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

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

File No. 1066

1937 August 18

Roanoke Island, NC

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT
ROANOKE ISLAND

Until recent years history was taught as a series of facts and dates. Today we are beginning to look more closely into the events which preceded ~~certain~~ great social and economic and political changes which deeply affect the known history of the world.

For example, most of us older people learned of Columbus' voyages, of how America came to be named --- and we jumped from there in our North American history to the founding of Jamestown and of Plymouth. There may have been a passing reference to the planting of Sir Walter Raleigh's "Lost Colony" but in the minds of most Americans there is an amazing gap, a void in which the whole Atlantic Seaboard is in a state of complete oblivion for over a century. — 1492 to 1607 with mere passing reference to Roanoke and perhaps to the voyage of Verrazzano.

It has always been a pet theory of mine that many other voyages of exploration and of trade took place in this century along our American shores. We know that during the

same period the Spaniards established great colonies throughout the West Indies, at Panama and other points in Central America, and extended their cities, their churches and even their universities to both the east and west coasts of South America. It is unbelievable that white men did not come scores of times to what is today the Atlantic Seaboard of the United States. Some day perhaps a closer search of the records of the seafaring towns of Britain and France and Flanders and Holland and Scandinavia will rediscover discoverers. Perhaps even it is not too much to hope that documents in the old country and excavations in the new may throw some further light, however dim, on the fate of the "Lost Colony" and Roanoke and *Virginia Dare*.

If we are to understand the full significance of the early explorations and the early settlements, if we are to understand the kind of world upon which Virginia Dare opened her eyes on that far-away August day in 1587, we must ask why Western Europe came to the new world.

It was in part because the era was an era of restless action. Under the Renaissance men experienced great awakenings -- they were fired with restless energy

to burst the narrow bounds of the medieval conception of the Universe -- to fare forth on voyages of exploration and conquest.

Many of those who sailed in immense discomfort, in tiny ships, across the Atlantic, were adventurers -- some of them seeking riches, some seeking fame, some impelled by the mere spirit of unrest. But most of them -- the men, the women and the children, came hither seeking something very different -- seeking an opportunity which they could not find in their ~~own~~ homes of the old world.

We hear of the gentlemen of title, who, on occasion, came to the Colonies, and we hear of the gentlemen of wealth who helped to fit out the expeditions. But it is a simple fact which cannot ~~be~~ too often stressed that an overwhelming majority of those who came to the Colonies from England and Scotland and Ireland and Wales and France and Holland and Sweden belonged to what our British cousins would, even today, call "the lower middle classes." The opportunity they sought was something they did not have at home -- opportunity freely to exercise their own chosen form of religion,

opportunity to get into an environment where there were no classes, opportunity to escape from a system which still contained most of the elements of Feudalism.

This is not in derogation of those pioneers. It is rather in praise of them. They had the courage, physically and mentally, by deed and word, to seek better things, to try to capture ideals and hopes forbidden to them by the rulers ^{laws and} of their home lands.

It is well, too, that we bear in mind that in all the pioneer settlements democracy and not feudalism was the rule. The men had to take their turn standing guard at the stockade raised against the Indians. The women had to take their turn husking corn stored for the winter supply of the community. Rules of conduct had to be established to keep private greed or personal misconduct in check. I fear very much that if certain modern Americans, who protest loudly their devotion to American ideals, were suddenly to be given a comprehensive view of the earliest American colonists and ^{and} their methods of life and government, they would promptly label them socialists ^{and communists} and ~~communists~~. They would forget that in these pioneer settlements were all the germs of the later American Constitution.

They would forget, too, that although in the days that intervened between Roanoke and Jamestown and Plymouth, and the time of the American Revolution itself, practical democracy was carried on in the lives of the inhabitants of nearly every community in the Thirteen Colonies. It is true that as commerce developed in the seaboard cities, and as a few great landed estates were set up here and there, a school of thought parallel with the same school of thought in England made great headway.

It was this policy which came into the open in the Constitutional Convention of 1787; for in that Convention there were some who wanted a King, there were some who wanted to create titles, and there were many, like Alexander Hamilton, who sincerely believed that suffrage and the right to hold office should be confined to persons of property and persons of education. We know, however, that although this school persisted, with the assistance of the newspapers of the day, during the first three National Administrations, it was —
at least temporarily and for many years eliminated under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson and his successors.

His was the first great battle for the preservation of democracy.

His was the first great victory for democracy.

In the half century that followed there was constant war between those who, like Andrew Jackson, believed in a democracy conducted by and for a complete cross-section of the population, and those who, like the Directors of the Bank of the United States and their friends in the United States Senate, believed in the conduct of government by a self-perpetuating group at the top of the ladder. That this was the clear line of demarcation -- the fundamental difference of opinion in regard to American institutions is proved by an amazingly interesting letter which Lord Macaulay wrote in 1857 to an American friend.

This friend of his had written a book about Thomas Jefferson. Macaulay said "You are surprised to learn that I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. ~~Am~~ I am certain that I never wrote a line and that I have neveruttered a word indicating an opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society."

Macaulay, in other words, was opposed to what we call "popular government."

He went on to say "I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both." [He goes on to point out the failure of democracy in France after the Revolution of 1848. He speaks of national bankruptcy, a new partition of the soil, of maximum prices, of a ruinous load of taxation laid on the rich for the purpose of supporting the poor in idleness. He goes on, referring to the seizure of power by Napoleon III to say "Happily the danger was averted; and now there is despotism, a silent tribute, an enslaved press but civilization has been saved." In other words, he comes out wholeheartedly for dictatorship because it saved civilization from the demoralization created by a democracy.]

Then, speaking of England, he says "I have not the smallest doubt that, if we had a purely democratic government here, the effect would be the same..... You may think that (speaking of America) your country enjoys an exception from these evils I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have

a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the old world, and while /that is the case, the Jeffersonian polity policy may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity.

But the time will come when New England will be as thickly peopled populated as Old England. Wages will be ^{as} low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams, and in those Manchesters and Birminghams hundreds ~~of~~ thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes ~~without~~ ^{out of} work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million while another ~~—~~ cannot get a full meal." And then Macaulay goes on to tell his American friend how they handled such situations in England. He says "In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here and sometimes a little rioting, but it matters little. For here the sufferers are not the rulers ~~—~~ ~~the~~ The Supreme power is in the hands of ~~the~~ ^{the} class, numerous indeed, but select an educated class a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly the

malcontents are firmly ~~but~~ gently restrained. The bad time is
got over without robbing the wealthy to relieve the indigent.
The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again
.....and all is tranquility and cheerfulness.*

Almost methinks, I am reading not from Macaulay
but from a ^{resolution} of the United States Chamber of Commerce,
the Liberty League, the National Association of Manufacturers
or the editorials written at the behest of well-known newspaper
proprietors.

Like these gentlemen of 1937, Macaulay in 1857 painted this gloomy picture of the future of the United States - "I cannot help foreboding the worst, ~~W~~. It is quite plain that your government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority The day will come when a multitude ^{had} of people, none of whom has more than half a breakfast or expects ^A to have more than half a dinner, will choose a legislature On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights On the other ~~is~~ is a demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists and asking why anybody should be ~~permitted~~ to drink champagne and to ride in a carriage while ^{and} thousands of honest folks are in want of necessities I seriously apprehend that you will, / in some such season of adversity do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like ~~the~~ people who ^{should} ~~were~~ in a year of scarcity ^{a year,} devour all the seed corn and thus make the next year ~~not~~ ^{one} of scarcity but of absolute famine, There is nothing to stop you. Your constitution is all sail and no anchor. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be ~~be~~ laid waste by Barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth."

That, my friends, with all due respect to Lord Macaulay,
is an excellent representation of the cries of alarm which rise
today from the throats of American Lord Macaulays. They tell
you that America drifts toward the Scylla of dictatorship on the
one hand, or ~~the~~ the Charybdis of anarchy on the other. Their
anchor for the salvation of the Ship of State is Macaulay's
anchor! "Supreme power in the hands of a class, numerous indeed,
but select; ^{of} an educated class, a class which is, and knows itself
to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the
maintenance of order."

Mine is a different anchor. They do not believe in
democracy -- I do. My anchor is ~~more~~ ^{and} democracy, ~~more~~ more
democracy. And, my friends, I am of the firm belief that the
Nation, by an overwhelming majority, supports my opposition to
the vesting of supreme power in the hands of any class, numerous
but select.

It is of interest to read Macaulay's letter with
care -- for I find in it no reference to the improving of the
living conditions of the poor, to the encouragement of better
homes or greater wages, or steadier work. I find no reference
to the averting of panics, no words for the encouragement of
the farmer -- nothing at all, in fact, except the suggestion

that ~~conditions~~ are ~~now~~ firmly but gently restrained . . .

in the interest of the security of property and the maintenance
of order.

I conceive it to be true that I am just as strongly
in favor of the security of property and the maintenance of
order as Lord Macaulay, or as the American Lord Macaulay, who
thundered ~~on the eighteenth~~ today. And in this the American
people are with me, too. But we cannot go along with the Tory
insistence that salvation lies in the vesting of power in the
hands of a select class, and that if America does not come to
that system, America will perish.

Macaulay condemned the American scheme of government
based on popular majority. In this country eighty years later
his successors do not yet dare openly to condemn the American
form of government by popular majority, for they profess adherence
to the form, while, at the same time, their every act shows
their opposition to the very fundamentals of democracy. They
love to intone praise of liberty, to mouth phrases about the
sanctity of our Constitution -- but in their hearts they distrust
majority rule because an enlightened majority will not tolerate
the abuses which a privileged minority would seek to foist upon
the people as a whole.

Since the determination of this minority is to substitute their will for that of the majority, would it not be more honest for them, instead of using the Constitution as a cloak to hide their real designs, to come out frankly and say: "We agree with Macaulay that the American form of government will lead to disaster and therefore we seek a change in the American form of government as laid down by the Founding Fathers"?

They seek to substitute their own will for that of the majority, for they would serve their own interest above the general welfare. They reject the principle of the greater good for the greater number, which is the cornerstone of democratic government.

Under democratic government the poorest are no longer necessarily the most ignorant part of society. I agree with the saying of one of our famous statesmen who devoted himself to the principle of majority rule: "I respect the aristocracy of learning; I deplore the plutocracy of wealth; but thank God for the democracy of the heart."

I seek no change in the form of American government. Majority rule must be preserved as the safeguard of both liberty and civilization.

Under it property can be secure; under it abuses can end; under it order can be maintained -- and all of this for / the simple, cogent reason that to the average of our citizenship can be brought a life of greater opportunity, of greater security, of greater happiness.

Those worthy hopes ~~which~~ led the father and mother of Virginia Dare and the fathers and mothers from many nations through many centuries to seek new life in the new world. Pioneering it was called in the olden days; pioneering it still is -- pioneering for the preservation of our fundamental institutions against the ceaseless attack of those who have no faith in democracy. Fortitude and courage on our part succeed~~p~~ the fortitude and courage of those who planted a colony on this Island in the days of good Queen Bess.

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT

ROANOKE ISLAND

Until recent years history was taught as a series of facts and dates. Today we are beginning to look more closely into the events which preceded those great social and economic and political changes which have deeply affected the known history of the world.

For example, most of us older people learned of Columbus' voyages, of how America came to be named -- and we jumped from there in our North American history to the founding of Jamestown and of Plymouth -- 1492 to 1607 with mere passing reference to Roanoke and perhaps to the voyage of Verazzano.

It has always been a pet theory of mine that many other voyages of exploration and of trade took place in that century along our American shores. We know that during the same period the Spaniards established great colonies throughout the West Indies, at Panama and other points in Central America, and extended their cities, their religious institutions

and even their universities to both the east and west coasts of South America. It is unbelievable that white men did not come scores of times to what is today the Atlantic Seaboard of the United States. Some day perhaps a closer search of the records of the seafaring towns of Britain and France and Flanders and Holland and Scandinavia will rediscover discoverers. Perhaps even it is not too much to hope that documents in the old country and excavations in the new may throw some further light, however dim, on the fate of the "Lost Colony" and Roanoke and Virginia Dare.

If we are to understand the full significance of the early explorations and the early settlements, if we are to understand the kind of world upon which Virginia Dare opened her eyes on that far-away August day in 1587, we must ask why Western Europe came to the new world.

It was in part because the era was an era of restless action. Under the Renaissance men experienced great awakenings -- they were fired with restless energy to burst

the narrow bounds of the medieval conception of the Universe -- to fare forth on voyages of exploration and conquest.

Many of those who sailed in immense discomfort, in tiny ships, across the Atlantic, were adventurers -- some of them seeking riches, some seeking fame, some impelled by the mere spirit of unrest. But most of them -- the men, the women and the children, came hither seeking something very different -- seeking an opportunity which they could not find in their homes of the old world.

We hear of the gentlemen of title, who, on occasion, came to the Colonies, and we hear of the gentlemen of wealth who helped to fit out the expeditions. But it is a simple fact which cannot too often be stressed that an overwhelming majority of those who came to the Colonies from England and Scotland and Ireland and Wales and France and Holland and Sweden belonged to what our British cousins would, even today, call "the lower middle classes." The opportunity they sought was something they did not have at home -- opportunity

freely to exercise their own chosen form of religion, opportunity to get into an environment where there were no classes, opportunity to escape from a system which still contained most of the elements of Feudalism.

This is not in derogation of those pioneers. It is rather in praise of them. They had the courage, physically and mentally, by deed and word, to seek better things, to try to capture ideals and hopes forbidden to them by the laws and rulers of their own home lands.

It is well, too, that we bear in mind that in all the pioneer settlements democracy and not feudalism was the rule. The men had to take their turn standing guard at the stockade raised against the Indians. The women had to take their turn husking corn stored for the winter supply of the community. Rules of conduct had to be established to keep private greed or personal misconduct in check. I fear very much that if certain modern Americans, who protest loudly their devotion to American ideals, were suddenly to be given a comprehensive view of the earliest American colonists and

their methods of life and government, they would promptly label them socialists. They would forget that in these pioneer settlements were all the germs of the later American Constitution.

They would forget, too, that although in the days that intervened between Roanoke and Jamestown and Plymouth and the time of the American Revolution itself, practical democracy was carried on in the lives of the inhabitants of nearly every community in the Thirteen Colonies. It is true that as commerce developed in the seaboard cities, and as a few great landed estates were set up here and there, a school of thought parallel with the same school of thought in England made great headway.

It was this policy which came into the open in the Constitutional Convention of 1787; for in that Convention there were some who wanted a King, there were some who wanted to create titles, and there were many, like Alexander Hamilton, who sincerely believed that suffrage and the right to hold

office should be confined to persons of property and persons of education. We know, however, that although this school persisted, with the assistance of the newspapers of the day, during the first three National Administrations, it was eliminated for many years at least under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson and his successors. His was the first great battle for the preservation of democracy. His was the first great victory for democracy.

In the half century that followed there was constant war between those who, like Andrew Jackson, believed in a democracy conducted by and for a complete cross-section of the population, and those who, like the Directors of the Bank of the United States and their friends in the United States Senate, believed in the conduct of government by a self-perpetuating group at the top of the ladder. That this was the clear line of demarcation -- the fundamental difference of opinion in regard to American institutions is proved by an amazingly interesting letter which Lord Macaulay wrote in 1857 to an American friend.

This friend of his had written a book about Thomas Jefferson. Macaulay said "You are surprised to learn that I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain that I never wrote a line and that I have neveruttered a word indicating an opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society." Macaulay, in other words, was opposed to what we call "popular government."

He went on to say "I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both."

Then, speaking of England, he ^{said} ~~said~~ "I have not the smallest doubt that, if we had a purely democratic government here, the effect would be the same.....You may think that your country (speaking of America) enjoys an exception from these evils.....I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the old world, and while

that is the case, the Jeffersonian polity may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity. But the time will come when New England will be as thickly peopled as Old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams, and in those Manchesters and Birminghams hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million while another cannot get a full meal." And then Macaulay goes on to tell his American friend how they handled such situations in England. He ~~said~~^{said}
"In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here and sometimes a little rioting, but it matters little. For here the sufferers are not the rulers. The Supreme power is in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but selectan educated class a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly the malcontents are firmly yet gently restrained. The bad time

is got over without robbing the wealthy to relieve the indigent.

The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again

and all is tranquility and cheerfulness."

Almost, methinks, I am reading not from Macaulay
but from a resolution of the United States Chamber of Commerce,
the Liberty League, the National Association of Manufacturers
or the editorials written at the behest of some well-known
newspaper proprietors.

Like these gentlemen of 1937, Macaulay in 1857 painted
this gloomy picture of the future of the United States - "I
cannot help foreboding the worst. It is quite plain that your
government will never be able to restrain a distressed and
discontented majority.....The day will come when.....a
multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a
breakfast or expects to have more than half a dinner, will
choose a legislature.....On one side is a statesman preaching
patience, respect for vested rights.....On the other is a
demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists.....and
asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and
to ride in a carriage while thousands of honest folks are in
want of necessities.....I seriously apprehend that you will,

in some such season of adversity.....do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like people who should in a year of scarcity devour all the seed corn and thus make the next year a year, not of scarcity but of absolute famine.....There is nothing to stop you. Your constitution is all sail and no anchor.....Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be.....laid waste by Barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth."

That, my friends, with all due respect to Lord Macaulay, is an excellent representation of the cries of alarm which rise today from the throats of American Lord Macaulays. They tell you that America drifts toward the Scylla of dictatorship on the one hand, or the Charybdis of anarchy on the other. Their anchor for the salvation of the Ship of State is Macaulay's anchor: "Supreme power.....in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select; of an educated class, of a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order."

Mine is a different anchor. They do not believe in democracy -- I do. My anchor is democracy -- and more democracy. And, my friends, I am of the firm belief that the Nation, by an overwhelming majority, supports my opposition to the vesting of supreme power in the hands of any class, numerous but select.

It is of interest to read Macaulay's letter with care -- for I find in it no reference to the improving of the living conditions of the poor, to the encouragement of better homes or greater wages, or steadier work. I find no reference to the averting of panics, no words for the encouragement of the farmer -- nothing at all, in fact, except the suggestion that "malcontents are firmly but gently restrained".....in the interest of the "security of property and the maintenance of order."

I conceive it to be true that I am just as strongly in favor of the security of property and the maintenance of order as Lord Macaulay, or as the American Lord Macaulays who thunder today. And in this the American people are with me, too. But we cannot go along with the Tory insistence that salvation

lies in the vesting of power in the hands of a select class, and that if America does not come to that system, America will perish.

Macaulay condemned the American scheme of government based on popular majority. In this country eighty years later his successors do not yet dare openly to condemn the American form of government by popular majority, for they profess adherence to the form, while, at the same time, their every act shows their opposition to the very fundamentals of democracy. They love to intone praise of liberty, to mouth phrases about the sanctity of our Constitution -- but in their hearts they distrust majority rule because an enlightened majority will not tolerate the abuses which a privileged minority would seek to foist upon the people as a whole.

Since the determination of this minority is to substitute their will for that of the majority, would it not be more honest for them, instead of using the Constitution as a cloak to hide their real designs, to come out frankly and

say: "We agree with Macaulay that the American form of government will lead to disaster and therefore we seek a change in the American form of government as laid down by the Founding Fathers"?

They seek to substitute their own will for that of the majority, for they would serve their own interest above the general welfare. They reject the principle of the greater good for the greater number, which is the cornerstone of democratic government.

Under democratic government the poorest are no longer necessarily the most ignorant part of society. I agree with the saying of one of our famous statesmen who devoted himself to the principle of majority rule: "I respect the aristocracy of learning; I deplore the plutocracy of wealth; but thank God for the democracy of the heart."

I seek no change in the form of American government. Majority rule must be preserved as the safeguard of both liberty and civilization.

Under it property can be secure; under it abuses can end; under it order can be maintained -- and all of this for

the simple, cogent reason that to the average of our citizenship can be brought a life of greater opportunity, of greater security, of greater happiness.

Those worthy hopes led the father and mother of Virginia Dare and the fathers and mothers from many nations through many centuries to seek new life in the New World. Pioneering it was called in the olden days; pioneering it still is -- pioneering for the preservation of our fundamental institutions against the ceaseless attack of those who have no faith in democracy. Fortitude and courage on our part succeed the fortitude and courage of those who planted a colony on this Island in the days of good Queen Bess.

- - - - -

SPECH OF THE PRESIDENT
ROANOKE ISLAND

Until recent years history was taught as a series of facts and dates. Today we are beginning to look more closely into the events which preceded those great social and economic and political changes which have deeply affected the known history of the world.

For example, most of us older people learned of Columbus' voyages, of how America came to be named -- and we jumped from there in our North American history to the founding of Jamestown and of Plymouth -- 1492 to 1607 with mere passing reference to Roanoke and perhaps to the voyage of Verazzano.

It has always been a pet theory of mine that many other voyages of exploration and of trade took place in that century along our American shores. We know that during the same period the Spaniards established great colonies throughout the West Indies, at Panama and other points in Central America, and extended their cities, their religious institutions

and even their universities to both the east and west coasts of South America. It is unbelievable that white men did not come scores of times to what is today the Atlantic Seaboard of the United States. Some day perhaps a closer search of the records of the seafaring towns of Britain and France and Flanders and Holland and Scandinavia will rediscover discoverers. Perhaps even it is not too much to hope that documents in the old country and excavations in the new may throw some further light, however dim, on the fate of the "Lost Colony" and Roanoke and Virginia Dare.

If we are to understand the full significance of the early explorations and the early settlements, if we are to understand the kind of world upon which Virginia Dare opened her eyes on that far-away August day in 1587, we must ask why Western Europe came to the new world.

It was in part because the era was an era of restless action. Under the Renaissance men experienced great awakenings -- they were fired with restless energy to burst

the narrow bounds of the medieval conception of the Universe -- to fare forth on voyages of exploration and conquest.

Many of those who sailed in immense discomfort, in tiny ships, across the Atlantic, were adventurers -- some of them seeking riches, some seeking fame, some impelled by the mere spirit of unrest. But most of them -- the men, the women and the children, came hither seeking something very different -- seeking an opportunity which they could not find in their homes of the old world.

We hear of the gentlemen of title, who, on occasion, came to the Colonies, and we hear of the gentlemen of wealth who helped to fit out the expeditions. But it is a simple fact which cannot too often be stressed that an overwhelming majority of those who came to the Colonies from England and Scotland and Ireland and Wales and France and Holland and Sweden belonged to what our British cousins would, even today, call "the lower middle classes." The opportunity they sought was something they did not have at home -- opportunity

freely to exercise their own chosen form of religion,
opportunity to get into an environment where there were no
classes, opportunity to escape from a system which still
contained most of the elements of Feudalism.

This is not in derogation of those pioneers. It
is rather in praise of them. They had the courage, physically
and mentally, by deed and word, to seek better things, to try
to capture ideals and hopes forbidden to them by the laws and
rulers of their own home lands.

It is well, too, that we bear in mind that in all
the pioneer settlements democracy and not feudalism was the
rule. The men had to take their turn standing guard at the
stockade raised against the Indians. The women had to take
their turn husking corn stored for the winter supply of the
community. Rules of conduct had to be established to keep
private greed or personal misconduct in check. I fear very
much that if certain modern Americans, who protest loudly
their devotion to American ideals, were suddenly to be given
a comprehensive view of the earliest American colonists and

their methods of life and government, they would promptly label them socialists. They would forget that in these pioneer settlements were all the germs of the later American Constitution.

They would forget, too, that although in the days that intervened between Roanoke and Jamestown and Plymouth and the time of the American Revolution itself, practical democracy was carried on in the lives of the inhabitants of nearly every community in the Thirteen Colonies. It is true that as commerce developed in the seaboard cities, and as a few great landed estates were set up here and there, a school of thought parallel with the same school of thought in England made great headway.

It was this policy which came into the open in the Constitutional Convention of 1787; for in that Convention there were some who wanted a King, there were some who wanted to create titles, and there were many, like Alexander Hamilton, who sincerely believed that suffrage and the right to hold

office should be confined to persons of property and persons of education. We know, however, that although this school persisted, with the assistance of the newspapers of the day, during the first three National Administrations, it was eliminated for many years at least under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson and his successors. His was the first great battle for the preservation of democracy. His was the first great victory for democracy.

In the half century that followed there was constant war between those who, like Andrew Jackson, believed in a democracy conducted by and for a complete cross-section of the population, and those who, like the Directors of the Bank of the United States and their friends in the United States Senate, believed in the conduct of government by a self-perpetuating group at the top of the ladder. That this was the clear line of demarcation -- the fundamental difference of opinion in regard to American institutions is proved by an amazingly interesting letter which Lord Macaulay wrote in 1857 to an American friend.

This friend of his had written a book about Thomas Jefferson. Macaulay said "You are surprised to learn that I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain that I never wrote a line and that I have neveruttered a word indicating an opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society." Macaulay, in other words, was opposed to what we call "popular government."

He went on to say "I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both."

Then, speaking of England, he says "I have not the smallest doubt that, if we had a purely democratic government here, the effect would be the same.....You may think that your country (speaking of America) enjoys an exception from these evils.....I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the old world, and while

that is the case, the Jeffersonian polity may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity. But the time will come when New England will be as thickly peopled as Old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams, and in those Manchesters and Birminghams hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million while another cannot get a full meal." And then Macaulay goes on to tell his American friend how they handled such situations in England. He says "In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here and sometimes a little rioting, but it matters little. For here the sufferers are not the rulers. The Supreme power is in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but selectan educated class a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly the malcontents are firmly yet gently restrained. The bad time

is got over without robbing the wealthy to relieve the indigent.

The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again

and all is tranquility and cheerfulness."

Almost, methinks, I am reading not from Macaulay
but from a resolution of the United States Chamber of Commerce,
the Liberty League, the National Association of Manufacturers
or the editorials written at the behest of some well-known
newspaper proprietors.

Like these gentlemen of 1937, Macaulay in 1857 painted
this gloomy picture of the future of the United States - "I
cannot help foreboding the worst. It is quite plain that your
government will never be able to restrain a distressed and
discontented majority.....The day will come when.....a
multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a
breakfast or expects to have more than half a dinner, will
choose a legislature.....On one side is a statesman preaching
patience, respect for vested rights.....On the other is a
demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists.....and
asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and
to ride in a carriage while thousands of honest folks are in
want of necessities.....I seriously apprehend that you will,

in some such season of adversity.....do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like people who should in a year of scarcity devour all the seed corn and thus make the next year a year, not of scarcity but of absolute famine.....There is nothing to stop you. Your constitution is all sail and no anchor.....Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be.....laid waste by Barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth."

That, my friends, with all due respect to Lord Macaulay, is an excellent representation of the cries of alarm which rise today from the throats of American Lord Macaulays. They tell you that America drifts toward the Scylla of dictatorship on the one hand, or the Charybdis of anarchy on the other. Their anchor for the salvation of the Ship of State is Macaulay's anchor: "Supreme power.....in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select; of an educated class, of a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order."

Mine is a different anchor. They do not believe in democracy -- I do. My anchor is democracy -- and more democracy. And, my friends, I am of the firm belief that the Nation, by an overwhelming majority, supports my opposition to the vesting of supreme power in the hands of any class, numerous but select.

It is of interest to read Macaulay's letter with care -- for I find in it no reference to the improving of the living conditions of the poor, to the encouragement of better homes or greater wages, or steadier work. I find no reference to the averting of panics, no words for the encouragement of the farmer -- nothing at all, in fact, except the suggestion that "malecontents are firmly but gently restrained".....in the interest of the "security of property and the maintenance of order."

I conceive it to be true that I am just as strongly in favor of the security of property and the maintenance of order as Lord Macaulay, or as the American Lord Macaulays who thunder today. And in this the American people are with me, too. But we cannot go along with the Tory insistence that salvation

lies in the vesting of power in the hands of a select class, and that if America does not come to that system, America will perish.

Macaulay condemned the American scheme of government based on popular majority. In this country eighty years later his successors do not yet dare openly to condemn the American form of government by popular majority, for they profess adherence to the form, while, at the same time, their every act shows their opposition to the very fundamentals of democracy. They love to intone praise of liberty, to mouth phrases about the sanctity of our Constitution -- but in their hearts they distrust majority rule because an enlightened majority will not tolerate the abuses which a privileged minority would seek to foist upon the people as a whole.

Since the determination of this minority is to substitute their will for that of the majority, would it not be more honest for them, instead of using the Constitution as a cloak to hide their real designs, to come out frankly and

say: "We agree with Macaulay that the American form of government will lead to disaster and therefore we seek a change in the American form of government as laid down by the Founding Fathers?"

They seek to substitute their own will for that of the majority, for they would serve their own interest above the general welfare. They reject the principle of the greater good for the greater number, which is the cornerstone of democratic government.

Under democratic government the poorest are no longer necessarily the most ignorant part of society. I agree with the saying of one of our famous statesmen who devoted himself to the principle of majority rule: "I respect the aristocracy of learning; I deplore the plutocracy of wealth; but thank God for the democracy of the heart."

I seek no change in the form of American government. Majority rule must be preserved as the safeguard of both liberty and civilization.

Under it property can be secure; under it abuses can end; under it order can be maintained -- and all of this for

the simple, cogent reason that to the average of our citizenship can be brought a life of greater opportunity, of greater security, of greater happiness.

Those worthy hopes led the father and mother of Virginia Dare and the fathers and mothers from many nations through many centuries to seek new life in the New World. Pioneering it was called in the olden days; pioneering it still is -- pioneering for the preservation of our fundamental institutions against the ceaseless attack of those who have no faith in democracy. Fortitude and courage on our part succeed the fortitude and courage of those who planted a colony on this Island in the days of good Queen Bess.

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT

ROANOKE ISLAND

Wed - Aug 18, 1937 -

Cfj

Until recent years history was taught as a series of facts and dates. Today we are beginning to look more closely into the events which preceded those great social and economic and political changes which have deeply affected the known history of the world.

For example, most of us older people learned of Columbus' voyages, of how America came to be named -- and we jumped from there in our North American history to the founding of Jamestown and of Plymouth -- 1492 to 1607 with mere passing reference to Roanoke and perhaps to the voyage of Verazzano.

It has always been a pet theory of mine that many other voyages of exploration and of trade took place in that century along our American shores. We know that during the same period the Spaniards established great colonies throughout the West Indies, at Panama and other points in Central America, and extended their cities, their religious institutions

and even their universities to both the east and west coasts of South America. It is unbelievable that white men did not come scores of times to what is today the Atlantic Seaboard of the United States. Some day perhaps a closer search of the records of the seafaring towns of Britain and France and Flanders and Holland and Scandinavia will rediscover discoverers. Perhaps even it is not too much to hope that documents in the old country and excavations in the new may throw some further light, however dim, on the fate of the "Lost Colony" and Roanoke and Virginia Dare.

If we are to understand the full significance of the early explorations and the early settlements, if we are to understand the kind of world upon which Virginia Dare opened her eyes on that far-away August day in 1587, we must ask why Western Europe came to the new world.

It was in part because the era was an era of restless action. Under the Renaissance men experienced great awakenings -- they were fired with restless energy to burst

the narrow bounds of the medieval conception of the Universe -- to fare forth on voyages of exploration and conquest.

Many of those who sailed in immense discomfort, in tiny ships, across the Atlantic, were adventurers -- some of them seeking riches, some seeking fame, some impelled by the mere spirit of unrest. But most of them -- the men, the women and the children, came hither seeking something very different -- seeking an opportunity which they could not find in their homes of the old world.

We hear of the gentlemen of title, who, on occasion, came to the Colonies, and we hear of the gentlemen of wealth who helped to fit out the expeditions. But it is a simple fact which cannot too often be stressed that an overwhelming majority of those who came to the Colonies from England and Scotland and Ireland and Wales and France and Holland and Sweden belonged to what our British cousins would, even today, call "the lower middle classes." The opportunity they sought was something they did not have at home -- opportunity

freely to exercise their own chosen form of religion, opportunity to get into an environment where there were no classes, opportunity to escape from a system which still contained most of the elements of Feudalism.

This is not in derogation of those pioneers. It is rather in praise of them. They had the courage, physically and mentally, by deed and word, to seek better things, to try to capture ideals and hopes forbidden to them by the laws and rulers of their own home lands.

It is well, too, that we bear in mind that in all the pioneer settlements democracy and not feudalism was the rule. The men had to take their turn standing guard at the stockade raised against the Indians. The women had to take their turn husking corn stored for the winter supply of the community. Rules of conduct had to be established to keep private greed or personal misconduct in check. I fear very much that if certain modern Americans, who protest loudly their devotion to American ideals, were suddenly to be given a comprehensive view of the earliest American colonists and

their methods of life and government, they would promptly label them socialists. They would forget that in these pioneer settlements were all the germs of the later American Constitution.

They would forget, too, that although in the days that intervened between Roanoke and Jamestown and Plymouth and the time of the American Revolution itself, practical democracy was carried on in the lives of the inhabitants of nearly every community in the Thirteen Colonies. It is true that as commerce developed in the seaboard cities, and as a few great landed estates were set up here and there, a school of thought parallel with the same school of thought in England made great headway.

It was this policy which came into the open in the Constitutional Convention of 1787; for in that Convention there were some who wanted a King, there were some who wanted to create titles, and there were many, like Alexander Hamilton, who sincerely believed that suffrage and the right to hold

office should be confined to persons of property and persons of education. We know, however, that although this school persisted, with the assistance of the newspapers of the day, during the first three National Administrations, it was eliminated for many years at least under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson and his successors. His was the first great battle for the preservation of democracy. His was the first great victory for democracy.

In the half century that followed there was constant war between those who, like Andrew Jackson, believed in a democracy conducted by and for a complete cross-section of the population, and those who, like the Directors of the Bank of the United States and their friends in the United States Senate, believed in the conduct of government by a self-perpetuating group at the top of the ladder. That this was the clear line of demarcation -- the fundamental difference of opinion in regard to American institutions is proved by an amazingly interesting letter which Lord Macaulay wrote in 1857 to an American friend.

This friend of his had written a book about Thomas Jefferson. Macaulay said "You are surprised to learn that I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain that I never wrote a line and that I have neveruttered a word indicating an opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society." Macaulay, in other words, was opposed to what we call "popular government."

He went on to say "I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both."

Then, speaking of England, he says "I have not the smallest doubt that, if we had a purely democratic government here, the effect would be the same.....You may think that your country (speaking of America) enjoys an exception from these evils.....I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the old world, and while

that is the case, the Jeffersonian polity may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity. But the time will come when New England will be as thickly peopled as Old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams, and in those Manchesters and Birminghams hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million while another cannot get a full meal." And then Macaulay goes on to tell his American friend how they handled such situations in England. He says "In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here and sometimes a little rioting, but it matters little. For here the sufferers are not the rulers. The Supreme power is in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but selectan educated class a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly the malcontents are firmly yet gently restrained. The bad time

is got over without robbing the wealthy to relieve the indigent.

The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again

and all is tranquility and cheerfulness."

Almost, methinks, I am reading not from Macaulay
but from a resolution of the United States Chamber of Commerce,
the Liberty League, the National Association of Manufacturers
or the editorials written at the behest of some well-known
newspaper proprietors.

Like these gentlemen of 1937, Macaulay in 1857 painted
this gloomy picture of the future of the United States - "I
cannot help foreboding the worst. It is quite plain that your
government will never be able to restrain a distressed and
discontented majority.....The day will come when.....a
multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a
breakfast or expects to have more than half a dinner, will
choose a legislature.....On one side is a statesman preaching
patience, respect for vested rights.....On the other is a
demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists.....and
asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and
to ride in a carriage while thousands of honest folks are in
want of necessities.....I seriously apprehend that you will,

in some such season of adversity.....do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like people who should in a year of scarcity devour all the seed corn and thus make the next year a year, not of scarcity but of absolute famine.....There is nothing to stop you. Your constitution is all sail and no anchor.....Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be.....laid waste by Barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth."

That, my friends, with all due respect to Lord Macaulay, is an excellent representation of the cries of alarm which rise today from the throats of American Lord Macaulays. They tell you that America drifts toward the Scylla of dictatorship on the one hand, or the Charybdis of anarchy on the other. Their anchor for the salvation of the Ship of State is Macaulay's anchor: "Supreme power.....in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select; of an educated class, of a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order."

Mine is a different anchor. They do not believe in democracy -- I do. My anchor is democracy -- and more democracy. And, my friends, I am of the firm belief that the Nation, by an overwhelming majority, supports my opposition to the vesting of supreme power in the hands of any class, numerous but select.

It is of interest to read Macaulay's letter with care -- for I find in it no reference to the improving of the living conditions of the poor, to the encouragement of better homes or greater wages, or steadier work. I find no reference to the averting of panics, no words for the encouragement of the farmer -- nothing at all, in fact, except the suggestion that "malcontents are firmly but gently restrained".....in the interest of the "security of property and the maintenance of order."

I conceive it to be true that I am just as strongly in favor of the security of property and the maintenance of order as Lord Macaulay, or as the American Lord Macaulays who thunder today. And in this the American people are with me, too. But we cannot go along with the Tory insistence that salvation

lies in the vesting of power in the hands of a select class, and that if America does not come to that system, America will perish.

Macaulay condemned the American scheme of government based on popular majority. In this country eighty years later his successors do not yet dare openly to condemn the American form of government by popular majority, for they profess adherence to the form, while, at the same time, their every act shows their opposition to the very fundamentals of democracy. They love to intone praise of liberty, to mouth phrases about the sanctity of our Constitution -- but in their hearts they distrust majority rule because an enlightened majority will not tolerate the abuses which a privileged minority would seek to foist upon the people as a whole.

Since the determination of this minority is to substitute their will for that of the majority, would it not be more honest for them, instead of using the Constitution as a cloak to hide their real designs, to come out frankly and

say: "We agree with Macaulay that the American form of government will lead to disaster and therefore we seek a change in the American form of government as laid down by the Founding Fathers"?

They seek to substitute their own will for that of the majority, for they would serve their own interest above the general welfare. They reject the principle of the greater good for the greater number, which is the cornerstone of democratic government.

Under democratic government the poorest are no longer necessarily the most ignorant part of society. I agree with the saying of one of our famous statesmen who devoted himself to the principle of majority rule: "I respect the aristocracy of learning; I deplore the plutocracy of wealth; but thank God for the democracy of the heart."

I seek no change in the form of American government. Majority rule must be preserved as the safeguard of both liberty and civilization.

Under it property can be secure; under it abuses can end; under it order can be maintained -- and all of this for

the simple, cogent reason that to the average of our citizenship can be brought a life of greater opportunity, of greater security, of greater happiness.

Those worthy hopes led the father and mother of Virginia Dare and the fathers and mothers from many nations through many centuries to seek new life in the New World. Pioneering it was called in the olden days; pioneering it still is -- pioneering for the preservation of our fundamental institutions against the ceaseless attack of those who have no faith in democracy. Fortitude and courage on our part succeed the fortitude and courage of those who planted a colony on this Island in the days of good Queen Bess.

- - - - -

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
delivered at Manteo, Roanoke Island, North Carolina
Wednesday, August 18, 1937; 5:30 P.M.

GOVERNOR HOLT, CONGRESSMAN WARREN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE STATE
OF NORTH CAROLINA AND YOU, THE VISITORS FROM VIRGINIA PLANTATIONS AND
OTHER PLACES:

The thousands of us who are gathered here today are reliving American history and, that being so, I think it is entirely fitting that we should look back for a moment on those three and one-half centuries.

Until comparatively recent years history was taught as a series of facts and dates. Today we are beginning to look more closely into the events (which) that preceded and caused those great social and economic and political changes which (have) deeply affected the (known) history of the world.

For example, most of us older people have learned (of) about Columbus' voyages, and of how America came to be (named) called America -- and then we jumped from there in our North American history to the founding of Jamestown and (of) Plymouth -- all the way from 1492 to 1607 with a mere passing reference to Roanoke and perhaps another passing reference to the voyage of Verazzano along this coast.

But it has always been a pet theory of mine, that I have
not been able to prove yet, that many other voyages of exploration
and of trade took place in that century along our (American) shores.
We know that during the same period the Spaniards to the south of us
were (established) establishing great colonies throughout the West
Indies, at Panama and other points in Central America, and (extended)
extending their cities, their religious institutions and even their

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

This is a transcript made by the White House stenographer from his shorthand.

house stenographer from his shorthand notes taken at the time the speech was made. Underlining indicates words or names added to the original

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.

universities to both the east and west coasts of South America. And so, to me, it is unbelievable that white men did not come scores of times to what is today the Atlantic Seaboard of the United States. Some day perhaps a closer search of the records of the seafaring towns of Britain and France and Flanders and Holland and Scandinavia will rediscover discoverers. Perhaps even it is not too much to hope that documents in the old country and even excavations in the new may throw some further light, however dim, on the fate of the "Lost Colony" and (Roanoke and) Virginia Dare.

If we are to understand the full significance of the early explorations and the early settlements in North America, if we are to understand the kind of world upon which Virginia Dare opened her eyes on that far-away (August) day of August, in 1587, we must ask the question why Western Europe came to (the) this New World.

It was in part because the era was an era of restless action. Under the Renaissance men experienced great awakenings -- they were fired with restless energy to burst the narrow bounds of the medieval conception of (the Universe) a flat world -- to fare forth on voyages of exploration and of conquest.

Many of (those) the people who sailed in immense discomfort, in tiny ships, across the Atlantic, they were adventurers -- some (of them) seeking riches, some seeking fame, and some impelled by the mere spirit of unrest. But most of (them) the people who came in the early days to America -- the men, (the) women and (the) children, came (hither) seeking something (very) different -- they came seeking an opportunity which they could not find in their homes of the old world.

We hear of the gentlemen of title, who, on occasion, came to

the Colonies, and we hear of the gentlemen of wealth who helped to fit out (the) expeditions. But it is a simple fact which cannot too often be stressed that an overwhelming majority of those who came to the Colonies from England and Scotland and Ireland and Wales and France and Holland and Sweden and Germany, they belonged to what our British cousins would, even today, call "the lower middle classes." (Applause) The opportunity they sought was something they did not have at home -- opportunity freely to exercise their own chosen form of religion, opportunity to get into an environment where there were no classes, opportunity to escape from a system which still contained most of the elements of Feudalism.

This is said not in derogation of those pioneers. It is rather in praise of them. They had the courage, physically and mentally, by deed and word, to seek better things, to try to capture ideals and hopes that were forbidden to them by the laws and rulers of their own home lands.

And it is well, too, (that we) to bear in mind that in all the pioneer settlements democracy and not feudalism was the rule. The men had to take their turn standing guard at the stockades raised against the Indians. The women had to take their turn husking corn stored for the winter supply of the community. In other words, they were all working for the life and success of the community. Rules of conduct had to be established to keep private greed or personal misconduct in check. And I fear very much that if certain modern Americans, who protest loudly their devotion to American ideals, were suddenly to be given a comprehensive view of the earliest American colonists and their methods of life and government, these modern Americans

(they) would promptly label them socialists. They would forget that in these pioneer settlements were all the germs of the later American Constitution.

They would forget, too, that although in the days that intervened between Roanoke and Jamestown and Plymouth, and the time of the American Revolution itself, practical democracy was carried on in the lives of the inhabitants of nearly every community in the Thirteen Colonies. It is true that as commerce developed in the seaboard cities, and as a few great landed estates were set up here and there, a school of thought parallel with the same school of thought in England made great headway.

It was this policy which came into the open in the Constitutional Convention of 1787; for remember that in that Convention there were some who wanted a King, there were some who wanted to create titles, and there were many, like Alexander Hamilton, who sincerely believed, honestly believed, that suffrage and the right to hold office should be confined to persons of property and persons of education. We know, however, that although (this) that school of thought persisted, with the assistance of the newspapers of the day, during the first three National Administrations, it was eliminated (for many years at least), destroyed under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson and his successors. (His) And so history tells us and we have proved that Thomas Jefferson's was the first great battle for the preservation of democracy. His was the first great victory for American democracy.

And in (the) that half century that followed there was constant war between those who, like Andrew Jackson, believed in a

democracy conducted by and for a complete cross section of the population and, on the other hand, those who, like the private Directors of the Bank of the United States and their friends in the United States Senate, believed in the conduct of Government by a self-perpetuating group at the top of the ladder. (Applause) That this was the clear line of demarcation -- the fundamental difference of opinion in regard to American institutions is proved by an amazingly interesting letter which the great historian, Lord Macaulay, wrote eighty years ago, in 1857, to an American friend.

This American friend of his had written a book about Thomas Jefferson, and Macaulay (said) wrote him this:

"You are surprised to learn that I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain that I never wrote a line and that I have never uttered a word indicating an opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society."

Macaulay, in other words, was opposed to what (we) you and I call "popular government."

And he went on to say this:

"I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both."

And then, speaking of England, he (says) went on to say:

"I have not the smallest doubt that, if we had a

purely democratic government here, the effect would be the same You may think that your country (speaking of America) enjoys an exception from these evils I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you (in America) have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the old world, and while that is the case, the Jeffersonian polity may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity."

He wanted to be kind.

"But the time will come when New England will be as thickly (peopled) populated as Old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams, and in those Manchesters and Birminghams hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million while another cannot get a full meal."

And then Macaulay goes on to tell his American friend how they handled such situations in England. He says this:

"In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here and

sometimes a little rioting, but it matters little. For here the sufferers are not the rulers. The supreme power is in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select an educated class a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly the malcontents are firmly yet gently restrained. The bad time is got over without robbing the wealthy to relieve the indigent. The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again and all is tranquility and cheerfulness."

Almost, methinks, I am not reading (not) from Macaulay (but) almost, methinks, I am quoting from a resolution of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Liberty League, the National Association of Manufacturers or the editorials written at the behest of some well-known newspaper proprietors in 1936 and 1937. (Applause)

Yes, like these gentlemen of 1936 and (19)37, Macaulay in 1857, eighty years before, painted (this) that gloomy picture of the future of the United States - he goes on to say this:

"I cannot help foreboding the worst. It is quite plain that your government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority"

Get that -- restrain a majority!

"The day will come to us when a multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a legislature On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights

On the other is a demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in a carriage while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessities I seriously apprehend,"

says Macaulay,

"that you will, in some such season of adversity do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like people who should in a year of scarcity devour all the seed corn and thus make the next year a year, not of scarcity but of absolute famine There is nothing to stop you. Your constitution is all sail and no anchor Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be laid waste by Barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth."

That, my friends, with all due respect to Lord Macaulay, is an excellent representation of the cries of alarm which rise today from the throats of American Lord Macaulays. (Applause) They tell you that America drifts toward the Scylla of dictatorship on the one hand, or the Charybdis of anarchy on the other. Their anchor for the salvation of the Ship of State is Macaulay's anchor: "Supreme power in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select; of an educated class, of a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order."

Mine is a different anchor. (Applause) They do not believe

in democracy -- I do. (Applause) My anchor is democracy -- and more democracy. And, my friends, I am of the firm belief that (the) this Nation of ours, by an overwhelming majority, supports my opposition to the vesting of supreme power in the hands of any class, numerous but select.

It is of interest to read the whole of this letter of Macaulay's (letter) with care -- for I find in it no single reference to the improving of the living conditions of the poor, to the encouragement of better homes or greater wages, or steadier work. I find no reference to the averting of panics, no words for the encouragement of the farmer -- nothing at all, in fact, except the suggestion that "malcontents are firmly but gently restrained" in the interest of the "security of property and the maintenance of order."

I conceive it to be true that I am just as strongly in favor of the security of property and the maintenance of order as Lord Macaulay or as the American Lord Macauleys who thunder today. And in this the American people are with me, too. But we cannot go along with the Tory insistence that salvation of the Nation lies in the vesting of power in the hands of a select class, and that if America does not come to that system, America will perish.

Macaulay condemned the American scheme of government based on popular majority. And in this country eighty years later his successors do not yet dare openly to condemn the American form of government by popular majority, for they profess adherence to the form, (while) but, at the same time, their every act shows their opposition to the very fundamentals of democracy. They love to intone praise of liberty, to mouth phrases about the sanctity of our Constitution --

but in their hearts they distrust majority rule because an enlightened majority will not tolerate (the) abuses which a privileged minority would seek to foist upon the people as a whole.

And since the determination of (this) many who compose this minority is to substitute their will for that of the majority, would it not be more honorable, more honest for them, instead of using the Constitution of the United States as a cloak to hide their real designs, to come out frankly and say: "We agree with Macaulay that the American form of government will lead to disaster and therefore we seek a change in the American form of government as laid down by the Founding Fathers?"

Yes, they seek to substitute their own will for that of the majority, for they would serve their own interest above the general welfare. They reject the principle of the greater good for the greater number, which is the cornerstone of democratic American government.

And an interesting thing has happened under this form of democratic government. (Under democratic government) Under it the poorest are no longer necessarily the most ignorant part of society, and thank God for that. I agree with the saying of one of our famous statesmen who devoted (himself) his whole life to the principle of majority rule, when he said:

"I respect the aristocracy of learning; I deplore the plutocracy of wealth; but I thank God for the democracy of the heart."

I seek, you seek no change in the form of American government. Majority rule must be preserved as the safeguard of both lib-

erty and civilization.

Under it property can be secure; under it abuses can end; under it order can be maintained -- and all of this for the simple, cogent reason that to the average of our citizenship can be brought, and I believe will be brought, a life of greater opportunity, of greater security, and of greater happiness.

Those worthy hopes led the father and mother of Virginia Dare, three and a half centuries ago, to come to the New World, (and the) and those hopes have led fathers and mothers from many nations, through many centuries to seek new life in the New World. Pioneer-ing it was called in the olden days; and pioneering it still is -- pioneering for the preservation of our fundamental institutions against the ceaseless attack of those who have no faith in democracy. Fortitude and courage on our part succeed today the fortitude and courage of those who planted a colony on this spot, on this Island in the days of good Queen Bess (Applause)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
delivered at Manteo, Roanoke Island, North Carolina
Wednesday, August 15, 1937, 3:30 P.M.

GOVERNOR HOLT, Congressman WARREN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE STATE
OF NORTH CAROLINA AND YOU, VISITORS FROM VIRGINIA PLANTATIONS AND
OTHER PLACES:

The thousands of us who are gathered here today are reliving
American history, and, that being so, I think it is entirely fitting
that we should look back for a moment on those three and one-half
centuries.

STATEMENTS FILE
Shorthand By Kanneer

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

FOR THE PRESS

August 17, 1937.

This address of the President, to be delivered at Manteo, on Roanoke Island, North Carolina, tomorrow, WEDNESDAY, August 18, (EIGHTEENTH) is released for publication in editions of all newspapers appearing on the streets NOT EARLIER THAN 3:30 o'clock P.M., Eastern Standard Time.

NOTE: Please safeguard against premature release.

STEPHEN EARLY
Secretary to the President

(think) that Until recent years history was taught as a series of facts and dates. Today we are beginning to look more closely into the events which preceded those great social and economic and political changes which have deeply affected the ~~known~~ history of the world.

For example, most of us older people learned of Columbus' voyages, of how America came to be ~~new~~ — and we jumped from there in our North American history to the founding of Jamestown and of Plymouth — 1492 to 1607 with here passing reference to Roanoke and perhaps to the voyage of ~~Juan Rodriguez~~ ^(name) ~~Cavazquez~~ ^(name) called Amerigo ^(name) ~~all the way down~~.

another passing reference to the ^{to the North West} ^{and so to me} ^{I have not been able to principles that} It has always been a pet theory of mine, that many other voyages of exploration and of trade took place in that century along our American shores. We know that during the same period the Spaniards established their colonies throughout the West Indies, at Panama and other points in Central America, and extended their cities, their religious institutions and even their universities to both the east and west coasts of South America. It is unbelievable that while men did not come scores of times to what is today the Atlantic Seaboard of the United States. Some day perhaps a closer search of the records of the seafaring towns of Britain and France and Flanders and Holland and Scandinavia will rediscover discoverers. Perhaps even it is not too much to hope that documents in the old country and excavations in the now may throw some further light, however dim, on the fate of the "Lost Colony" and Roanoke and (Roanoke and) Virginia Dare.

If we are to understand the full significance of the early explorations and the early settlements, if we are to understand the kind of world upon which Virginia Dare opened her eyes on that far-away August day in 1587, we must ask why Western Europe came to the New World.

It was in part because the era was an era of restless action. Under the Renaissance man experienced great awakenings — they were fired with restless energy to burst the narrow bounds of the medieval conception of the Universe — to fare forth on voyages of exploration and conquest.

Many of ~~them~~ ^(the people) who in instant discomfort, in tiny ships, across the Atlantic, with adventurers — some of them seeking riches, some seeking fame, were impelled by the mere spirit of unrest. But most of ~~them~~ ^(the men, the women and the children, came either) seeking something very different — seeking an opportunity which they could not find in their homes of the old world.

(they came)
(they came)
(they came)
(they came)

We hear of the gentlemen of title, who, on occasions, came to the Colonies, and we hear of the gentlemen of wealth ~~who~~ helped to fit out ~~the~~ expeditions. But it is a simple fact which cannot too often be stressed that an overwhelming majority of those who came to the Colonies from England and Scotland and Ireland and Wales and France and Holland and Sweden belonged to what our British cousins would, even today, call "the lower middle classes." The opportunity they sought was something they did not have at home — opportunity freely to exercise their own chosen form of religion, opportunity to get into an environment where there were no classes, opportunity to escape from a system which still contained most of the elements of Feudalism.

This is not in derogation of those pioneers. It is rather in praise of them. They had the courage, physically and mentally, by deed and word, to seek better things, to try to capture ideals and hopes forbidden to them by the laws and rulers of their own home lands.

It is well, too, that we bear in mind that in all the pioneer settlements democracy and not feudalism was the rule. The men had to take their turn standing guard at the stockades raised against the Indians. The women had to take their turn husking corn stored for the winter supply of the community. Rules of conduct had to be established to keep private greed or personal misconduct in check. ~~I fear very much that if certain modern Americans, who protest loudly their devotion to American ideals, were suddenly to be given a comprehensive view of the earliest American colonists and their methods of life and government, they would promptly label them socialists.~~ They would forget that in these pioneer settlements were all the germs of the later American Constitution.

They would forget, too, that although in the days that intervened between Roanoke and Jamestown and Plymouth, and the time of the American Revolution itself, practical democracy was carried on in the lives of the inhabitants of nearly every community in the Thirteen Colonies. It is true that as commerce developed in the seaboard cities, and as a few great landed estates were set up here and there, a school of thought parallel with the same school of thought in England made great headway.

It was this policy which came into the open in the Constitutional Convention of 1787; for in that Convention there were some who wanted a King, there were some who wanted to create titles, and there were many, like Alexander Hamilton, who sincerely believed that suffrage and the right to hold office should be confined to persons of property and persons of education. We know, however, that although this school persisted, with the assistance of the newspapers of the day, during the first three National Administrations, it was eliminated for many years at least, under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson and his successors. ~~This was the first great battle for the preservation of democracy.~~ This was the first great victory for American democracy.

~~destroyed~~ destroyed thoroughly believed

thought

(History) and as history tells me and we have learned that Thomas Jefferson

Good (he) that
In the half century that followed there was constant war between those who, like Andrew Jackson, believed in a democracy conducted by and for a complete cross-section of the population, and those who, like the ~~Directors~~ of the Bank of the United States and their friends in the United States Senate, believed in the conduct of government by a self-perpetuating group at the top of the ladder. That this was the clear line of demarcation -- the fundamental difference of opinion in regard to American institutions is proved by an amazingly interesting letter which Lord Macaulay wrote in 1837, to an American friend.

This friend of his had written a book about Thomas Jefferson.
Macaulay said: You are surprised to learn that I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain that I never wrote a line and that I have never uttered a word indicating an opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society." Macaulay, in other words, was opposed to what we call "popular government."

He went on to say:
He went on to say: "I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both."

(in America)
What
He added:
Then, speaking of England, he says: "I have not the smallest doubt that, if we had a purely democratic government here, the effect would be the same..... You may think that your country (speaking of America) enjoys an exception from these evils I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the old world, and while that is the case, the Jeffersonian polity may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity." But the time will come when New England will be as thickly populated as Old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Liverpools, and in those Manchesters and Liverpools hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million while another cannot get a full meal." And then Macaulay goes on to tell his American friend how they handled such situations in England. He says: "In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here and sometimes a little rioting, but it matters little. For here the sufferers are not the rulers. The Supreme power is in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select an educated class a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly the malcontents are firmly yet gently restrained. The bad time is got over without robbing the wealthy to relieve the indigent. The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again and all is tranquility and cheerfulness."

Almost, methinks, I am reading ~~not~~ (not) from Macaulay but from a resolution of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Liberty League, the National Association of Manufacturers or the editorials written at the behest of some well-known newspaper proprietors. 1937

20 (c)
(not) almost, but
finest I am
writing

1936 and 1937
(Opposite)

written to me then:

1861

July 4th year past

Also those gentlemen of 1837, Moncley in 1851 painted state that that
bloody picture of the future of the United States - "I cannot help
foreseeing the worst. It is quite plain that your government will
never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority....."
"The day will come when..... a multitude of people, none of whom has had
more than half a breakfast or expects to have more than half a dinner,
will choose a legislature..... On one side is a statesman preaching
petitions, respect for voted rights..... On the other is a
dangerous ranting about the tyranny of capitalistic..... and asking
why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in a
carriage while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessaries.....
I seriously apprehend what you will, in some such season of adversity.....
..... do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that
you will not like people who should in a year of scarcity devote all
the good corn and thus make the next year a year, not of scarcity but
of absolute famine..... There is nothing to stop you. Your constitu-
tion is all sail and no anchor..... Either soon Czar or Napoleon will
seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will
be..... laid waste by Barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman
Empire was in the fifth."

That, my friends, with all due respect to Lord Moncley, is an
excellent representation of the crisis of alarm which rises from the
threat of American Lord Moncley. They tell you that America drifts
toward the sofa of dictatorship on the one hand, or the Charabid of
anarchy on the other. Their advisor for the anarchy of the ship of
State is Macaulay's anchor, "Supreme power..... in the hands of a class,
numerous indeed, but select; of an educated class, or a class which is,
and keeps itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property,
and the maintenance of order."

Man is a different animal. They do not believe in democracy -
I do. My anchor is democratic and more dignified. And, my friends, I
am of the firm belief that the overwhelming majority
supports my opposition to the vesting of supreme power in the hands of
any class, numerous but select.

It is of interest to read Macaulay's lecture, which sure - for
the poor, to the improvement of the living conditions of
stapler work. I find no reference to the averting of famine, no words
for the disengagement of the farmer - nothing at all, in fact, except
the suggestion that "landlords are firmly but gently restrained".....
in the interest of the "security of property and the maintenance of
order."

I confess it to be true that I am just as strongly in favor
of the security of property and the maintenance of order as Lord Moncley,
or as the American Lord Macaulay who thunder today. And in this the
American people are with me, too. But we cannot go along with the Tory
insistencies that sympathies in the vesting of power in the hands of a
select class, and that if America does not come to that system, America
will perish.

J. H. Wm

Usually condemned the American scheme of government based on
popular majority. This country eighty years later his supporters do
not yet dare openly to condemn the American form of government by popular
majority, for they profess adherence to the form, while at the same time,
their every act shows their opposition to the very fundamentals of democracy.
They love to listen prattle of liberty, to mouth phrases about the sanctity
of our Constitution - but in their hearts, they distrust minority rule because
an enlightened majority will not tolerate abuses which a privileged
minority would seek to foist upon the people as a whole.

(This) many who approve this
is

more honorable

and

Since the determination of this minority is to substitute their will for that of the majority, would it not be more honest for them, instead of using the Constitution ~~and a slogan to this:~~ hide their real designs, to come out frankly and say "We agree with Nassauy that the American form of government will lead to disaster and therefore we seek a change in the American form of government as laid down by the Founding Fathers?"

yes,

They seek to substitute their own will for that of the majority, for they would serve their own interest above the general welfare. They reject the principle of the greater good for the greater number, which is the cornerstone of democratic government.

American

Guide an interest
thing has happened
under this plan of
democratic government
ment. Under
democratic government
under its

Under democratic government the poorest are no longer necessarily the most ignorant part of society. I agree with the saying of one of our famous statesmen who devoted himself to the principle of majority rule, "I respect the aristocracy of learning; I deplore the plutocracy of wealth; but thank God for the democracy of the heart." *when he said:*

I seek no change in the form of American government. Majority rule must be preserved as the safeguard of both liberty and civilization.

Under it property can be secure; under it abuses can end; under it order can be maintained -- and all of this for the simple, cogent reason that to the average of our citizenship can be brought a life of greater opportunity, of greater security, of greater happiness.

These worthy hopes led the father and mother of Virginia Dare and the fathers and mothers from many nations through many centuries to seek new life in the New World. Pioneering it was called in the olden days; pioneering it still is -- pioneering for the preservation of our fundamental institutions against the ceaseless attack of those who have no faith in democracy. Fortitude and courage on our part succeed the fortitude and courage of those who planted a colony on this Island in the days of good Queen Bess. *(Applause)*

three and a half
centuries ago
to come to the New
World, (and the)
and those before
have left?

spot on this

M (himself) his
whole life

?

end

1186 - 4-2-520
1191 - 7-2-77
411 - 5-3-2-714
211 - 8-2-4

My very ~ / but not ~ & the
scars ~ & the scars ~ &
the ~

21 Aug 1974

卷之三

جواب کے لئے

Fig. 1 - 3, 3

Engrich

PL-2-2
BB 1110-1

CKR 11-11
CSD 11-11

Aug 19

37.4 cm.

John C. H.

Oct 22

• Pick up gear

16.4 W. 2

cinammon

in Ridge

卷之八

$\mathcal{C}Rm \in (-1) \mathbb{P}$

con-^{tra}-gua-ge-fac-tu-

1966-1970

⑦ ۲۲ - ۱ ۰
۰۰ ۹۸ ۶ (۶۳ ۱۸)
۶۰ ۰۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰
۰۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰
۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰

1. 1900
2. 1901
3. 1902
4. 1903
5. 1904
6. 1905
7. 1906
8. 1907
9. 1908
10. 1909
11. 1910
12. 1911
13. 1912
14. 1913
15. 1914
16. 1915
17. 1916
18. 1917
19. 1918
20. 1919
21. 1920
22. 1921
23. 1922
24. 1923
25. 1924
26. 1925
27. 1926
28. 1927
29. 1928
30. 1929
31. 1930
32. 1931
33. 1932
34. 1933
35. 1934
36. 1935
37. 1936
38. 1937
39. 1938
40. 1939
41. 1940
42. 1941
43. 1942
44. 1943
45. 1944
46. 1945
47. 1946
48. 1947
49. 1948
50. 1949
51. 1950
52. 1951
53. 1952
54. 1953
55. 1954
56. 1955
57. 1956
58. 1957
59. 1958
60. 1959
61. 1960
62. 1961
63. 1962
64. 1963
65. 1964
66. 1965
67. 1966
68. 1967
69. 1968
70. 1969
71. 1970
72. 1971
73. 1972
74. 1973
75. 1974
76. 1975
77. 1976
78. 1977
79. 1978
80. 1979
81. 1980
82. 1981
83. 1982
84. 1983
85. 1984
86. 1985
87. 1986
88. 1987
89. 1988
90. 1989
91. 1990
92. 1991
93. 1992
94. 1993
95. 1994
96. 1995
97. 1996
98. 1997
99. 1998
100. 1999