
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. 1250

1939 October 26

Radio Address to the Herald Tribune Forum

RADIO ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
TO THE HERALD TRIBUNE FORUM
OCTOBER 26, 1939

I am glad to say a word in this forum because I heartily approve the forum idea. After all, two eighteenth century forums in Philadelphia gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It is the magic of radio that has so greatly increased the usefulness of the forum. Radio listeners have learned to discriminate over the air between the honest advocate who relies on truth and logic and the more dramatic speaker who is clever in appealing to the passions and prejudices of his listeners.

We have had an example of objective reporting during recent weeks in the presentation of international subjects, both in the press and the radio. Right here I should like to throw bouquets to the majority of the press and the radio.

Through a period of grave anxiety both have tried to discriminate between fact and propaganda and unfounded rumor and to give their readers and listeners an unbiased and factual chronicle of developments. This has worked so well in international reporting that one may be pardoned for wishing for more of it in the field of domestic news. It is a good rule in one, why is it not a good rule in the other?

From the end of the World War onwards this country, like many others, went through a phase of having large groups of people carried away by some emotion -- some alluring, attractive, even speciously inspiring, public presentation of a nostrum. Many Americans lost their heads because several plausible fellows lost theirs in expounding schemes to end barbarity, to give weekly handouts, to give everybody a better job -- or, more modestly, to put a chicken or two in every pot -- all by adoption of some new financial plan or some new social system. And they all burst like bubbles.

Some proponents of nostrums were honest and sincere -- others, too many of them, were seekers of personal power; still others saw a chance to get rich on the dimes and quarters of the poor. All of them, perhaps unconsciously, were capitalizing the fact that the democratic form of government works slowly, that there always exists in a democratic society a large group which champs at the bit over the slowness of democracy. That is why it is right for us who believe in democracy to keep the democratic processes progressive -- moving forward with the advances in civilization. That is why it is dangerous for democracy to stop moving forward because any period of stagnation increases the numbers of those who demand action and action now.

There are, therefore, two distinct dangers to democracy -- the peril from those who seek the fulfillment of ideals at a pace too fast for the machinery of the modern body politic to function -- people who by insistence on too great speed foster an oligarchic form of government such as Communism, or Nazism or Fascism.

The other group, which presents an equal danger, is composed of that small minority which complains that the democratic processes are inefficient as well as being slow, people who would have the whole of government put into the hands of a little group of those who have proved their efficiency in lines of specialized science or specialized private business. They equally, and in most cases unconsciously too, are in effect advocating the oligarchic form of government -- Communism or Nazism or Fascism.

Extreme Rightists and extreme Leftists should not be taken out by us and shot against the wall, for they sharpen the argument and make us realize the value of the democratic middle course -- especially if that middle course, in order to keep up with the times, is "just a little bit left of center".

I am reminded of four definitions:
A Radical is a man with both feet firmly planted -- in the air.

A Conservative is a man with two perfectly good legs who, however, has never learned to walk.

A Reactionary is a somnambulist walking backwards.

A Liberal is a man who uses his legs and his hands at the behest of his head.

It has been a good thing that during the past twenty years we have seen the effect of organized propaganda even when it has been based on nostrums or prejudices.

It has been a good thing for the country that the Congress of the United States has been deluged from time to time by organized propaganda. Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate begin to discriminate nowadays between honest spontaneous, unsolicited expressions of opinion on the part of voters and the propaganda type of mass appeals.

Because the country is so profoundly interested in the world situation today I do want to leave with you one thought bearing on international relations. I make bold to do this because the topic of this evening's discussion,

as I understand it, is "The War's Challenge to the United States".

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogey man. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any state government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake.

I have not the slightest objection to make against the amateurs who, to the reading and listening public, discourse on the inner meanings of the military and naval events of the war in Europe. They do no harm because the average citizen

is acquiring the gift of discrimination -- and the more all of these subjects are talked about by amateur armchair strategists the more the public will make up its own mind in the long run. The public will acquire the ability to think things through for themselves.

The fact of the international situation -- the simple fact, without any bogey in it, without any appeals to prejudice -- is that the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war. That we can be neutral in thought as well as in act is, as I have said before, impossible of fulfillment because again, the people of this country, thinking things through calmly and without prejudice, have been and are making up their minds about relative merits of current events on other continents.

It is a fact increasingly manifest that presentation of real news has sharpened the minds and the judgment of men and women everywhere in these days of real public discussion --

and we Americans begin to know the difference between the truth on the one side and the falsehood on the other, no matter how often the falsehood is iterated and reiterated. Repetition does not transform a lie into a truth.

Franklin Roosevelt

The orig. reading copy

INTRODUCTION OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT TONIGHT WILL BE AS FOLLOWS--
"AND NOW WE COME TO THE CLIMAX AND FINAL SPEECH OF OUR PROGRAM.
EXTREMISTS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY ARE APT TO BELIEVE THAT THE NEW YORK
HERALD TRIBUNE NEVER SAYS A FRIENDLY WORD ABOUT OUR CHIEF EXECUTIVE.
EXTREMISTS AMONG REPUBLICANS ARE CONVINCED THAT WE PUBLISH A DEMOCRATIC
PAPER. THE MIDDLE GROUND IS IN BETWEEN WHERE DIFFERENCES AND AGREEMENTS
OF OPINION BOTH EXIST. IN THE CURRENT PROBLEM BEFORE CONGRESS AND
THE COUNTRY AS TO LIFTING THE EMBARGO THERE HAS BEEN NO MIDDLE GROUND.
WE AGREE WHOLEHEARTEDLY WITH THE PRESIDENT'S POSITION AND HAVE GIVEN
HIM OUR UTMOST SUPPORT IN CLARIFYING THE ISSUE AND AIMING TO CONVINCE
THE PUBLIC THAT ENDING THE EMBARGO WILL PROVE A KEYSTONE IN THIS
COUNTRY'S DETERMINED EFFORT TO STAY OUT OF WAR. I HAVE THE HONOR
TO PRESENT TO YOU IN A BROADCAST FROM THE WHITE HOUSE THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES".

FOR YOUR INFORMATION FOLLOWING HIS TALK MRS. REID WILL ACKNOWLEDGE AS
FOLLOWS:

"IN THANKING OUR CHIEF EXECUTIVE FOR THE SPEECH WHICH WE HAVE JUST LISTENED
TO I WANT OUR ENTIRE AUDIENCE BOTH YOU WHO ARE ASSEMBLED HERE AND YOU WHO
ARE LISTENING IN ON THE RADIO TO KNOW OF THE HELPFUL COOPERATION WHICH HE
HAS GIVEN IN PLANNING THE FORUM PROGRAM. IT WAS ONLY WITH HIS AID THAT WE
COULD HAVE THE PRESENTATION BY SOME OF HIS CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF ADMINISTRATION
THINKING, AN ESSENTIAL OF COURSE FOR GIVING YOU A COMPLETE PICTURE OF
CURRENT PROBLEMS. I EXTEND TO HIM FOR MYSELF FOR THE PAPER WHICH I
REPRESENT AND FOR THE FORUM OUR DEEPEST GRATEFULNESS".

#1250

Miss Le Hand

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

October 26, 1939

The following address of the President, to be broadcast from the White House to the New York Herald Tribune Forum, is for release in editions of all newspapers appearing on the streets NOT EARLIER than 11:00 P.M., E. S. T., October 26, 1939.

PLEASE SAFEGUARD AGAINST PREMATURE RELEASE.

STEPHEN EARLY
Secretary to the President

I am glad to say a word in this forum because I heartily approve the forum idea. After all, two eighteenth century forums in Philadelphia gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It is the magic of radio that has so greatly increased the usefulness of the forum. Radio listeners have learned to discriminate over the air between the honest advocate who relies on truth and logic and the more dramatic speaker who is clever in appealing to the passions and prejudices of his listeners.

We have had an example of objective reporting during recent weeks in the presentation of international subjects, both in the press and the radio. Right here I should like to throw bouquets to the majority of the press and the radio. Through a period of grave anxiety both have tried to discriminate between fact and propaganda and unfounded rumor and to give their readers and listeners an unbiased and factual chronicle of developments. This has worked so well in international reporting that one may be pardoned for wishing for more of it in the field of domestic news. If it is a good rule in one, why is it not a good rule in the other?

From the end of the World War onwards this country, like many others, went through a phase of having large groups of people carried away by some emotion — some alluring, attractive, even speciously inspiring, public presentation of a nostrum. Many Americans lost their heads because several plausible fellows lost theirs in expounding schemes to end barbarity, to give weekly hand-outs, to give everybody a better job — or, more modestly, to put a chicken or two in every pot — all by adoption of some new financial plan or some new social system. And they all burst like bubbles.

Some proponents of nostrums were honest and sincere — others, too many of them, were seekers of personal power; still others saw a chance to get rich on the dimes and quarters of the poor. All of them, perhaps unconsciously, were capitalizing the fact that the democratic form of government works slowly, that there always exists in a democratic society a large group which champs at the bit over the slowness of democracy. That is why it is right for us who believe in democracy to keep the democratic processes progressive — moving forward with the advances in civilization. That is why it is dangerous for democracy to stop moving forward because any period of stagnation increases the numbers of those who demand action and action now.

There are, therefore, two distinct dangers to democracy -- the peril from those who seek the fulfillment of ideals at a pace too fast for the machinery of the modern body politic to function -- people who by insistence on too great speed foster an oligarchic form of government such as Communism, or Nazism or Fascism.

The other group, which presents an equal danger, is composed of that small minority which complains that the democratic processes are inefficient as well as being slow, people who would have the whole of government put into the hands of a little group of those who have proved their efficiency in lines of specialized science or specialized private business. They equally, and in most cases unconsciously too, are in effect advocating the oligarchic form of government -- Communism or Nazism or Fascism.

Extreme Rightists and extreme Leftists should not be taken out by us and shot against the wall, for they sharpen the argument and make us realize the value of the democratic middle course -- especially if that middle course, in order to keep up with the times, is "just a little bit left of center."

I am reminded of four definitions:

A Radical is a man with both feet firmly planted -- in the air.

A Conservative is a man with two perfectly good legs who, however, has never learned to walk.

A Reactionary is a nonambulist walking backwards.

A Liberal is a man who uses his legs and his hands at the behest of his head.

It has been a good thing that during the past twenty years we have seen the effect of organized propaganda even when it has been based on nostrums or prejudices.

It has been a good thing for the country that the Congress of the United States has been deluged from time to time by organized propaganda. Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate begin to discriminate nowadays between honest spontaneous, unsolicited expressions of opinion on the part of voters and the propaganda type of mass appeals.

Because the country is so profoundly interested in the world situation today I do want to leave with you one thought bearing on international relations. I make bold to do this because the topic of this evening's discussion, as I understand it, is "The War's Challenge to the United States".

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogey man. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any state government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake.

I have not the slightest objection to make against the amateurs who, to the reading and listening public, discourse on the inner meanings of the military and naval events of the war in Europe. They do no harm because the average citizen is acquiring the gift of discrimination -- and the more all of these subjects are talked about by amateur armchair strategists the more the public will make up its own mind in the long run. The public will acquire the ability to think things through for themselves.

The fact of the international situation -- the simple fact, without any bogey in it, without any appeals to prejudice -- is that the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war. That we can be neutral in thought as well as in act is, as I have said before, impossible of fulfillment because again, the people of this country, thinking things through calmly and without prejudices, have been and are making up their minds about relative merits of current events on other continents.

It is a fact increasingly manifest that presentation of real news has sharpened the minds and the judgment of men and women everywhere in these days of real public discussion -- and we Americans begin to know the difference between the truth on the one side and the falsehood on the other, no matter how often the falsehood is iterated and reiterated. Repetition does not transform a lie into a truth.

FIRST DRAFT

RADIO ADDRESS TO HERALD TRIBUNE FORUM
OCTOBER 26, 1939.

The general thought that the Herald-Tribune Forum and every one of similar forums in the United States is useful and because of their existence in the past we are better able as citizens to understand what existing world conditions actually mean. (Note: A dirty dig along this line.)

In the average forum, whether conducted on the speech or the debate method, the audience present, and those present on the radio, learn an absolutely essential lesson -- how to discriminate between the poor speaker who in a simple way states logical facts without appeal to passion and without exaggeration and on the other side an expert speaker who appeals to passions and prejudices and tries to carry his audience with him into believing that false facts are true facts and glosses over the untenable aspects of his subject.

In other words, the reading and listening public in these days of real public discussions are acquiring a better discrimination than they have ever before had.

In this the press and the radio, especially recently, are contributing to the presentation of both sides of international subjects in a way which would serve as a model for future presentations of domestic subjects. (Take a good shot in example). Since the end of the World War this country like many others went through a phase -- a phase of having large groups of people carried away by some emotion -- some attractive, even inspiring, public presentation of a nostrum.

This is proved that there were millions of people in the United States who would believe the lurid description of the ^{Cure} carry-all that was presented to them either over the radio or through intensively organized propaganda. Many of us went wild over several of our fellow citizens who were going to end barbarity, take care of the aged, give everybody an immediate and a permanent job at higher salary than that ever received

before -- all by adoption of some new financial plan or some new social system. It was a good thing that this happened. It has been a good thing for the country that the Congress of the United States has been deluged from time to time by organized and letter-sending campaigns.

The Congress itself has learned the lesson. It begins to discriminate between unsolicited expressions of opinion on the part of the voters and the propaganda types -- (that means a little development, the President says) and the voters themselves are beginning to discriminate between quiet arguments that stick to facts -- whether the arguments take place in the Congress, in the press, or over the radio or in the forums -- on the one side and arguments that do not confine themselves to facts but seek either to sell a nostrum or scare the country half to death by setting up imaginary bogey men. It is only because the whole country is interested in the world situation today that I take an expression from the field of international relations. In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battle fields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fake arguments in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginative (pick up from Grace Tally)

3

CONTINUATION OF PARAGRAPH

It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogey man for the simple reason that no person in any responsible place in the National Administration in Washington or in any State government or in any City government or in any County government has ever suggested in any shape, manner or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American Mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe.

I have not the slightest objection to the amateurs who to the reading and listening public discourse on the inner meanings of the military and naval events of the war in Europe. I have not the slightest objection to the armchair strategists that exist in every community throughout the land. They do no harm because the average citizen has, again, acquired the gift of discrimination -- and the more all of these subjects are talked about by amateurs the more the public will make up its own mind in the long run. The public will acquire the ability to think things through for themselves.

The fact of the international situation -- the simple fact, without any bogey in it, without any appeals to prejudice, is that the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war. That we can be neutral in thought as well as in act is, as I have said before, impossible of fulfillment because again the people of this country, thinking things through calmly and without prejudice, have been and still are making up their minds about the relative merits of current events on other Continents.

Second Draft

I am glad to say a word in this forum because I heartily approve the forum idea. After all, two eighteenth century forums in Philadelphia gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. ~~Very, the fruits of forums have been rich and plentiful.~~

sognathly increased the influence of the
It is the magic of radio that has ~~made~~ ^{so greatly increased the} forums, ~~widely called, sometimes, the town meeting of the air.~~ Radio listeners, ~~have~~, have learned to discriminate over the air between the honest advocate who relies on truth and logic and the more dramatic speaker who is clever in appealing to the passions and prejudices of his listeners.

We have had an example of objective reporting during recent weeks in the presentation of international subjects, both in the press and ~~by means of~~ the radio. ~~These discussions have contributed mightily to the development of increasingly efficient standards of discrimination~~
~~on the part of the reader or the listener.~~ Right here I should like to throw bouquets to the press and ~~to~~ the radio. Through a period of grave anxiety both have discriminated between fact and propaganda and unfounded rumor and ~~never~~ ^{they} give~~s~~ their readers and listeners an unbiased and factual chronicle of developments. This has worked so well in international reporting that one may be pardoned for wishing for more of it in the field of domestic news. *If it is a good idea we can do it if we want to do it.*

From the end of the World War onwards this country, like many others, went through a phase of having large groups of people carried away by some emotion -- some alluring, attractive, even inspiring, public presentation of a nostrum. Many ~~of us~~ lost ^{their} heads because several plausible fellows ~~obviously~~ lost theirs in expounding schemes to and

INSERT A Page 2

Some proponents of nostrums were honest and sincere -- others, too many of them, were seekers of personal power; still others saw a chance to get rich on the dimes and quarters of the poor. All of them, perhaps unconsciously, were capitalizing the fact that the democratic form of government works slowly, that there always exists ~~a large group in a democratic~~ society which champs at the bit over the slowness of democracy. That is why it is right for us who believe in democracy to keep the democratic processes progressive -- moving forward with the advances in civilization. That is why it is dangerous for democracy to stop moving forward because any period of stagnation increases the numbers of those who demand action and action now.

There are, therefore, two distinct dangers to democracy -- the peril from those who seek the fulfilment of ideals at a pace too fast for the machinery of the modern body politic ~~to function~~, people ^{who} by insistence on too great speed foster an ~~xenixmighaxix~~ oligarchic form of

government such as Communism, or Nazism or Fascism. The other group, which presents an equal danger, is composed of that small minority which complain that the democratic processes are inefficient as well as being slow, ^{prob'l} who would have the whole of government put into the hands of a little group of ~~people~~ ^{those} who have proved their efficiency in lines of ~~private~~ ^{ofcial} science of ^{ofcial} ~~private~~ business. They equally, and in most cases unconsciously ~~too~~, are in effect advocating the oligarchic form of government -- Communism or Nazism or Fascism.

Extreme Rightists and extreme Leftists should not be taken out by us and shot against the wall, for they sharpen the argument and make us realize the value of the democratic middle course -- especially if that middle course, in order to ~~keep~~ keep ~~up~~ ^{up} with the times, is just a little bit left of center.

I am reminded of four definitions:

A Radical is a man with both feet firmly planted -- in the air.

A Conservative is a man with two perfectly good legs ~~but~~, however, has never learned to ^{how} walk.

A Reactionary is a somnambulist walking backwards.

A Liberal is a man who uses his legs and his hands at the behest of his head.

It has been a good thing that during the past twenty years we have seen the effect of organized propaganda even when it has been based on nostrums or prejudices.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

given weekly broadcasts
barbarity, to ~~sake~~ ^{of} ~~the~~ ^{two} ~~country~~, to give everybody a better job -- or, more modestly, to put a chicken in every pot -- all by adoption of some new financial plan or some new social system. And they all burst like bubbles.

~~A~~ *It was a good thing that this happened.* It has been a good thing for the country that the Congress of the United States has been deluged from time to time by organized propaganda. Members of the House of Representatives and ~~the~~ the Senate begin to discriminate nowadays between honest ~~and~~ spontaneous, unsolicited expressions of opinion on the part of ~~the~~ voters and the propaganda type of ~~communications~~ *news appeal*.

Because the country is so profoundly interested in the world situation today I do want to leave with you one thought bearing on international relations. I make bold to do this because the topic of this evening's discussion, as I understand it, is "The War's Challenge to the United States".

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fake arguments in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogey man. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any state government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. *That is why I label that argument as a complete and shallowist fallacy.*

I have not the slightest objection to make against the amateurs who, to the reading and listening public, discourse on the inner meanings of the military and naval events of the war in Europe. They do no harm because the average citizen ^{is not qualified} ~~is not qualified~~ the gift of discrimination -- and the more all of these subjects are talked about by amateurs the more

*47, 1
T. T. G. 1/16*

INSERT B - Page 3

discussion -- and we Americans begin to know
the difference between the truth on the one side
and the falsehood on the other, no matter how
often the falsehood is iterated and reiterated.
Repetition does not transform a lie into a ~~xxxmxx~~
truth.

the public will make up its own mind in the long run. The public will acquire the ability to think things through for themselves.

The fact of the international situation -- the simple fact, without any bogey in it, without any appeals to prejudice -- is that the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war. That we can be neutral in thought as well as in act is, as I have said before, impossible of fulfillment because again, the people of this country, thinking things through calmly and without prejudice, have been and ~~are~~ are making up their minds about relative merits of current events on other continents.

It is a fact increasingly manifest that ~~international~~ sharpened ~~and~~ presentation of ~~international~~ the minds and the judgment of men and women everywhere in these days of real public discussion. ~~The ideal of freedom of expression in the twentieth-century forum, however, must be that upheld by Voltaire when he wrote to a correspondent: "I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it".~~

And adhesion to those principles of freedom and integrity of thought and statement which we uphold in radio communications still carries its ancient force if applied in the use of the older medium which Gutenberg gave to the world.

STATEMENTS FILE
ShorthandByKannee

Mr. Forster

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

October 26, 1939

The following address of the President, to be broadcast from the White House to the New York Herald Tribune Forum, is for release in editions of all newspapers appearing on the streets NOT EARLIER than 11:00 P.M., E. S. T., October 26, 1939.

PLEASE SAFEGUARD AGAINST PREMATURE RELEASE.

11:05 STEPHEN EARLY

Secretary to the President

Mrs. Reed Fisher, Chairwoman of the H. T. F.

9 A.M. - 10:30 A.M.

I am glad to say a word in this forum because I heartily approve the forum idea. After all, two eighteenth century forums in Philadelphia gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It is the magic of radio that has so greatly increased the usefulness of the forum. Radio listeners have learned to discriminate over the air between the honest advocate who relies on truth and logic and the more dramatic speaker who is clever in appealing to the passions and prejudices of his listeners.

We have had an example of objective reporting during the recent weeks in the presentation of international subjects, both in the press and (the) radio. Right here I should like to throw bouquets to the majority of the press and the radio. Through a period of grave anxiety both have tried to discriminate between fact and propaganda and unfounded rumor and to give their readers and listeners an unbiased and factual chronicle of developments. This has worked so well in international reporting that one may be pardoned for wishing for more of it in the field of domestic news. If it is a good rule in one, why is it not a good rule in the other?

From the end of the World War [towards] this country, like many others, went through a phase of having large groups of people carried away by some caption -- some alluring, attractive, even specifically inspiring, public presentation of a nostrum. Many Americans lost their heads because several plausible fellows lost theirs in expounding schemes to end barbarity, to give weekly hand-outs, to give everybody a better job -- or, more modestly, to put a chicken or two in every pot -- all by adoption of some new financial plan or some new social system. And they all burst like bubbles.

Some proponents of nostrums were honest and sincere -- others, too many of them, were seekers of personal power; still others saw a chance to get rich on the dimes and quarters of the poor. All of them, perhaps unconsciously, were capitalizing the fact that the democratic form of government works slowly, that there always exists in a democratic society a large group which chomps at the bit over the slowness of democracy. That is why it is right for us who believe in democracy to keep the democratic processes progressive -- moving forward with the advances in civilization. That is why it is dangerous for democracy to stop moving forward because any period of stagnation increases the numbers of those who demand action and action now.

There are, therefore, two distinct dangers to democracy -- the peril from those who seek the fulfillment of ideals at a pace too fast for the machinery of the modern body politic to function -- people who by insistence on too great speed foster an oligarchic form of government such as Communism, or Nazism or Fascism.

The other group, which presents an equal danger, is composed of (tiny) small minority which complains that the democratic processes are inefficient as well as being slow, people who would have the whole of government put into the hands of a little group of those who have proved their efficiency in lines of specialized science or specialized private business. They equally, and in most cases unconsciously too, are in effect advocating the oligarchic form of government -- Communism or Nazism or Fascism.

Extreme rightists and extreme leftists should not be taken out by us and shot against the wall, for they sharpen the argument and make us realize the value of the democratic middle course -- especially if that middle course, in order to keep up with the times, is "just a little bit left of center."

I am reminded of four definitions:

A Radical is a man with both feet firmly planted -- in the air.

A Conservative is a man with two perfectly good legs who, however, has never learned to walk.

A Reactionary is a somnambulist walking backwards.

A Liberal is a man who uses his legs and his hands at the behest of his head.

It has been a good thing that during the past twenty years we have seen the effect of organized propaganda even when it has been based on nostrums or prejudices.

It has been a good thing for the country that the Congress of the United States has been deluged from time to time by organized propaganda. Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate begin to discriminate nowadays between honest spontaneous, unsolicited expressions of opinion on the part of voters and the propaganda type of mass appeals.

Because the country is so profoundly interested in the world situation today I do want to leave with you one thought bearing on international relations. I make bold to do this because the topic of this evening's discussion, as I understand it, is "The War's Challenge to the United States".

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogey man. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any state government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake.

I have not the slightest objection to make against the amateurs who, to the reading and listening public, discourse on the inner meanings of the military and naval events of the war in Europe. They do no harm because the average citizen is requiring the gift of discrimination -- and the more all of these subjects are talked about by amateur armchair strategists the more the public will make up its own mind in the long run. The public will require the ability to think things through for themselves.

The fact of the international situation -- the simple fact, without any bogey in it, without any appeals to prejudice -- is that the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war. That we can be neutral in thought as well as in act is, (as I have said before,) impossible of fulfillment because again, the people of this country, thinking things through calmly and without prejudice, have been and are asking up their minds about relative merits of current events on other continents.

It is a fact increasingly manifest that presentation of real news has sharpened the minds and the judgment of men and women everywhere in these days of real public discussion -- (and we Americans begin to know the difference between the truth on the one side and the falsehood on the other, no matter how often the falsehood is iterated and reiterated. *Repetition does not transform a lie into a truth.*)

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

October 26, 1939

The following address of the President, to be broadcast from the White House to the New York Herald Tribune Forum, is for release in editions of all newspapers appearing on the streets NOT EARLIER than 11:00 P.M., E. S. T., October 26, 1939.

PLEASE SAFEGUARD AGAINST PREMATURE RELEASE.

STEPHEN EARLY
Secretary to the President

to
I am glad to say a word in this forum because I heartily approve the forum idea. After all, two eighteenth century forums in Philadelphia gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It is the magic of radio that has so greatly increased the usefulness of the forum. Radio listeners have learned to discriminate over the air between the honest advocate who relies on truth and logic and the more dramatic speaker who is clever in appealing to the passions and prejudices of his listeners.

We have had an example of objective reporting during *the* recent weeks in the presentation of international subjects, both in the press and the radio. Right here I should like to throw bouquets to the majority of the press and the radio. Through a period of grave anxiety both have tried to discriminate between fact and propaganda and unfounded rumor and to give their readers and listeners an unbiased and factual chronicle of developments. This has worked so well in international reporting that one may be pardoned for wishing for more of it in the field of domestic news. If it is a good rule in one, why is it not a good rule in the other?

31 yrs ago
people
From the end of the World War ~~onwards~~ this country, like many others, went through a phase of having large groups of people carried away by some emotion — some alluring, attractive, even speciously inspiring, public presentation of a nostrum. Many Americans lost their heads because several plausible fellows lost theirs in expounding schemes to end barbarity, to give weekly hand-outs to give everybody a better job — or, more modestly, to put a chicken or two in every pot — all by adoption of some new financial plan or some new social system. And ~~they~~ burst like bubbles. *all of them, all of them* *for staple*

in other words,
really
in our population
Some proponents of nostrums were honest and sincere — others, too many of them, were seekers of personal power; still others saw a chance to get rich on the dimes and quarters of the poor. All of them, perhaps unconsciously, were capitalizing the fact that the democratic form of government works slowly, that there always exists in a democratic society a large group which ~~gains~~ not ~~champs~~ at the bit over the slowness of democracy. That is why it is right for us who believe in democracy to keep the democratic processes progressive, moving forward with the advances in civilization. That is why it is dangerous for democracy to stop moving forward because any period of stagnation increases the numbers of those who demand action and action now.

- of Standing Still

a form of government
There are, therefore, two distinct dangers to democracy -- the peril from those who seek the fulfillment of ideals at a pace ~~that~~ too fast for the machinery of the modern body politic to function -- people who by insistence on too great speed foster an oligarchic form of government such as Communism, or Nazism or Fascism.

bold is really a And the other group, ~~that~~ presents an equal danger, is composed of ~~a~~ small minority which complains that the democratic processes are inefficient as well as being slow; people who would have the whole of government put into the hands of a little group of those who have proved their efficiency in lines of specialized science or specialized private business. They equally, and in most cases unconsciously too, are in effect advocating the oligarchic form of government -- Communism or Nazism or Fascism.

Extreme Rightists and extreme Leftists ~~should not be~~ because taken out by us and shot against the wall, ~~for they~~ sharpen the people's argument and make us realize the value of the democratic middle ~~but that~~ course -- especially if that middle course, in order to keep up with the times, is "just a little bit left of center."

and I quote what I said before

I am reminded of four definitions:

a Radical

A Radical is a man with both feet firmly planted -- in the air.

A Conservative is a man with two perfectly good legs who, however, has never learned to walk ~~forward~~.

A Reactionary is a communist walking backwards.

But a Liberal is a man who uses his legs and his hands at the honest of his head.

at the command for me

It has been a good thing that during the past twenty years we have seen the effect of organized propaganda even when ~~it was~~ ~~that~~ based on nostrums or prejudices.

propaganda has It has been a good thing for the country that the Congress of the United States has been deluged from time to time by organized propaganda. Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate begin to discriminate nowadays between honest spontaneous, unsolicited expressions of opinion on the part of voters and the propaganda type of mass appeals.

Because the country is so profoundly interested in the world situation today, I do want to leave with you one thought bearing on international relations. I make bold to do this because the topic of this evening's discussion, as I understand it, is "The War's Challenge to the United States".

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogey man. The simple truth is that no person ~~in~~ ^{no place on} any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any state government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument shameless and dishonest fake.

I have not the slightest objection to make against the amateur who, to the reading and listening public, discourse on the inner meanings of the military and naval events of the war in Europe. They do no harm because the average citizen is acquiring the gift rapidly of discrimination -- and the more all of these subjects are talked about by amateur armchair strategists the more the public will make up its own mind in the long run. The public will acquire the ability to think things through for themselves.

the American voting public

the World situation

of America

The fact of the international situation -- the simple fact, without any bogey in it, without any appeals to prejudice -- is that the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war. That we can be neutral in thought as well as in act is, as I have said before, impossible of fulfillment because again, the people of this country, thinking things through calmly and without prejudice, have been and are making up their minds about relative merits of current events on other continents.

It is a fact increasingly manifest that presentation of real news has sharpened the minds and the judgment of men and women everywhere in these days of real public discussion -- ~~and~~ we Americans begin to know the difference between the truth on the one side and the falsehood on the other, no matter how often the falsehood is iterated and reiterated. Repetition does not transform a lie into a truth.

my friends remember that

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
To the New York Herald Tribune Forum
Delivered from the White House
October 26, 1939, 11:05 P. M., E. S. T.

MRS. REED, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE HERALD TRIBUNE

FORUM:

I am glad to say a word in this forum because I heartily approve the forum idea. After all, two eighteenth century forums in Philadelphia gave to us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It is the magic of radio that has so greatly increased the usefulness of the forum. Radio listeners have learned to discriminate over the air between the honest advocate who relies on truth and logic and the more dramatic speaker who is clever in appealing to the passions and prejudices of his listeners.

We have had an example of objective reporting during the recent weeks in the presentation of international subjects, both in the press and (the) radio. Right here I should like to throw bouquets to the majority of the press and the radio. Through a period of grave anxiety both have tried to discriminate between fact and propaganda and unfounded rumor and to give to their readers and listeners an unbiased and factual chronicle of developments. This has worked so well in international reporting that one may be pardoned for wishing for more of it in the field of domestic news. It's a good rule. If it is a good rule in

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

This is a transcript made by the White House stenographer from his shorthand notes taken at the time the speech was made. Underlining indicates words extemporaneously added to the previously prepared reading copy text. Words in parentheses are words that were omitted when the speech was delivered, though they appear in the previously prepared reading copy text.

one, why is it not a good rule in the other?

From the end of the World War (onwards) twenty-one years ago, this country, like many others, went through a phase of having large groups of people carried away by some emotion -- some alluring, attractive, even speciously inspiring, public presentation of a nostrum, a cure-all. Many Americans lost their heads because several plausible fellows lost theirs in expounding schemes to end barbarity, to give weekly handouts to people, to give everybody a better job -- or, more modestly, for example, to put a chicken or two in every pot -- all by adoption of some new financial plan or some new social system. And (they all) all of them, all of them burst like bubbles.

Some proponents of nostrums were honest and sincere -- others, too many of them, were seekers of personal power; still others saw a chance to get rich on the dimes and quarters of the poorer people in our population. All of them, perhaps unconsciously, were capitalizing the fact that the democratic form of government works slowly, that there always exists in a democratic society a large group which, quite naturally, champs at the bit over the slowness of democracy and that is why it is right for us who believe in democracy to keep the democratic processes progressive -- in other words, moving forward with the advances in civilization. That is why it is dangerous for democracy to stop moving forward because any period of

stagnation, of standing still increases the numbers of those who demand action and action now.

There are, therefore, two distinct dangers to democracy -- the peril from those who seek the fulfillment of fine ideals at a pace that is too fast for the machinery of the modern body politic to function - people who by insistence on too great speed foster an oligarchic form of government, a form of government such as Communism, or Nazism or Fascism.

And, the other group, (which) that presents an equal danger, is composed of (that) what is really a small minority which complains that the democratic processes are inefficient as well as being too slow, people, in other words, who would have the whole of their government put into the hands of a little group of those who have proved their efficiency in lines of specialized science or specialized private business and do not see the picture as a whole. They equally, and in most cases unconsciously too, are in effect advocating the oligarchic form of government -- Communism or Nazism or Fascism.

Extreme Rightists and extreme Leftists (should) ought not to be taken out by us and shot against the wall, (for they) because people like that sharpen the argument and make us realize the value of the democratic middle course -- especially if that middle course, in order to keep up with the times, is, and I quote what I have said

before, "just a little bit left of center."

I am reminded of four definitions:

A Radical -- a Radical is a man with both feet firmly planted -- in the air.

A Conservative is a man with two perfectly good legs who, however, has never learned to walk forward.

A Reactionary is a somnambulist walking backwards.

A Liberal is a man who uses his legs and his hands at the behest -- at the command -- of his head.

It has been a good thing for us that during the past twenty years we have seen the effect of organized propaganda even when (it) that propaganda has been based on nostrums or prejudices.

It has been a good thing for (the) our country that the Congress of the United States has been deluged from time to time by organized propaganda. Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate begin to discriminate nowadays between honest spontaneous, unsolicited expressions of opinion on the part of the voters and the propaganda type of mass appeals.

Because the country is so profoundly interested in the world situation today I do want to leave with you one thought bearing on international relations. I make bold to do this because the topic of this evening's discussion, as I understand it, is "The War's Challenge to

the United States".

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That - that, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogey man. The simple truth is that no person, no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any state government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battle-fields of Europe. And that is why I label that argument as a shameless and dishonest fake.

I have not the slightest objection to make against (the) those amateurs who, to the reading and the listening public, discourse on the inner meanings of the military and naval events of the war in Europe. They do no harm because the average citizen is acquiring rapidly the gift of discrimination -- and the more all (of) these subjects are talked about by amateur armchair strategists the more the public will make up its own mind in the long run. The public, the American voting public will acquire the ability to think things through for themselves.

The fact of the international situation, the

world situation -- the simple fact, without any bogey in it, without any appeals to prejudice -- is that the United States of America, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war. That we can be neutral in thought as well as in act is, (as I have said before,) impossible of fulfillment because again, the people of this country, thinking things through calmly and without prejudice, have been and are making up their minds about the relative merits of current events on other continents.

It is a fact increasingly manifest that presentation of real news has sharpened the minds and the judgment of men and women everywhere in these days of real public discussion -- (and) we Americans begin to know the difference between the truth on the one side and the falsehood on the other, no matter how often the falsehood is iterated and reiterated. My friends, remember that repetition does not transform a lie into a truth.