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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.

End
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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 (ap- plause) 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.
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.
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 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, 1935, 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 Republ- 

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 friend-
ships (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 inter-
national traffic in arms. That proposal also came to
(nothing) nought. We participated -- again to the
bitter end -- in a conference to continue Naval limita-
tions, 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. (Prolonged 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 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 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)
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 establishments 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 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 limits of size of naval vessels. 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, 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
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 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 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 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.
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 EXOCHORDIA 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 United States ... is one opposed to armed interven-
tion". This Government, together with the other Govern-
ments 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 Ma-
rines were withdrawn from Haiti and a new treaty signed with
Panama designed to put our relations on a mutually satis-
factory 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 coopera-
tion.

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 communi-
tion to the other chiefs of state suggesting that an extra-
ordinary 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 outstand-
ing 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 as in regard to the rest of the world is a policy of peace. 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 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 look-
ing after our mutual and reciprocal interests, to disre-
gard the interests which may be affected of other coun-
tries. 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 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
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 activi-
ties 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
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 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 nationalism 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 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 end
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
decreasing 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 attempt-
ing 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 for- eign 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 con- cessions 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
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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 those 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
the trade agreements program for these increases, not-
withstanding 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 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.
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 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 con-
nection 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 con-
ferences on Child Welfare, Double Taxation, and other
world problems. We also participate in the work of the
International Labor Office which strives to improve work-
ing 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 un-
numbered 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
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
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 war 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 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 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
experienced 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.
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Mr. President:

Thank you for sending me the latest draft. I am taking the liberty of making a few personal suggestions. It seems to me a fit for the needs of public expression in that audience.
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. Beaton that I would come to Chautauqua one 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 **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 **tomorrow**.

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 during the past four years has spent a portion of every twenty-four hours in the study of foreign relations, then 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 but it represents more than 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
eighbor 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
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 - the same sort of mutual trust throughout the Americas was our aim.

The American Republics to the south of us have been always ready 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 the mutual profit of commerce.
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, 1938 at the Capitol of our great southern neighbor, Argentina, and 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; even though peace in the western world be 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 proof were needed of the sincerity of our good will toward other peoples, that proof is provided in our policy with regard to the Philippines. 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 Philippines 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 agreements to which we are a party have not lived up 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 principles of honor. Permanent friendships between nations as between men, can be sustained only by scrupulous respect for the pledged word.

We have steadfastly 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 naught. We participated -- 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 signed 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 conferences affecting international health, child welfare, double taxation and the improvement of working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.
not

We are 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 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 talking 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. There are
ancient xenial hatreds,
turbulent frontiers, the legacy of old forgotten, far-off things,
and battles long ago. There are new-born fanaticisms, convic-
tions 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 xenial wars between
conflicting religions, a dark 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 forms of government, 48 customs barriers, 48 languages, and 48 eternal and different verities, speeding their time and their substance in a frenzy of effort to make themselves strong enough to conquer their neighbors or 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. The trade agreements which we 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 compress the economic needs of nations without boundaries and tend to produce the expansion which place such pressure on nations which do not possess great natural resources that to them the price of peace seems less terrible than the price of war. We do not maintain that international trade will stop war but fear that without international trade war is a natural regime.

The Congres of the United States has given me the authority 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 to conduct our international relations, has thus in large part been given new weapons with which to maintain our maintenance of 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 happens to occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.
IT IS CLEAR that our present policy and the affluence 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 profits 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 another continent should come again to war, 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 - would attempt to break down 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, the inevitable day of
rarely seen reckoning that would come 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." And now 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 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 will to say "No" to those who deliberately or mistakenly would set us on a 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 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.
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,

Enclosure.

The President,

The White House.
At the outbreak of the rebellion in Spain it is estimated that there were between 1300 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 amended 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 be 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 passed 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 custom 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.

End
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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 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.

End
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"I hate 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.

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 agree-
ments in and with a world of neighbors.”

THIS declaration represents my purpose; but it rep-
resents 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;

U. S. Not Predatory,
Precedent,
But Stands
No conquest; we stand for peace.
For Peace
In the whole of the Western Hem-
sphere 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,

Criticizes
Predecessors neighbor policy there was among them
resentment and fear, because certain

administrations in Washington had slighted their na-
tional pride and their sovereign rights.

In pursuance of the good neighbor policy, and be-
cause 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 determina-
tion so to remain.

Good Neighbor Spirit is A Practical Fact
To give substance to this determina-
tion a conference will meet on Dec. 1.
1936, at the capital of our great south-
ern 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 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 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 only in war 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 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 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 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 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.

War Profits 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—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 to the 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

Peace, Not unanimous.

Profits, Is With that wise and experienced man

Only Answer 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 Imperialism ourselves and defend our neighborhood.

Opposed, We seek to dominate no other nation.

Arms Cut We ask no territorial expansion. We Sought 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
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Hotel Biltmore
New York City
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. Bester 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 besides, 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 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."
That declaration represented 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 friendly 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, 1933 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, & 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—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 as long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace will 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, but for the nation as a whole 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 acres.

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 foresight, 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 unawisely would lead us 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.