would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you -- and unfortunately their views would get wide publicity -- that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond -- to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer -- must answer -- "we choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day to day decisions.

At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the great war in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "No" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

Of all the nations of the world today we are in many ways most singularly blessed. Our closest neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood.

We seek to dominate no other nation. We ask no territorial expansion. We oppose imperialism. We desire reduction in world armaments.

We believe in democracy. We believe in freedom. We believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish our friendship look us in the eye and take our hand.

B n d

Cheutauqua, N.Y.
August 14, 1936.

PEACE



President Franklin D. Roosevelt's
Speech at Chautauqua,
New York

AUGUST 14, 1936



"I hate war"

Franklin D. Roosevelt

★ PEACE ★

AS many of you who are here tonight know, I formed the excellent habit of coming to Chautauqua more than twenty years ago. After my inauguration in 1933 I promised Mr. Bestor that during the next four years I would come to Chautauqua again; it is in fulfillment of this that I am with you tonight.

A few days ago I was asked what the subject of this talk would be, and I replied that for two good reasons I wanted to discuss the subject of peace; first, because it is eminently appropriate in Chautauqua and, secondly, because in the hurly-burly of domestic politics it is important that our people should not overlook problems and issues which, though they lie beyond our borders, may, and probably will, have a vital influence on the United States of the future.

Many who have visited me in Washington in the past few months may have been surprised when I have told them that personally, and because of my own daily contacts with all manner of different situations, I am more concerned and less cheerful about international world conditions than about our immediate domestic prospects.

Hopes for New Peace Tide I say this to you not as a confirmed pessimist but as one who still hopes that envy, hatred and malice among nations have reached their peak and will be succeeded by a new tide of peace and good will—I say this as one who has participated in many of the decisions of peace and war before, during and after the World War; one who has traveled much and one who has spent a goodly portion of every twenty-four hours in the study of foreign relations.

Long before I returned to Washington as President of the United States I had made up my mind that, pending what might be called a more opportune moment on

other continents, the United States could best serve the cause of a peaceful humanity by setting an example. That was why on the 4th of March, 1933, I made the following declaration:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself, and because he does so, respects the rights of others—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

THIS declaration represents my purpose; but it represents more than a purpose, for it stands for a practice. To a measurable degree it has succeeded; the whole world now knows that the United States cherishes

U. S. Not Predatory, But Stands for Peace

In the whole of the Western Hemisphere our good neighbor policy has produced results that are especially heartening.

The noblest monument to peace and to neighborly economic and social friendship in all the world is not a monument in bronze or stone, but the boundary which unites the United States and Canada—3,000 miles of friendship with no barbed wire, no gun or soldier and no passport on the whole frontier.

Mutual trust made that frontier—to extend the same sort of mutual trust throughout the Americas was our aim.

The American republics to the south of us have been ready always to co-operate with the United States on a basis of equality and mutual respect, but before we inaugurated the good neighbor policy there was among them resentment and fear, because certain

administrations in Washington had slighted their national pride and their sovereign rights.

In pursuance of the good neighbor policy, and because in my younger days I had learned many lessons in the hard school of experience, I stated that the United States was opposed definitely to armed intervention.

We have negotiated a Pan American convention embodying the principle of non-intervention. We have abandoned the Platt amendment which gave us the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba. We have withdrawn American marines from Haiti. We have signed a new treaty which places our relations with Panama on a mutually satisfactory basis. We have undertaken a series of trade agreements with other American countries to our mutual commercial profit. At the request of two neighboring republics, I hope to give assistance in the final settlement of the last serious boundary dispute between any of the American nations.

THROUGHOUT the Americas the spirit of the good neighbor is a practical and living fact. The twenty-one American republics are not only living together in friendship and in peace; they are united in the determination so to remain.

Good Neighbor To give substance to this determination a conference will meet on Dec. 1, 1936, at the capital of our great southern neighbor, Argentina, and it is, I know, the hope of all chiefs of state of the Americas that this will result in measures which will banish wars forever from this vast portion of the earth.

Peace, like charity, begins at home; that is why we have begun at home. But peace in the western world is not all that we seek.

It is our hope that knowledge of the practical application of the good neighbor policy in this hemisphere will be borne home to our neighbors across the seas.

For ourselves we are on good terms with them—terms in most cases of straightforward friendship, of peaceful understanding.

Hopes But, of necessity, we are deeply concerned about tendencies of recent years among many of the nations of other continents. It is a bitter experience to us when the spirit of agreements to which we are a party is not lived up to. It is an even more bitter experience for the whole company of nations to witness not only the spirit but the letter of international agreements violated with impunity and without regard to the simple principles of honor. Permanent friendships between nations, as between men, can be sustained only by scrupulous respect for the pledged word.

In Foreign Wars In spite of all this we have sought steadfastly to assist international movements to prevent war. We cooperated to the bitter end—and it was a bitter end—in the work of the General Disarmament Conference. When it failed we sought a separate treaty to deal with the manufacture of arms and the international traffic in arms. That proposal also came to nothing. We participated—again to the bitter end—in a conference to continue naval limitations, and when it became evident that no general treaty could be signed because of the objections of other nations, we concluded with Great Britain and France a conditional treaty of qualitative limitation which, much to my regret, already shows signs of ineffectiveness.

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with

the political activities of the League of Nations; but I am glad to say that we have co-operated wholeheartedly in the social and humanitarian work at Geneva. Thus we are a part of the world effort to control traffic in narcotics, to improve international health, to help child welfare, to eliminate double taxation and to better working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.

We are not isolationists except in so far as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war. Yet we must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war.

I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running. **Isolationists** Only in War I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs. I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. I have seen 200 limping, exhausted men come out of line—the survivors of a regiment of 1,000 that went forward forty-eight hours before. I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.

I have passed unnumbered hours, I shall pass unnumbered hours, thinking and planning how war may be kept from this nation.

I WISH I could keep war from all nations; but that is beyond my power. I can at least make certain that no act of the United States helps to produce or to promote war. I can at least make clear that the conscience of America revolts against war. **No Act of U. S. Will Help to Promote War** and that any nation which provokes war forfeits the sympathy of the people of the United States. Many causes produce war. There are ancient hatreds, turbulent frontiers, the

"legacy of old forgotten, far-off things, and battles long ago." There are new-born fanaticisms, convictions on the part of certain peoples that they have become the unique depositaries of ultimate truth and right.

A dark Old World was devastated by wars between conflicting religions. A dark modern world faces wars between conflicting economic and political fanaticisms in which are intertwined race hatreds. To bring it home, it is as if within the territorial limits of the United States forty-eight nations with forty-eight forms of government, forty-eight customs barriers, forty-eight languages and forty-eight eternal and different verities, were spending their time and their substance in a frenzy of effort to make themselves strong enough to conquer their neighbors or strong enough to defend themselves against their neighbors.

In one field, that of economic barriers, the American policy may be, I hope, of some assistance in discouraging the economic source of war and therefore a contribution towards the peace of the world. The trade agreements which we are making are not only finding outlets

for the products of American fields and

Discourage Economic Source American factories but are also pointing the way to the elimination of embargoes, quotas and other devices which place such pressure on nations not possessing great natural resources that to them the price of peace seems less terrible than the price of war.

We do not maintain that a more liberal international trade will stop war, but we fear that without a more liberal international trade war is a natural sequence.

The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given

new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

NEVERTHELESS—and I speak from a long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of War Profits State.

for Few, Disaster for Many It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed; but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war plowed areas.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans, who seeking immediate riches—fools' gold **Fools' Gold** —would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in

the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

IF we face the choice of profits or peace, the nation will answer—must answer—“We choose peace.” It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

Peace, Not Profits, Is Only Answer With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who

direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day to day decisions.

At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the Great War in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war, and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say “No” to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

OF all the nations of the world today, we are in many ways most singularly blessed. Our closest neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood.

Imperialism Opposed, We seek to dominate no other nation.

Arms Cut Sought We ask no territorial expansion. We oppose imperialism. We desire reduction in world armaments.

We believe in democracy; we believe in freedom; we believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish our friendship look us in the eye and take our hand.

Issued by the
DEMOCRATIC
NATIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE
Hotel Biltmore
New York City

STATEMENTS FILE

889

Shorthand by Kanner

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

CONFIDENTIAL

Chautauqua, New York,
August 14, 1938.

CAUTION: This address of the President, to be delivered at Chautauqua, New York, must be held in strict confidence until released.

Release upon delivery (expected about 8 P.M., Daylight Saving Time).

Please safeguard against premature release.

M. H. McINTYRE
Assistant Secretary to the President.

As many of you who are here tonight know, I formed the excellent habit of coming to Chautauqua more than twenty years ago. After my Inauguration in 1933, I promised Mr. Bestor that during the next four years I would come to Chautauqua again; it is in fulfillment of this that I am with you tonight.

A few days ago I was asked what the subject of this talk would be, and I replied that for two good reasons I wanted to discuss the subject of peace. First, because it is eminently appropriate in Chautauqua, and, secondly, because in the hurly-burly of domestic politics it is important that our people should not overlook problems and issues which, though they lie beyond our borders, may, and probably will, have a vital influence on the United States of the future.

Many who have visited me in Washington in the past few months may have been surprised when I have told them that personally and because of my own daily contacts with all manner of difficult situations, I am more concerned and less cheerful about international world conditions than about our immediate domestic prospects.

I say this to you not as a confirmed pessimist but as one who still hopes that envy, hatred and malice among nations have reached their peak and will be succeeded by a new tide of peace and good will -- I say this as one who has participated in many of the decisions of peace and war before, during and after the World War; "one who has traveled much and one who has spent a goodly portion of every twenty-four hours in the study of foreign relations.

Long before I returned to Washington as President of the United States, I had made up my mind that pending what might be called a more opportune moment on other continents, the United States could best serve the cause of a peaceful humanity by setting an example. That was why on the 4th of March, 1933, I made the following declaration:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor -- the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and because he does so, respects the rights of others -- the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

The declaration represents my purpose: but it represents more than a purpose, for it stands for a practice. To a measurable degree it has succeeded; the whole world now knows that the United States cherishes no predatory ambitions. We are strong: but less powerful nations know that they need not fear our strength. We seek no conquest: we stand for peace.

In the whole of the western hemisphere our good neighbor policy has produced results that are especially heartening.

The noblest monument to peace and to neighborly economic and social friendship in all the world is not a monument in bronze or stone, but the boundary which unites the United States and Canada -- 3000 miles of friendship with no barbed wire, no gun or soldier, and no passport on the whole frontier. (S) V

Mutual trust made that frontier --- to extend the same sort of mutual trust throughout the Americas was our aim.

The American Republics to the south of us have been ready always to cooperate with the United States on a basis of equality and mutual respect, but before we inaugurated the good neighbor policy there was among them resentment and fear, because certain administrations in Washington had slighted their national pride and their sovereign rights.

In pursuance of the good neighbor policy, and because in my younger days I had learned many lessons in the hard school of experience, I stated that the United States was opposed definitely to armed intervention. (S)

We have negotiated a Pan American Convention embodying the principle of non-intervention. We have abandoned the Platt Amendment which gave us the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba. We have withdrawn American Marines from Haiti. We have signed a new Treaty which places our relations with Panama on a mutually satisfactory basis. We have undertaken a series of trade agreements with other American countries to our mutual commercial profit. At the request of two neighboring Republics, I hope to give assistance in the final settlement of the last serious boundary dispute between any of the American nations. (S)

Throughout the Americas the spirit of the good neighbor is a practical and living fact. The twenty-one American Republics are not only living together in friendship and in peace; they are united in the determination so to remain.

To give substance to this determination a conference will meet on December 1, 1936 at the Capitol of our great southern neighbor, Argentina, and it is, I know, the hope of all Chiefs of State of the Americas that this will result in measures which will banish wars forever from this vast portion of the earth. (S)

Peace, like charity, begins at home; that is why we have begun at home. But peace in the western world is not all that we seek. (S) V

It is our hope that knowledge of the practical application of the good neighbor policy in this hemisphere will be borne home to our neighbors across the seas.

For ourselves we are on good terms with them - terms in most cases of straightforward friendship, if peaceful understanding.

But, of necessity, we are deeply concerned about tendencies of recent years among many of the nations of other continents. It is a bitter experience to us when the spirit of agreements to which we are a party is not lived up to. It is an even

more bitter experience for the whole company of nations to witness not only the spirit but the letter of international agreements violated with impunity and without regard to the simple principles of honor. Permanent friendships between nations as between men can be sustained only by scrupulous respect for the pledged word.

In spite of all this we have sought steadfastly to assist international movements to prevent war. We cooperated to the bitter end -- and it was a bitter end -- in the work of the General Disarmament Conference. When it failed we sought a separate treaty to deal with the manufacture of arms and the international traffic in arms. That proposal also came to nothing. We participated -- again to the bitter end -- in a conference to continue Naval limitations, and when it became evident that no general treaty could be signed because of the objections of other nations, we concluded with Great Britain and France a conditional treaty of qualitative limitation which, much to my regret, already shows signs of ineffectiveness.

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations; but I am glad to say that we have cooperated wholeheartedly in the social and humanitarian work at Geneva. Thus we are a part of the world effort to control traffic in narcotics, to improve international health, to help child welfare, to eliminate double taxation and to better working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.

We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war. Yet we must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war.

I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running from the wounded. I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs. I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. I have seen two hundred limping, exhausted men come out of line -- the survivors of a regiment of one thousand that went forward forty-eight hours before. I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.

I have passed unnumbered hours, I shall pass unnumbered hours thinking and planning how war may be kept from this Nation.

I wish I could keep war from all nations; but that is beyond my power. I can at least make certain that no act of the United States helps to produce or to promote war. I can at least make clear that the conscience of America revolts against war and that any nation which provokes war forfeits the sympathy of the people of the United States.

Many causes produce war. There are ancient hatreds, turbulent frontiers, the "legacy of old forgotten, far off things, and battles long ago." There are new-born fanaticisms, convictions on the part of certain peoples that they have become the unique depositories of ultimate truth and right.

A dark old world was devastated by wars between conflicting religions. A dark modern world faces wars between conflicting economic and political fanaticisms in which are intertwined race hatreds. To bring it home, it is as if within the

territorial limits of the United States, forty-eight nations with forty-eight forms of government, forty-eight customs barriers, forty-eight languages and 48 eternal and different verities, were spending their time and their substance in a frenzy of effort to make themselves strong enough to conquer their neighbors or strong enough to defend themselves against their neighbors.

In one field, that of economic barriers, the American policy may be, I hope, of some assistance in discouraging the economic source of war and therefore a contribution towards the peace of the world. The trade agreements which we are making are not only finding outlets for the products of American fields and American factories but are also pointing the way to the elimination of embargoes, quotas and other devices which place such pressure on nations not possessing great natural resources that to them the price of peace seems less terrible than the price of war.

We do not maintain that a more liberal international trade will stop war but we fear that without a more liberal international trade, war is a natural sequence.

The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

Nevertheless -- and I speak from a long experience -- the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the west plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war plowed areas.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches -- fools' gold -- would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you -- and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity -- that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond -- to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer - we must answer -- "we choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer, and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day to day decisions.

At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the great war in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

Of all the nations of the world today we are in many ways most singularly blessed. Our closest neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood.

We seek to dominate no other nation. We ask no territorial expansion. We oppose imperialism. We desire reduction in world armaments.

We believe in democracy; we believe in freedom; we believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish our friendship look us in the eye and take our hand.